4-1990

Executive Training in State Government : An Evaluation of the Maine Executive Institute and Comparable Programs in Other States

C. Edwin Meadows Jr.
Maine Department of Conservation

Christopher Spruce
University of Maine

Executive Training in State Government:

An Evaluation of the Maine Executive Institute

and

Comparable Programs in Other States

by C. Edwin Meadows Jr., Commissioner
Maine Department of Conservation

and

Christopher Spruce, Graduate Research Assistant
Bureau of Public Administration, University of Maine

A Paper Prepared for PAA 550, Public Personnel Management
for the
Graduate Program in Public Administration
and
Professor Kenneth K. Ahn
Department of Public Administration
University of Maine

April, 1990

"Government is becoming more complex, more technical, and more technological. And as it is more entwined with the private sector, executives find it harder to survive by common sense and seat of the pants leadership, no matter how good their instincts and their initial training...."

-- from a brochure for
The Maryland Government
Executive Institute

"...A governor (or other state executive) who sends some of his or her key people to an executive-education program is sending a clear message to all subordinates: Management Counts!"

--from brochure for
The Governors Center
at Duke University

"The single best experience of my 19 years in state government."

--from a participant
of the 1989 Maine
Executive Institute

Table of Contents

Executive Training in State Government:
An Evaluation of the Maine Executive Institute

by C. Edwin Meadows and Christopher Spruce

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the Maine Executive Institute (MEI) and compares it with similar executive training programs in other states. The paper expands upon other studies which have evaluated executive training programs.

The paper has several objectives:

-- To describe the Maine Executive Institute;

-- To analyze the evaluations of the Maine Executive Institute which were completed by participants in the first three years of the program;

-- To update information from comparable programs in other states for comparison with MEI;

-- To identify opportunities for strengthening MEI, both those which can easily be implemented in the near future as well as potential improvements of a more long-term nature;

-- To compile the results and to collect the survey data from other states for use by the Maine Bureau of Human Resources and the Bureau of Public Administration.

The study was conducted in two parts:

1. Previous studies were reviewed to select comparable programs for comparisons. A survey of selected states was

conducted and the results analyzed. Ed Meadows conducted this part of the project.

2. The evaluations completed by MEI particpants in the first three years of the program -- 1987 through 1989 -- were analyzed in the first such effort in the three-year history of MEI. This analysis was undertaken by Christopher Spruce.

The principal objective of this paper is to provide information useful to MEI, the Bureau of Human Resources and the Department of Public Administration. Many opportunities for further study were identified, as well. A substantial amount of excellent information was gathered as part of the survey of other states. All of the material will be presented to the Director of the State Training and Development Programs in the Maine Department of Administration for future reference.

II. THE MAINE EXECUTIVE INSTITUTE:

Executive Development in Maine State Government (1)

The Maine Executive Institute held its inaugural course in July, 1987. From the outset, the program has had strong support from top leadership in state government. This support was recognized by the originators as a key element in the success of the program. The Governor convened a special briefing for

---

(1) Information in this section was developed from several sources, both primary and written references. It was taken from personal interviews by the authors with Elaine Trubee, State Training Director, and Dr. Ahn, as well as the personal experience of Mr. Meadows as an MEI participant. Additional information was developed from review of the original MEI proposal, background memorandum, current brochures, and evaluations by the participants. [See Appendix A.]

participants held in the Cabinet room prior to the beginning of the initial Institute. He also was one of the keynote speakers at the first program.

A. History of MEI

MEI was created by the University of Maine and the Bureau of Human Resources. The genesis of MEI was passage of legislation in 1986 which reorganized a number of departments in state government and created the Department of Administration. The Bureau of Human Resources in the new Administration Department was given a mandate to conduct management training for state agencies using the latest theories in management practice. That mandate provided authorization to establish MEI. The Department of Public Adminstration at the University of Maine submitted a proposed three-week executive training course to the Department of Administration in April, 1987. The first Executive Institute began less than three months later in July.

The rapidity with which MEI was developed and executed has been attributed to the strong support and direct participation by Commissioner of Administration Charles Morrison, Director of State Training Programs Elaine Trubee, and Professor Ahn.

From the beginning, the state endeavored to use the best training techniques and speakers/facilitators from similar institutes across the nation. The new program was modeled after the Federal Executive Institute and the Virginia Executive Institute. Dr. Chong Pak, Director of the Department of Personnel and Training for the Commonwealth of Virginia, was

retained to advise in the design of the program and to open the first annual institute.

According to Dr. Ahn, an underlying assumption of the institute was that public sector executives face greater and more varied challenges than managers in the private sector. As a result, public sector executives need a different type of training. There is a belief that regular managerial training is not sufficient for public sector executives. They also must possess unique communications and interpersonal skills to be successful in the political environment (PAA 550 discussion, April, 1990).

