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SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

11/16/90 - 11/26/90

A preliminary search of the various libraries (State Library, Thomas Cooper Library, Richland County Library) and several national clearinghouses (Council on State Governments; National Conference of State Legislatures; National Governor's Association) was made regarding the issue of reorganization in state government. A number of books, periodicals, and reports were gleaned from this search, and a reference outline was prepared as part of a presentation for Senator John Drummond to the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce's Task Force for Reorganizing State Government on November 26, 1990. (See Attachments A and B.)

11/26/90 - 12/7/90

The literature search at the area libraries was conducted on a more aggressive level, and the national clearinghouses' assistance was more comprehensive during this time. Also, the footnotes and bibliographies of some of the more relevant materials gathered and of those authored by the emerging experts in the field were examined thoroughly and these sources were followed-up. Gathering, indexing, copying, and categorizing the materials were duties performed on a daily basis. During this time, a survey and letter were drafted to be sent out to the Nation's governors to ascertain what reorganization initiatives had taken place in their states and to request information.

12/7/90 - 12/21/90

On December 7, 1990, the letters and surveys to the Nation's Governors were sent out requesting that the information be sent back by January 4, 1991. (See Attachment C.) Also, during this time, a list of twenty universities with top political science and public administration departments (gleaned from the Gorman List which ranks schools according to their fields of study) were contacted to ascertain whether they had knowledge of any work being done in this area and to enlist their assistance in broadening our contact list and bibliography. (See Attachment D.)

Work continued on accumulating materials through the libraries and national clearinghouses and the footnotes and bibliographies of pertinent articles. Indexing, copying, categorizing, and entering information were duties performed on a daily basis. The material was categorized into 9 categories: (1) General Theory; (2) Proposed Models; (3) Case Studies; (4) Executive Branch Reorganization; (5) Governors' Perspective on Reorganization; (6) Constitutional Approaches to Reorganization; (7) Reference Materials; (8) South Carolina Studies and Information; and (9) Federal Reorganization.
Also, during this time, work commenced on organizing a Master Bibliography and Contact List. (See Attachments E and F.) For each entry on the Master Bibliography, there is a hard copy of the information in the files, properly categorized. (A symbol, i.e. CS for CASE STUDIES, etc., appears after each entry and denotes in which category the information is filed.) The material was also narrowed down to the "cream of the crop" and a "Key Articles" list was developed. (See Attachment G.)

During this period, a "Governors' Reorganization Survey Checklist" was developed. (See Attachment H.) As the information is received from the states, details are entered on the Checklist, follow-up work is performed (i.e. calling experts, etc.), and the materials are properly filed according to state name.

Only six states had responded by the deadline to our letter and survey dated December 7, 1990, and a follow-up letter was prepared and sent to those outstanding states on January 4, 1991, requesting that they respond by January 22. (See Attachment I.) Follow-up calls to non-responding states are planned after this date. Also, a letter similar to the one sent to the governors was prepared on January 4, 1991 and sent to all the state libraries in the Nation to ascertain whether their institutions may have additional information on this issue of governmental reorganization. (See Attachment J.) Follow-up calls will be made to those libraries which do not respond by January 31.

Also, during this period, the "Key Articles" list was further narrowed down to some top twenty articles, and staff is presently reading and outlining these.
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ATTACHMENT A
SENATOR JOHN DRUMMOND  
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce  
Task Force for Reorganizing State Government  
Monday, November 26, 1990, 11:30 a.m.  
Chamber Offices, AT&T Building

OUTLINE

I. PURPOSES OF REORGANIZATION

A. To increase effectiveness of management;

B. To promote economy and efficiency in government;

C. To group agencies by major function so as to coordinate and consolidate them;

D. To reduce the number of agencies by grouping them into large agencies housing similar functions organized under a single agency head; and

E. To reduce overlap and duplication of services.

II. STATE REORGANIZATION COMMISSION

A. Created in 1948 by Act 621, amended by Act 410, 1971 (Sections 1-19-10-260, S.C. Code of Laws, 1976, as amended) to study the administrative needs of the State and to recommend when departments should be merged and when agencies had served their purposes and should be discontinued.

B. The State Reorganization Commission’s work revolves around the following major research and policy development areas: Compliance Review; Regulatory Agency Review (Sunset); Occupational Registration and Licensing Review (Sunrise); Jail/Prison Overcrowding Project; Human Services Integration Project; and Special Projects.

C. Furthermore, Section 1-19-10 of the South Carolina Code of Laws declares it to be in the public interest that the Executive and administrative agencies and functions of the state government be reorganized to increase the efficiency of their operations, to promote economy, and to reduce the cost of government.

D. During the early 1950s and during the 1970’s the Commission submitted various proposals detailing changes needed in the administrative organization of the State. The following represents those proposals which were successfully enacted:
1. 1950 - Transfer of functions of Fertilizer Board of Control and State Crop Pest Commission to Clemson University.

2. 1950 - Transfer of Surplus Property Procurement Property Division of the Research, Planning and Development Board to the State Budget and Control Board.

3. 1950 - Consolidation of the following agencies into the State Budget and Control Board:
   a. State Budget Commission
   b. Commissioners of the Sinking Fund
   c. Board of Phosphate Commissioners
   d. State Finance Committee
   e. Board of Claims for the State of South Carolina
   f. Commission on State House/State House Grounds
   g. Joint Committee on Printing
   h. S.C. Retirement System

4. 1951 - Consolidation of the State Board of Fisheries, the State Game and Fish Commission, and the Chief Game Warden into the Wildlife and Marine Resources Department.

5. 1973 - Consolidation of the Board of Health, the State Department of Health, the Executive Committee of Board of Health, and the Pollution Control Authority into the Department of Health and Environmental Control.


7. 1977 - The Disaster Preparedness Division from the Governor's Office transferred to the Adjutant General.

8. 1978 - Consolidation of three joint legislative energy-related committees into one.

9. 1978 - The Eleemosynary Charter Studies transferred from the Department of Social Services to the Secretary of State.

10. 1978 - The responsibility for purchase of spoils disposal property transferred from the Development Board to the Coastal Council.

11. 1979 - The Insurance Commission was restructured (through the Commission's Sunset review process)

12. 1981 - The Consolidated Procurement Code, after a two-year Commission study, was enacted into law.
E. An addition to these Commission efforts, there have been other consolidations of functions in the state government:

1. In 1981, the Juvenile Placement and Aftercare and the Youth Services were merged to form the present Department of Youth Services.

2. The Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism was established in 1967 when the state parks division was transferred from the Forestry Division.

3. In 1973, the functions of the State Recreation Commission were added to the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, thus eliminating a state agency which had been established earlier.

4. The Agricultural Marketing Commission which operated the State Farmers Market in Columbia was abolished in 1975 and its activities were transferred to the State Department of Agriculture.

5. The Higher Education Commission was created to provide for some unified control over all institutions of higher education in the State.

F. Between 1920 and 1985, there have been fourteen major reorganization reports/studies in South Carolina. They are as follows:

1. 1920 - Griffenhagen and Associates Study
2. 1935 - Professor J. Karl Coleman Study
3. 1945 - Preparedness for Peace Commission
4. 1948 - State Reorganization Commission Studies
5. 1955 - Fiscal Survey Commission
7. 1968-85 - Opportunity and Growth in South Carolina
8. 1969-71 - South Carolina State Government Organization
9. 1971 - State Reorganization Commission Studies
10. 1972 - Governor's Management Review Commission
12. 1982 - South Carolina State Government: Organization and Administration
13. 1983 - A Study of the Organizational Structure of State Government
14. 1985 - The Organizational Structure of South Carolina State Government
III. REORGANIZATION

A. WHAT IS REORGANIZATION?

1. The need for governmental reorganization is a perennial one. In the past, it has been felt at all levels of government and in all three of its traditional branches. But because of the rapidly multiplying tasks and services that apparently only the executive can perform, by far the greatest activity has been in the field of administrative reorganization.

2. Sometimes, the need for major structural and procedural adjustments has seemed so great that new constitutions have been adopted or seriously considered. Other times, there have been major reorganizations in one of the three branches, more frequently there have been smaller changes within one of the branches - usually the executive. But whether the scope be constitutional revision, over-all administrative reorganization, or piecemeal adjustment, all these efforts are part of the continuing process of adjustment of government structure and machinery to the needs of the people.

3. Although there are no uniform set of principles of state reorganization, there is agreement on what should be done. These standards are as follows:

   a. Concentration of authority and responsibility - The governor has adequate authority to direct the state administration, being uniformly vested with broad executive powers which the other elective officials under the state constitutions do not have. He is therefore in a position to manage the administration, provided the machinery of the state government is properly arranged. The whole practice of administrative reorganization turns on this point;

   b. Departmentalization or functional integration - Previously existing offices, boards, commission, and agencies of the administration are consolidated and their activities integrated in a few orderly departments, each of which approximates in its work a major function of the state government. This process tends to locate responsibility for administrative action or inaction, to unify and standardize methods of procedure, to aid in getting information for management, and to facilitate the financing of administrative work;

   c. Undesirability of boards for purely administrative work - Because of the division of authority and general lack of initiative and responsibility, boards are usually considered undesirable for purely administrative work. They have therefore been displaced by single executives in many of the reorganizations plans so far adopted;
d. Coordination of the staff services of administration - Staff services concern the governor a great deal more than do the operating or line services. These staff services have to do mainly with budgeting, accounting and reporting, purchasing, and personnel. It is advantageous to have them properly coordinated and brought together in a single staff department.

e. Provision for an independent audit - A complete separation of the function of financial control and accounting from those of independent auditing (postauditing) and review is necessary in order to obtain the most satisfactory results. The control and accounting functions are executive in character and therefore belong to an official - a controller - directly responsible to the governor. Such functions are part and parcel of the system of budgeting and financial management by which the governor is enabled to control the state's business.

f. Recognition of a governor's cabinet - In the management of integrated state administration, governors have found cabinet meetings almost indispensable. The administrative work and budgetary requirements of each department are discussed at these meetings and practical methods are devised and applied to further cooperation in and coordination of work, and to eliminate duplication and overlapping of functions between the various departments.

4. Comprehensive reorganizations of state government appear to fall in three general categories:

a. Traditional or Standard Type - With this type of reorganization, the reduction of the number of agencies is accomplished to some degree within the existing pattern of agencies headed by elected officers, boards and commissions;

b. Cabinet Type - This is the type of reorganization whereby heads of reorganized departments are all appointed by and responsible to the governor;

c. Secretary-Coordinator Type - This type of reorganization is that in which the structure and authority of agencies is unchanged and the secretaries have primarily a coordinating function.
B. WHY DOES REORGANIZATION OCCUR?:

1. The leading theoretical perspectives on state executive reorganization are as follows:

   a. Administrative Orthodoxy - In this classical perspective, the process is usually initiated by a sponsor who perceives a need for change in the existing organization of state government. Often the sponsor is the governor; however, it might be one of the governor's chief aides, a legislative leader, or even a prominent business leader outside of state government. The perceived need for reorganization might result from an event or from a realization that the present organization is inadequate;

   b. Reorganization as Political Competition - The thrust of this approach is that reorganization is basically a political process aimed at political ends. Reorganizations in this view, are undertaken to enhance a governor's power or detract from it; to insulate a governmental function from the influence of special interests or to ensure that influence; to shake up the executive branch in an effort to get rid of a "troublemaker" or to install one's own political appointees; or to boost, change, or thwart program direction;

   c. Socioeconomic Determinants - The perception, using this approach, is that the most significant influence on reorganization is the impact of socioeconomic variables. This perspective asserts that political processes have little power to explain the level of expenditures and outputs of state governments;

   d. Reorganization as Diffused Innovation - This approach looks to the diffusion of ideas, instrumentalities, policies, and even causal processes for reorganization across the states. Illinois, with the first major state executive reorganization in 1917, is often viewed as an innovator in state structural reform, and a number of states have emulated the Illinois example. The process typically starts when state officials or personnel perceive a gap between what state government is doing and what state decision makers believe it should be doing;

   e. Reorganization as Adaptation to Modernization - Reorganization is viewed as an attempt to adapt to actual or anticipated changes in the organizational environment. The reason for reorganization is to bring up to date, to permit the bringing up to date, of those aspects of organizational operations and relationships that have failed to modify themselves through incremental changes sufficiently to keep up with the changing context within which they operate;

   f. Reorganization as Synthesis - No single perspective is sufficient of itself to reveal all we need to know about reorganization. Although the Administrative Orthodoxy and Reorganization as Political Competition perspectives have been the
dominant conceptual lenses through which government reorganization is viewed, synthesizing the contributions of all perspectives can aid in understanding reorganization and in taking advantage of the collective strengths and compensate for the shortcomings of individual approaches.

C. HOW IS REORGANIZATION IMPLEMENTED?

1. A number of major obstacles to reorganization have been identified: (1) a negativistic, conservative attitude of legislative bodies toward major reform; (2) bureaucratic resistance to administrative reform; (3) the high political risk involved; (4) constitutional-legal constraints on reorganization; (5) inadequate knowledge and understanding of reorganization objectives and process; (6) resistance of clientele groups affected by reorganization; and (7) resource limitations.

2. The literature points to three sets of strategic options:

   a. **Timing** - the most advantageous time to attempt reorganization.

      The timing considered here revolves around recurrent time periods - the governor's tenure of office and the legislative session. The question is whether the beginning of a gubernatorial administration is a better time to launch upon executive reorganization or is it a better strategy to wait until later on in the administration. Although the National Governor's Association does not endorse a particular timing strategy, it has implied that executive reorganization should, at least, be considered during the early days of a governor's term, especially that of a new governor.

   b. **Tactics** - whether the reorganization should be pushed all at once or incrementally.

      The choice of adoption tactics involves the decision to attempt adoption of reorganization in one major effort (comprehensive) or to attempt to enact reorganization by applying phased or incremental tactics over a longer period of time. The experts agree that the piecemeal or incremental plan is the preferable strategy. A major disadvantage of the comprehensive tactic is that some part of the reorganization package may be unsatisfactory even though the plan as a whole may be basically sound. Interest groups opposed to different sections could combine to defeat the entire proposal.
c. Utilization of the Adoption Mechanism - whether the choice of legal instrumentality inhibits or facilitates adoption.

This issue centers on the type of legal mechanism employed to adopt a reorganization, whether it should be by statute, constitutional provision, or executive reorganization plan. Reorganization by statute is regarded as more feasible, but also easier to reverse or eliminate by opponents of reorganization or by new political regimes. Constitutional adoption is more difficult to achieve, but once in place, is regarded as more permanent. And, adoption by executive reorganization plan involves granting reorganization authority to the governor through executive order or reorganization plan. This method has been patterned after the reorganization authority with regard to the federal executive branch, but it appears that states with this device are reluctant to use it and fare no better than those states which do not have it. The general assessment is that reorganization by statute is more politically feasible, although truly comprehensive restructuring requires constitutional revision.

IV. BEYOND REORGANIZATION

1. There is no one answer as to how to make reorganization work. Some things to consider are:

a. Study the need. The state must review its functions, its major missions, and its present organization. It must then determine how activities might best be ordered. Decisions must be tempered by political realities.

b. Broad involvement is needed. A successful reorganization effort needs support from many directions, especially from the legislature, the governor, and the public. The public has usually been involved through participation in study groups, and in some states, the first step has been to obtain a public mandate through a constitutional amendment limiting the number of departments.

c. Give the governor adequate authority. The governor is the chief executive and can be held responsible for administration only if he has the authority to appoint and remove department heads.

d. Give authority to the department head. The department head must have adequate authority to coordinate the activities under him. He needs authority to manage.

e. Provide staff for the department head. For the department head to coordinate activities of previously independent groups, he not only needs authority, he needs staff. Staff can assist in planning, budgeting and manpower administration, and can help provide coordination.
f. Provide other coordinative devices. No reorganization can group everything that needs to be coordinated. A cabinet may be the coordinative mechanism, or coordination might be achieved through interdepartmental committees or a governor's staff liaison. Informal mechanisms for coordination should be recognized and utilized.

g. Continue management improvement efforts. Reorganization, to succeed, must be accompanied by management improvement efforts to assure that the governor, the legislature, their staffs, and the central budget, planning, and other management staffs are able to utilize the new structure effectively.

h. Commitment is needed. No reorganization will work unless the governor, the legislature, and department heads want to make it work.

i. Reorganization is never completed. When new problems or issues surface, institutions must be brought to bear on them. Reorganization will always be a continuing issue and must be undertaken, if not wholesale, at least piecemeal. Government organization must reflect the priorities of the times, and agencies must be aligned to best meet these priorities.

j. Every state has different needs. The state must proceed with reorganization in the light of its own needs. Some states have reorganized in the past twenty years, others have made considerable changes on a function-by-function basis. All have different existing structures, clientele group relations and political traditions. The initiative can come from the legislature, from the governor, or from both. Study groups in some instances are legislative, in others, primarily citizens. Whatever the past, each state must find a way to gear for effective action against current and emerging problems.
SENATOR JOHN DRUMMOND
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce
Task Force for Reorganizing State Government
Monday, November 26, 1990, 11:30 a.m.
Chamber Offices, AT&T Building

OUTLINE

1. SOUTH CAROLINA STATE REORGANIZATION COMMISSION

A) History of the State Reorganization Commission

- The State Reorganization Commission was created in 1948 and operates pursuant to Section 1-19-10, et seq. of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended. It was originally created to study administrative needs of the state, to recommend when departments should be merged, and to determine when agencies had served their purposes and should be dissolved. The Commission was created, and still operates, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of State government operations to the fullest extent practicable, promoting economy, and reducing generally the cost of government. This is currently effected through numerous management, administrative, evaluation, and "special" studies or reviews.

- During the early 1950s, the 1970s, and in the 1980s the Commission submitted various proposals detailing changes needed in the administrative organization of the State. The Commission's work has lead to 13 major enacted reorganization proposals. These are:

1) 1950 - Transfer of functions of Fertilizer Board of Control and State Crop Pest Commission to Clemson University.

2) 1950 - Transfer of Surplus Property Procurement Property Division of the Research, Planning and Development Board to the State Budget and Control Board.

3) 1950 - Consolidation of the following agencies into the State Budget and Control Board:
   a. State Budget Commission
   b. Commissioners of the Sinking Fund
   c. Board of Phosphate Commissioners
   d. State Finance Committee
e. Board of Claims for the State of South Carolina
f. Commission on State House/State House Grounds
g. Joint Committee on Printing
h. S.C. Retirement System

4) 1951 - Consolidation of the State Board of Fisheries, the State Game and Fish Commission, and the Chief Game Warden into the Wildlife and Marine Resources Department.

5) 1973 - Consolidation of the Board of Health, the State Department of Health, the Executive Committee of Board of Health, and the Pollution Control Authority into the Department of Health and Environmental Control.

6) 1974 - Consolidation of the S.C. Commission on Alcoholism and the Commissioner of Narcotics and Controlled Substances into the S.C. Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

7) 1977 - The Disaster Preparedness Division from the Governor's Office transferred to the Adjutant General.

8) 1978 - Consolidation of three joint legislative energy-related committees into one.

9) 1978 - The Eleemosynary Charter Studies transferred from the Department of Social Services to the Secretary of State.

10) 1978 - The responsibility for purchase of spoils disposal property transferred from the Development Board to the Coastal Council.

11) 1979 - The Insurance Commission was restructured (through the Commission's Sunset review process)

12) 1981 - The Consolidated Procurement Code, after a two-year Commission study, was enacted into law.

13) 1988 - The Adoption Merger Review, which created the plan to merge the Children's Bureau into the adoption unit of the Department of Social Services.
B) Current Mission/Activities of the Reorganization Commission

The State Reorganization Commission is required by statutory law and the Appropriation Act to conduct research and evaluations in five project areas. These are:

1) Compliance Review
2) Regulatory Agency Review or "Sunset"
3) Occupational Registration and Licensing Review or "Sunrise"
4) Jail/Prison Overcrowding Project
5) Human Services Integration Project

In addition, the Commission is also required by the FY 1990-91 Appropriation Act to work on three "Special Projects:" Privatization of School Bus Transportation; The Directory of State Boards, Commissions, Departments, Agencies, and Committees; and, the Advisory Commission on Elimination of Wasteful State Government Spending.

i) Compliance Review

The 1988 Compliance Review Act established a structured method by which Legislative Audit Council report findings and recommendations are made a direct part of the legislative process, ensuring agency accountability to the General Assembly. A review and hearing process conducted by a select committee of the legislature, staffed by analysts from the State Reorganization Commission, seeks to determine agency compliance, to LAC findings and recommendations designed to improve performance, and providing recommendations to the General Assembly.

In May of 1990, the first Compliance Review was completed. While this is still a new process, the first review shows great promise for the Act's effectiveness. The review of USC's compliance with the LAC's audit found that the University had complied with 12 of the 13 findings/issue areas in the Council's report. For the other finding/issue area, the Compliance Review Committee agreed with USC that compliance was unnecessary. Presently, four other Compliance Reviews are being conducted. They are reviews of the Adjutant General's Office, the Department of Mental Health, the Continuum of Care for Emotionally Disturbed Children, and the Alcoholic Beverage Commission. The Commission is also anticipating the release of a full-scope audit of the Department of Social Services.
ii) **Regulatory Agency Review (Sunset)**

- The 1978 Sunset Act created a formal process for periodic legislative review and evaluation of specified state agencies. The Sunset review process is designed to provide increased oversight of regulatory entities and to promote accountability and efficiency of 44 state agencies which are reviewed every six years.

- The LAC conducts audits of the specified agencies. Upon receipt of these reports, the SRC holds public hearings on the reports and the agencies under review. The SRC's Sunset Subcommittee then evaluates all testimony, the Council's report, and all other relevant information and makes final recommendations to the General Assembly, including whether to re-authorize agencies or to "Sunset" them.

iii) **Occupational Registration and Licensing Review (Sunrise)**

- The 1988 Occupational Registration and Licensing Review Act established a structured process for determining whether a profession should become regulated by the State.

- To determine the need for new regulation, legislative subcommittees responsible for bills proposing occupational regulation have three options under the law: they can handle independently the legislation; they can request the SRC's assistance in conducting a public hearing; or, they can turn responsibility for the public hearing, and the research and analysis of the need for the proposed new regulatory body, and the reporting of recommendations to the General Assembly over to the Reorganization Commission.

- In FY 1989-90, the Commission was requested to conduct "Sunrise" studies of the need for regulatory boards governing Dieticians and Residential Specialists (contractors).

iv) **Jail/Prison Overcrowding Project**

- The General Assembly, since FY 1984-85, has directed the Reorganization Commission to study programs that address prison overcrowding.

- Proviso 3.58, of the FY 1990-91 Appropriation Act, directs the SRC to "evaluate the diversionary effects and cost/benefit of the Restitution Center Program" of the SCDPPPS.

- Proviso 3.59 also directs the SRC to "complete an evaluation of the shock incarceration program established by the...[SCDC]...one year after the initiation of the program."
v) **Human Services Integration Project**

- This Commission project is in its final phase, dissemination of analytical information and recommendations. Under the auspices of the Commission, evaluations of four pilot sites operated under the auspices of the Human Services Coordinating Council, have been conducted to study the value of providing collocation and case management services to high risk students and other users of the State's social services system.

- The Commission continues to be a leading proponent of case management and collocation, disseminating information to federal, state, and local officials.
2. **THE STATE OF STATE GOVERNMENT**

A) **Complexity of Governmental Organization**

i) **185 South Carolina Governmental Entities:**

- The South Carolina State Government has presently 200 separate entities. If one even excludes constitutional offices, legislative bodies, and judicial entities, the State still has 145 separate entities.

- Most of these 145 entities are run by independent commissions and boards whose members are appointed for multi-year terms by the General Assembly, or the Governor, or both.

- The complexity of our present system of State government is shown clearly by the State Organization Chart.

ii) **Accountability of Boards & Commissions:**

- The number of independent State agencies raises an extremely important question:

  *Who are voters to hold accountable for operation of the 145 state "agencies" who are run by "Boards & Commissions"?*

- If our citizens are upset with how the Highway Department is being run, how can they force change in the system, when 18 of the 20 Commission members are appointed to four-year terms. Should voters hold the General Assembly responsible? Should they hold the Governor responsible?

- It could be said, and is the opinion of many, that our present system does not have clear lines of authority from our State's voters to our State agencies.

- In addition, one might ask, is it economical to have 200 separate state entities? Is it cost-effective, or is there substantial overlap of functions, duties, and services provided by these 200 government operations?

iii) **Growth in State Government 1970 to Today:**

- When you add the growth of State government over the last 20 years to the complexity of our present system of running state agencies through independent commissions and boards, the need for possible reorganization to lead to greater efficiency, productivity, and accountability of state agencies to the voters becomes a real issue.
Since 1970, the State's budget has increased 700%. It has gone from $508 million in FY 1970-71 to $3.6 billion in FY 1990-91.

The actual number of State employees has also probably increased by approximately 100%. In FY 1970-71, we had 26,000 individuals employed by the State either part-time or full-time. Today, we have 42,752 budgeted full-time positions. And, the State Retirement System has informed me that there are 72,149 presently employed participants in the State Retirement System. This is a true reflection of the growth in State government.

Functional Grouping Data (Operating Budgets, Not Appropriated Budgets for FY 1989-90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Entities</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive &amp; Administrative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$352,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,837,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,555,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Rehabilitative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$347,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$309,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$139,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$138,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. REORGANIZATION: CONCEPTS AND PROCESSES

A) Why Reorganize State Government?

- The perceived need for reorganization might result from an event or from a realization that the present organization is inadequate.

- Reorganizations may be undertaken to enhance the governor's power or detract from it; to insulate a governmental function from the influence of special interests or to ensure that influence; to shake up the executive branch in an effort to get rid of a "troublemaker" or to install one's own political appointees; or to boost, change, or thwart program direction.

- Reorganization may be needed in order for government to adapt to Modernization - Perhaps reorganization is needed to bring up to date of those aspects of organizational operations and relationships that have failed to change with the times, through incremental changes since the last reorganization in 1948, and to keep up with the changing context within which they operate.

- The most important reason though for reorganization of State government is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services provided to taxpayer, increase the productivity level of each governmental entity, and eliminate all wastes of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

B) Forms of Reorganization or Types of State Reorganizations

Those who study public administration have identified three separate, and distinct forms of reorganization.

i) Traditional Type of State Reorganization

- The goal of a traditional reorganization is to reduce the number of agencies to some degree within the existing pattern of agencies headed by constitutionally elected officers, boards and commissions.

ii) Cabinet Type of State Reorganization

- The goal of a Cabinet type of reorganization is to increase the accountability of state agencies, by eliminating the powers of independent boards and commission. This is accomplished by requiring the heads of all reorganized departments to be appointed by, and be directly responsible to the governor. Some constitutional offices maybe eliminated and replaced with agencies whose heads are appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of, the Governor.
iii) Secretary - Coordinator Type of State Reorganization

The goal of a Secretary - Coordinator type of reorganization is to maximize functional consolidation. Secretary - Coordinator reorganizations are those in which the structure and authority of agencies is unchanged. However, all state agencies are grouped into a few "super" departments or agencies whose directors or "Secretaries" are appointed by the Governor. Yet, the Governor and the Secretaries have only limited control over the individual agencies. Often, their control is limited to budgetary and administrative (not substantive) matters.
South Dakota: A Model Reorganization for More Responsive Government

REORGANIZED STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH PRIOR TO REORGANIZATION

BETWEEN AND AFTER REORGANIZATION. Chart which shows the cost reduction in government expenditures from 1975 to 1977 under reorganization plan. Result: stronger, more efficient, more responsive government.
4) CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL STATE REORGANIZATIONS

A) There is no one answer as to how to make reorganization work. Some things to consider are:

- Study the need. The state must review its functions, its major missions, and its present organization. It must then determine how activities might best be ordered. Decisions must be tempered by political realities.

- Broad involvement is needed. A successful reorganization effort needs support from many directions, especially from the legislature, the governor, and the public. The public has usually been involved through participation in study groups, and in some states, the first step has been to obtain a public mandate through a constitutional amendment limiting the number of departments.

- There must be a clear purpose and goal. Successful reorganization efforts are proceeded by clear and concise strategic planning. Clear goals will give guidance to administrative and operational activities throughout the process. For example, four goals of reorganization could be:

  1) Making government more responsive and accountable to citizens;
  2) Eliminating any overlap of responsibilities and services between State agencies;
  3) Increasing the effectiveness of governmental management; and,
  4) Encouraging, even requiring, economy and efficiency in State government to reduce waste, and the need for new taxes.

- Commitment is needed. No reorganization will work unless the governor, the legislature, and department heads want to make it work.

- Every state has different needs. The state must proceed with reorganization in the light of its own needs. Some states have reorganized in the past twenty years, others have made considerable changes on a function-by-function basis. All have different existing structures, clientele group relations and political traditions. The initiative can come from the legislature, from the governor, or from both. Study groups in some instances are legislative, in others, primarily citizens. Whatever the past, each state must find a way to gear up for effective action against current and emerging problems.
Continue management improvement efforts. Reorganization, to succeed, must be accompanied by management improvement efforts to assure that the governor, the legislature, their staffs, and the central budget, planning, and other management staffs are able to utilize the new structure effectively.

Reorganization is never completed. When new problems or issues surface, institutions must be brought to bear on them. Reorganization will always be a continuing issue and must be undertaken, if not wholesale, at least piecemeal. Government organization must reflect the priorities of the times, and agencies must be aligned to best meet these priorities.

B) Why do Reorganizations Fail?

According to a 1980 study by Dr. James L. Garnett, there are seven "major obstacles" to reorganization:

1) The negativistic, conservative attitude of legislative bodies towards major reform;
2) Bureaucratic resistance to administrative reform;
3) The high political risk involved;
4) Constitutional-legal constraints on reorganization;
5) Inadequate knowledge and understanding of reorganization objectives and process;
6) Resistance of clientele groups affected by reorganization; and,
7) Resource limitations.

C) Making Reorganization Work in South Carolina

If South Carolina is going to seriously attempt to reorganize State government, then the proponents of reorganization must assure that:

There should be no preconceived notions as to the outcome of the Reorganization.

The process should not argue for executive control or legislative control, but for real solutions to State government's real problems.

An empirical study of our present form of government and alternative forms of state government should be undertaken.

Problems with our past form of State government organization should be clearly identified.
The reorganization process must generate, through scientific management analysis, multiple solutions to the identified problems. By offering multiple solutions, the chances of building a consensus for reorganization through compromise is increased.

ii) South Carolina's Statutory Reorganization Plan

The General Assembly in 1948 created an eight-step statutory process to effect necessary reorganization of State government (Title 1 Chapter 19). The process, as evident by the 1948 reorganization of State government, is a thorough and effective guide to making real changes.

See Attached Flowchart and Codes
OVERVIEW OF REORGANIZATION PROCESS

1-19-98
Declaration of desirability of reorganization approved.

1-19-98
Examination of agencies to determine reorganization.

1-19-98
Preparation of a reorganization plan citing needed changes.

1-19-98
Preparation of alternative plans which include functions not related to state government.

1-19-198
Submission of alternative plan to House and Senate.

1-19-98
Submission of plan to Governor.

1-19-198
Submission of plan, as approved or disapproved, with reasons, and declaration to Senate and House.

1-19-213
Reorganization plan prepared as a bill.

1-19-22G
Any reorganization plan enacted, effective July 1st.
Reorganization Commission

§1-19-10. Declaration of desirability of reorganization.

It is declared to be in the public interest that executive and administrative agencies within the State government should be reorganized to increase their efficiency and economy, to reduce the costs of government.


Overlapping of functions of executive and administrative agencies; the combination of unrelated functions within an agency; the diffusion of responsibility between agencies for directing a single effort or function; the existence of multiple agencies having the same purposes; the existence of agencies or functions not required for the efficient operation of State government are prohibited.


The purpose of this chapter is to apply principles of reorganization to each executive and administrative agency, and to make needed changes to these entities expeditiously, without the use of specific legislation for each agency or function.


The terms "agency" and "executive and administrative agency," when used in this chapter, refer to any executive or administrative entity existing within the State government. The term "reorganization" refers to any change made for the betterment of an organization within the State government.

§1-19-50. Chapter amends legislation creating agencies.

This chapter constitutes an amendment to the legislation which created the various executive and administrative agencies. It allows each agency or function to be subject to change prescribed by the procedure authorized and provided for in this chapter.

§1-19-60. Composition of State Reorganization Commission.

The Commission will be composed of nineteen members who will serve two year terms. The members will include: the House Ways and Means Committee chairman; the House Judiciary Committee chairman; five members of the House as elected by the House; the Senate Finance Committee chairman; five members of the Senate as elected by the Senate; and five individuals appointed by the
Governor, one of whom will be a member of a state board. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

§1-19-70. Officers and employees; quorum; vote required.

The Commission will elect a chairman, a vice-chairman, a secretary, and will appoint employees deemed necessary to perform the functions of the Commission. A majority of the Commission will constitute a quorum. No reorganization plan may be submitted without the affirmative vote of seven commission members.

§1-19-80. General powers; examination of agencies.

The Commission will have the powers and functions described in this chapter. It will examine and from time to time re-examine each executive and administrative agency to determine their compliance to this chapter. If an entity is determined not to be in compliance, the commission will determine what changes are needed to bring the organization into compliance.

§1-19-90. Preparation and submission of reorganization plans.

Whenever the Commission, after examination and investigation, finds that it is necessary to change, consolidate, or abolish an executive or administrative agency or its functions in order to be in compliance with this chapter, the Commission is required to prepare a reorganization plan citing needed changes, and submit this plan to the Governor.

§1-19-100. Conditions necessitating submission of alternative plans.

In the event that any reorganization plan includes functions or activities not related to the State government, the Commission will submit alternative plans, and the Senate or House may disapprove the plan or one or more of the alternative plans. The alternative plan or plans not disapproved by the Senate or House will stand approved.

§1-19-110. Judicial and legislative power unaffected; budget.

The provisions of this chapter will not affect the judicial or legislative power of the State, nor will it affect constitutionally created agencies or those with outstanding revenue bonds. The budget process is declared to be an executive rather than a legislative function.

§1-19-120. Assistance of State officers and agencies.

The Commission may call any officer of the State or any State agency for assistance at any time it deems advisable. Such officers are required to cooperate fully and to render any reasonable service which is within the scope of the Commission's duties.
§1-19-130. Hearings and summonses.

The Commission may hold hearings and take testimony at times and places which it will determine. It can call persons before it by summons or notice, and can require any such person to answer questions under oath concerning relevant material.

§1-19-140. Testimony.

The Commission may administer all necessary oaths and any person who testifies falsely can be convicted of perjury. All testimony given before the Commission will be considered privileged information not usable for prosecution. The production of an official paper or record by a witness, however, does not grant that person immunity from further prosecution. No witness will be permitted to refuse to testify upon the ground that the testimony may disgrace or hurt the witness personally.

§1-19-150. Production and examination of books and papers.

The Commission may send for and require the production of any books and papers which are relevant to an investigation or examination. The Commission may also designate a person to examine these books or papers before a hearing is held in order to facilitate an orderly hearing.

§1-19-160. Contempt proceedings.

In the event that any person fails to answer a summons or notice to appear before the Commission, that person can be held in contempt of the Commission and may be punished by order of the Commission. Those failing to produce books or papers to the Commission may also be held in contempt. Proceedings concerning contempt may be reviewed by the courts as necessary.

§1-19-170. Form and content of reorganization plans.

Any reorganization plan transmitted to the Governor by the Commission will change, as the Commission deems necessary, the name of the agency affected and the title of its head. The plan may include provisions for appointment and compensation of the head of the agency. The plan will make provisions for the transfer of records, property, and personnel affected by the change of any agency. It will also provide for the use of appropriations connected with the agency to be altered. The plan will also provide for settling the affairs of an abolished agency.

§1-19-180. Matters prohibited from inclusion in reorganization plans.

No reorganization plan will have the power to:

1) Abolish, transfer, or change the name of a department, office, or
officer created by the Constitution or any function prescribed to
the agency by the Constitution.

2) Continue any office or function beyond the period authorized by
law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have
terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

3) Authorize any agency to perform any function not authorized by
law at the time the plan is submitted to the Governor.

4) Impose limitations on the independent judgment and discretion of
agency personnel in dealing with the quasi-judicial and quasi-
legislative functions possessed by an agency.

5) Increase the term of any office in an agency beyond that provided
for by law.

§1-19-190. Recommendations of agency heads.

Before any change occurs within an agency, the Commission will request the
comments and recommendations of the head of the agency being considered.
These comments and recommendations will be included with the plan when
it is submitted to the governor.

§1-19-200. Governor shall transmit plans with recommendations.

After receiving any reorganization plan from the Commission, the Governor
will submit the plan to the House and Senate. Included with this plan will be
his approval or disapproval of the plan, his reasons for approval or
disapproval, and all the declarations that accompany the plan. The plan is to
be submitted to both houses on the first day of the next session, or within five
legislative days in the current session.


Each reorganization plan transmitted to the Senate and the House will be
immediately printed, together with the accompanying declarations and the
statement of the Governor, and copies will be given to each member of the
General Assembly. Each plan must be passed as an act to be considered adopted.

§1-19-220. Effective date of reorganization plan approved by General Assembly;
appropriations.

Each reorganization plan which is approved by the General Assembly will take
effect on the first day of July following its approval. The Governor will declare
this by executive proclamation. All appropriations for any affected agency or
function will be paid out after this date in accordance with the reorganization
plan.
§1-19-230. **Filing and printing.**

Each reorganization plan which is approved by the General Assembly will be filed with the Secretary of State's office and will be printed in the Acts and Joint Resolutions of the session at which it was approved.

§1-19-240. **Effect of adopted plans on statutes, rules and regulations.**

Any statute, rule, or regulation affecting an agency made before a reorganization plan is put into effect will remain in effect after the changes have been made to the organization. Any statute, rule, or regulation existing in an agency that is transferred under the power of another agency will remain vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the reorganization plan.

§1-19-250. **Effect on pending actions.**

No suit, action, or proceeding brought by or against an agency, or an officer of an agency will be dismissed by reason of a reorganization plan taking effect. The court may, in the case that a reorganizational change is made to an agency, allow a suit, action, or proceeding to be continued by or against the successor of the agency or officer as specified under the reorganization plan.

§1-19-260. **Court review.**

The actions of the Commission, the Governor, and the General Assembly in formulating and executing a reorganization plan are not reviewable by any court.
ATTACHMENT C
December 7, 1990

Dear:

The State Reorganization is currently conducting a nation-wide survey to assist it in the development of an up-to-date bibliography regarding reorganization initiatives.

By way of introduction, the State Reorganization Commission was established in 1948 to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of state government operations to the fullest extent practicable, promoting economy, and reducing generally the cost of government. If necessary, the Commission has the statutory authority to accomplish this mandate through the reorganization of executive and administrative agencies within the state government.

The Commission staff have conducted an general literature review using available state resources, as well as national clearing houses. However, in order for our efforts to be as comprehensive as possible, it would be appreciated if you would take a few moments to fill out the enclosed survey and mail it and any materials back to us as soon as possible. For your convenience in returning the survey, please find enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Also, if you desire to fax any materials to us, our fax number is (803) 734-3163.

Your time and consideration in providing any information on this important topic is greatly appreciated. If possible, we would like to receive this survey and/or any materials by the first week in January, 1991. Should you have any questions regarding this request or survey, please feel free to contact Mr. Kenneth D'Vant Long, Senior Project Director, or myself.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Young

/pjk
Enclosures
REORGANIZATION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Have there been any reorganization initiatives in your state?

2. Who was/is responsible for reorganization in your state government? If there was/is statutory authority for this, may we obtain a copy of the law?

3. What was your principal source for scholarly, theoretical or research work for your reorganization initiatives (i.e., state agency, university, consultative groups, etc.)? May we obtain a list of these?

4. Was anything published regarding these initiatives, and if so, may we obtain copies of any reports, articles, etc.?

5. If nothing was published, may we obtain copies of any work plans, studies, surveys, drafted proposals, proposed legislation, etc., that may have been generated regarding these reorganization initiatives?

6. Do you have a bibliography of reorganization materials utilized in your efforts, and if so, may we obtain a copy?

7. If your state has an organizational chart, may we obtain an up-to-date copy of same?

8. Is there anything or anyone else (i.e., resident or state expert) that you can suggest that may be able to assist us in our research efforts?
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<table>
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</thead>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>FILENAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Theory</td>
<td>[TH]</td>
<td>THEORY.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Models</td>
<td>[PM]</td>
<td>PROPOSE.MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>[CS]</td>
<td>CASESTUD.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Approaches</td>
<td>[CA]</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Articles</td>
<td>[KE]</td>
<td>KEYARTIC.01</td>
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REORGANIZATION CONTACT LIST

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (202) 653-5540 - - Talked with Joan Cayce. She is sending four articles on state government reorganization and reform, 12/10. Also talked with Dr. McDowell. He sent A Question of State Government Capability which we received on 11/30.

BROOKINGS INSTITUTE (202) 797-6235 -- Talked with Susan McGrath. Received two books through interlibrary loan; however, both books contained no relevant material to reorganization.

CALIFORNIA SENATE (916) 445-1727 -- Talked with Elizabeth Kersten, who referred us to Randy Ghesk at the Joint Publications Committee (916 445-4874. He will conduct a search and send us any relevant materials, including copies of state reorganization plans.

CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF (BERKELEY) (415) 642-6000 -- Talked with Bruce Cain at the Institute for Governmental Studies, who was going to leave a message for Eugene Lee and Victor Jones to call us. He felt they were probably the best people at the Institute to help us. Attempts to call Eugene Lee at home at (415) 525-1428 and at work at (415) 642-4658 on 12/11 were to no avail. Mr. Lee called us back on 12/19 and referred us to Richard Gable at the University of California (Davis) at (916) 752-2638. Left a message for Mr. Gable on 12/19 at the main campus number, (916) 752-1011.

CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF, AT SACRAMENTO (213) 740-1111 -- Talked with Jeff Chapman on 12/12. He has dealt with reorganization at the local level only, and referred us to Steve Gold at SUNY-Albany (518) 443-5284.

CORNELL COLLEGE (IOWA) (319) 895-4000 -- Talked with David Loebssack. He has done no work in the area himself, but referred us to Craig Allin at Cornell and to Keith Snavely at Southern Illinois. He also suggested that we contact the Political Science Department at Iowa State. Tried to call Craig Allin at (319) 895-4278 on 12/12, but received no answer. Mr. Allin called back on 12/14 and advised us that he would drop a list of contacts in the mail to us. On 12/19, we received a referral from Mr. Allin: Dr. Charles Adrian, whom we called on 12/20, but received no answer.

COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS (606) 231-1829 -- Talked with Ed Garner. We have received copies of: "Executive Reorganization Provisions of the Montana and South Dakota Constitutions:

EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS-RUTGERS (908) 932-9384 -- Messages have been left for Allen Rosenthal on 12/11 and 12/13. Mr. Rosenthal called us back on 12/19 and referred us to Carl Van Horn in the New Jersey Governor's Office, (609) 777-1243, whom we called and left a message for on 12/19.

FLORIDA STATE (904) 644-3525 -- Talked with Dr. Chackerian He is sending copies of his work to us. Have not received materials as of 12/21.

GEORGE MASON (703) 323-3780 -- Talked with Mark Crain on 12/12. His expertise is in the area of legislative reorganization. He will send us a packet of information, and requested a copy of our bibliography when completed.

HARVARD -- Kennedy School of Government (617) 495-1155 They are sending a copy of their research directory which has a bibliography of the faculty and the work they have done. This was received 12-03-90, and a review of the directory revealed two professors that may have knowledge in this area: Dr. Ted Lascher (617) 495-4844 and Dr. Don Price (617) 495-1315. Attempts to reach them both on 12/19 were to no avail.
HERITAGE FOUNDATION  (202)  546-4400  -- Received a copy of their publications catalog on 12/14. A review of the catalog reveals that none of the publications are relevant to the issue of reorganization.

HUMPHREY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT--MINNEAPOLIS  (612)  625-9505  -- Received a copy of their publications catalog on 12/18. A review of the catalog reveals that none of the publications are relevant to the issue of reorganization.

ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY  (217)  782-6625  -- Talked with Stanley Johnson. Received copies of "Constitutional Developments in Illinois: A Background Paper to the Committee of Fifty to Re-examine the Illinois Constitution" and "State Management: Executive-Legislative Relations," both by Samuel K. Gove.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  (812)  855-4898  -- Talked with Jane Spencer. Ms. Spencer referred us to Kurt Zorn, who in turn referred us to Cosie Simon in the Governor's office. Received on 12/7: "Vision for the Future," Arthur Andersen Inc. on human services integration. Ms. Spencer also referred us to Tim Tilton (812) 855-4841. Attempts to contact him on 12/7 and 12/12 were to no avail, but a message was left for him on 12/18 at (812) 855-6308.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  (515)  294-4111  -- Talked with Dr. Jack Whitmer on 12/12. He will send us an information packet, and would like a copy of our bibliography when completed. Dr. Whitmer called back on 12/27 and suggested we call Lynn Barney with the Iowa State Department of Management at (515) 281-5272.

KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF  (913)  864-2700  -- Talked with Steven Maynard-Moody who referred us to his article "Reorganization as Status Drama", Public Administration Review, vol. 46, no. 4, p. 301, which we have on file.

KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF  (606)  257-4984  -- Talked with Dr. Malcolm Jewell on 12/6, who referred us to the Kentucky General Assembly. Talked with Vic Hellard in Kentucky (502) 564-8100 on 12/7. He sent a copy of "Report to the Special Commission on Constitutional Review," by the Legislative Research Commission on 12/11.

MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF (COLLEGE PARK)  (301)  405-4144  -- Talked with Mavis Mann-Reeves on 12/12, and she referred us to a chapter she had written in an ACIR publication called A Question of State Government Capability which we already have. She also referred us to several other people (e.g. Messrs. Garnette, Beyle, and Wright) whom we have already talked with.
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF -- Talked with both Greg Marcus (11/28) at (313) 764-5494 and John Kingdon (12/12) at (313) 764-6312. Mr. Marcus had done no work in this area, but referred us to John Jackson, whom we attempted to call on 12/12, but received no answer. Mr. Jackson called us back on 12/19, but informed us that he is a retired business professor and has done no work in this area. Mr. Kingdon referred us to Diel Wright (UNC), Daniel Elazar (Temple Univ.) and Charlie Press (retired, Michigan State). A search of Elazar and Press' work revealed nothing specific to reorganization.

MINNESOTA GENERAL ASSEMBLY (612) 296-8291 -- Talked with Carol Tagones on 12/7. Received copy of Governor's Reorganization Powers by Mark Shepard.


NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BUDGET OFFICERS (202) 624-5382 -- Talked with Gerald Miller who stated that no specific work on reorganization has been done by their organization.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (202) 347-3190 -- Talked with Mort Cohen on 12/14. He is sending a copy of their publications catalog.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION (202) 624-5300 -- Talked with Matthew Davis on 12/12. He is sending a copy of their publications catalog.


NEW YORK, STATE UNIVERSITY OF, AT ALBANY (SUNY) (518) 443-5284 -- Talked with Steve Gold's assistant, Sara Ritchie on 12/12, who suggested that we send a copy of our survey to her so she could see what kind of information she could send us.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE LIBRARY [through SC State Library: Debra Hotchkiss, 734-8666]: On 12/10, we received: State Government Reorganization in North Carolina; Report of the Governor's Committee on State Government Reorganization, and the first, second, third, and fourth quarterly reports on the progress of reorganization in N.C. state government in 1972.

NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF AT CHAPEL HILL (UNC) (919) 962-0414/929-2847 [home] -- Talked to Diel Wright who referred us to Prof. Ted Herbert (University of Utah) who had done some articles using Dr. Wright's data. He also referred me to Mavis Mann-Reeves, whose work is in the area of the question of state capacity. Also suggested we contact the National Assoc. of State Budget Officers and talk with Gerald Miller. Dr. Wright said that he may be of more help if we had any specific questions and that he would be glad to help in any way he could. His address is: Dept. of Political Science, MPA Program, UNC, Hamilton Hall, CB# 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265.

-- Also talked with Dr. Thad Beyle at UNC (919) 962-0404 on 12/6. He informed us that he was involved in the Connecticut and Illinois reorganizations and suggested we go to those governments to get the reports. He has written an article in the 1982 volume of State Government on the reorganization of governors' powers, and a chapter in the fourth edition of Politics in the American States,
both of which we have on file. We also have a copy of the bibliography he compiled for the Council of State Governments.

**NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY** (815) 753-7053 -- Talked with Dr. Robert Albritton on 12/13. He has done no work in this area, but referred us to Samuel Gove and David Kenney. We have several articles by Mr. Gove on file and have located some books authored by Mr. Kenney; however, they deal mainly with Illinois politics.

**OHIO STATE** (614) 292-3653 -- Talked with Dr. Patterson on 12/11 who referred us to Allen Rosenthal at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers (908) 932-9384 and to Robert Albritton at Northern Illinois University (815) 753-7053.


**PRINCETON** (609) 258-4778 -- Talked with Dr. Michael Danielson on 12/5. He has done no work in the area of reorganization himself and referred us to the Council of State Governments.

**RAND CORPORATION** (213) 393-0411 -- 12/10 Sending Publications Catalog. Received catalog on 12/19. A review of the Catalog reveals that none of the publications are relevant to the issue of reorganization.

**ROCHESTER, UNIVERSITY OF** -- Talked with James Fleming on 12/12, who referred us to Paul Ferber (716) 475-2938. Talked with Mr. Ferber on 12/14, and he informed us that he has done no work in this area.

**RUTGERS-CAMDEN** (609) 757-6359/854-8028 -- Talked with Jim Garnett. He is the author of a book entitled *Reorganizing State Government: The Executive Branch*, which we have on file. He is also sending us a list of relevant articles and would like to be kept informed on the happenings in South Carolina since he has predicted that South Carolina will be one of the next states to reorganize their government.

**SOUTHERN ILLINOIS** (618) 536-2371 -- Talked with Keith Snavely on 12/14. He has done no work in this area and did not know of anyone who could help us with our efforts.
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF (USC) (213) 740-0549 -- Talked with Dr. Gilbert Siegel on 11/29, and he is sent a copy of California Policy Choices on 12/04. He also referred us to Jeffrey Chapman at USC-Sacramento.

STANFORD (415) 723-0672 -- Talked with Richard Brody on 12/11. Dr. Brody referred us to Bruce Cain at the Institute of Governmental Studies at USC, and Malcolm Jewell at the University of Kentucky.

TEXAS, UNIVERSITY OF (512) 471-4962 -- Talked with Terrell Blodgett on 12/5, who referred us to Jay Stanford (512) 346-6921. Talked with Mr. Stanford who sent a copy of the report for the reorganization of Texas under Governor Clements on 12/12. Mr. Blodgett was actively involved in the reorganization of Texas but now is in the public sector.


WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF, AT MILWAUKEE (414) 229-6641 -- Talked with Dr. Ronald Webber, who advised us that he does not specialize in reorganization.

WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF, AT MADISON (608) 263-0446 -- Talked with Jim Conant on 12/12, who referred us to several articles he has authored: One in State and Local Government Review, vol. 58, no. 4; one in Public Administration Review, vol 46, no. 1; and another in the same journal, Sept/Oct '88. He will be doing an update of the 1988 article for a conference this coming spring and was very interested in keeping up with what will be going on in South Carolina. We have copies of his articles on file. Dr. Conant will gather additional bibliographies and forward same to us.

YALE (203) 432-5230 -- Talked with Dr. Vicki Hattam on 11/28, and she was going to see if she could think of anyone who had done work in this area. Attempts to contact Dr. Hattam thereafter on 11/29, 12/04, and 12/11 were to no avail. Left a message for her to call us back on 12/19.
ATTACHMENT G
REORGANIZATION: KEY ARTICLES

I. GENERAL THEORY


II. PROPOSED MODELS


Simmons, Robert H. "American State Executive Studies: A Suggested Departure." Western Political Quarterly 17 (December 1964): 777-783.


III. CASE STUDIES


Special Committee on Organization of State Agencies. Report to the Governor and Members of the 71st Texas Legislature (Austin, Special Committee, 1988).


IV. EXECUTIVE BRANCH REORGANIZATION


V. GOVERNORS' PERSPECTIVE ON REORGANIZATION


VI. CONSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO REORGANIZATION


VII. REFERENCE MATERIALS


VIII. SOUTH CAROLINA STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota Completed survey, report of the North Dakota Governmental Survey Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania John T. Tighe,III sent letter Contact John McGovern if we have further questions (717) 787-6303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island Governor Ed Diprete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee Jim Hall, Governor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Robert P. Schultze (804) 786-2211</td>
<td>1/2/91</td>
<td>Cover letter, reorganization plan, reorganization statute, HHS Consolidation Plan, Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission Bibliography, Topical Studies 1970-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT I
January 4, 1991

Dear:

This letter is to follow-up our previous correspondence to you dated December 7, 1990. We realize that this is a busy time of year for everyone, especially those state governments undergoing transitions. However, I only ask a moment of your time in filling out the "Reorganization Survey Questionnaire."

Collection of this type of data from all the states will be invaluable to us for, among other things, the preparation of a "survey of the states" report on this issue. We will, of course, forward a copy of our survey once this project is completed.

Enclosed is another copy of the survey, and we would appreciate your sending this back to us by Tuesday, January 22, 1991. Once again, our fax number is (803) 734-3163, and if you have any questions whatsoever, please do not hesitate to call either myself or our Senior Project Director, Kenneth D’Vant Long.

Thank you for your assistance to us on this important project.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Young

/pjk
Enclosures

cc: Kenneth D’Vant Long
January 3, 1991

Dear:

The State Reorganization Commission is currently conducting a nation-wide survey to assist it in the development of an up-to-date bibliography regarding reorganization initiatives.

By way of introduction, the State Reorganization Commission was established in 1948 to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of state government operations to the fullest extent practicable, promoting economy, and reducing generally the cost of government. If necessary, the Commission has the statutory authority to accomplish this mandate through the reorganization of executive and administrative agencies within the state government.

The Commission staff have conducted a general literature review using available state resources, as well as national clearinghouses. However, in order for our efforts to be as comprehensive as possible, it would be appreciated if you would take a few moments to survey your library's catalogues and indices to ascertain what information you may have on this issue, namely, reorganization of state government. This reorganization may involve any of the three branches of government, but more often, it has been of the executive branch. The approach to reorganization may be administrative or by way constitutional revision and may be through consolidation of agencies or piece-meal reorganization within one particular agency.

In order for you to better understand what we are looking for, I have enclosed a "Reorganization Survey Questionnaire" we recently sent out to the various state governments. If possible, we would like to have a listing or bibliography of authors, titles, publications, periodicals, reports, etc., that you may be able to accumulate in your search on this topic. If you desire to fax any materials to us, our fax number is (803) 734-3163.

Your time and consideration in providing any information in this matter is greatly appreciated. If possible, we would like to receive a response by January 31, 1991. Should you have any questions regarding this request, please feel free to contact either myself or our Senior Project Director, Mr. Kenneth D'Vant Long.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Young

/pjk

Enclosure

cc: Kenneth D'Vant Long
Ms. Joan G. Kerschner, State Librarian
Nevada State Library & Archives
Capitol Complex
401 N Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Ms. Barbara F. Weaver, State Librarian
New Jersey State Library, Dept. of Education
185 W State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-6200

Mr. Joseph F. Shubert, Asst. Commissioner
New York State Library, Dept. of Education
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12230

Ms. Patricia L. Harris, Director
North Dakota State Library
Liberty Memorial Building
Capitol Grounds
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Mr. Robert L. Clark, Jr., Director
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
200 NE 18th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Mr. Bruce F. Daniels, Director
Rhode Island Department of State Library Services
300 Richmond Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Mr. Edwin S. Gleaves, State Librarian
Tennessee State Library & Archives
403 Seventh Avenue N
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Ms. Patricia E. Klinck, State Librarian
Vermont Department of Libraries
111 State Street
c/o State Office Building Post Office
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Ms. Nancy Zussy, State Librarian
Washington State Library
Capitol Campus
Olympia, Washington 98504

Ms. Suzanne LeBarron, State Librarian
Wyoming State Library
Supreme Court & Library Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC311</td>
<td>SC 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>