Further, public sector executives have had to cope with often difficult to master technological advancements -- which appear to be growing exponentially --- even as they are being asked to deliver more and better services for less money. The rapid changes in the work environment -- in both the public and private sectors -- have been underscored by predictions that upwards of 60 percent of the jobs people will hold in the next 20 years have not yet been created (Sylvia and Meyer, 1989).

The program has undergone change from its beginning. But the changes have been evolutionary "mid-course corrections," rather than major alterations. Initially, the program was seen as a state-operated institute rather than a joint state-university effort. It also was not initially viewed as being a residential program.

B. Program Description

The Maine Executive Institute is an executive development

program which brings together experienced state executives with a distinguished faculty of academics and practitioners in a setting that is both different and far removed from the executive's normal work environment. MEI offers top level administrators of state government an opportunity to re-examine and enhance their abilities as managers and decision makers. Participants from the executive branch are nominated by the governor upon recommendation of their respective department commissioners. Candidates from the legislative branch also are eligible. They are nominated by the top leadership in the House of Representatives and the State Senate. As of this date, however, no legislative official has attended as a participant of MEI. Legislative leadership have, however, served as faculty.

The MEI brochure (1990) identified the central mission of the institute as: "Top management in state government is emerging as a specialization in its own right, distinct from operational management. In addition to managerial skills, the successful executive must be aware of the complex and dynamic sociopolitical and economic environment in which state executives must operate."

MEI attempts to offer leadership skills and analytical approaches which will "mobilize ideas, people, and resources in support of public programs" (Ahn, Morrison & Talcove, 1988). The stated specific objectives of the program are:

1. To heighten executives' awareness of the full range of environmental factors that influence the operation of government functions;
2. To generate broader and more long-term insights

into the needs, demands, and constraints that determine priorities for State programs;

3. To develop full appreciation by individual executives of the complex interactions of government systems and procedures, especially personnel and budget/finance;

4. To enhance effective management knowledge, skills and practices of senior executives so that they may contribute to increased effectiveness and efficiency in governmental operations, particularly in:

   * Promoting communication between executive and employees;

   * Enhancing management team development;

   * Providing information concerning goal setting, organizational change, and strategic planning;

   * Providing leadership and management theory and skill development in these areas, focusing on an analysis of individual style and how that affects employees.

   * Improving executive health and management of stress in the workplace

5. To establish an open forum for the full exchange of ideas and experiences in state government functions;

6. To foster inter-agency cooperation through the establishment of appropriate networks of executives; and

7. To promote bridges between the academic community of the University of Maine and the community of state executives (Maine Executive Institute, Brochure, 1990).

The curriculum of MEI focuses on the two major needs in response to which the program was developed: first, the environment in which the state executives operate and, second, individuals skills. Workshop topics covered in response to the first need include public relations, ethics and values of public executives, the state administrative system with emphasis on human resources and budgeting, and the priorities of the

executive branch.

Workshops for individual skills include subjects such as group dynamics and management team development, management by objectives, developing an effective leadership style, executive health and stress management in the workplace, developing effective communication skills, and self-assessment through the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Each year, the composition of MEI's faculty has changed somewhat. Presenter/facilitators have included Dr. Pak, who developed a similar program at the University of Virginia after which MEI is modeled; Frank Sherwood of Florida State University; and Ronald Stupak, an executive consultant who is a former dean of the Federal Executive Institute. Various members of the governor's cabinet also facilitate workshops, as well as faculty members from the University of Maine's Department of Public Administration and other departments.

MEI is convened only once a year, but it is delivered in two sessions scheduled at least a month apart. Participants are encouraged to view the entire time period between the two sessions as part of the program. Thus a two-week program may become a two-month training/learning experience. The sessions are held in a residential format at a conference setting away from the state capitol. By removing participants from their normal work environments/routines, MEI allows them to focus their attention more fully on the program.

Small group gatherings afford MEI participants opportunties to socialize and exchange ideas. Assigned readings, lectures,

case studies, simulations and video presentations also are included among the techniques used to prompt participants to interact so they might learn from each other as well as the facilitators/presenters. Each MEI session is limited to 30 participants to foster rapport among the executives and to allow the conducting of the small group discussions.

C. The MEI Experience

The experience from the outset has been nearly totally positive. The state training director indicates the program has, to date, met most of its goals, particularly in providing executives with keener insight into their management function, in creating esprit de corps, and in team-building among the participants. She believes an additional benefit has been the close working relationship established between state agencies and the university system providing new avenues for further application in other program areas. When asked to rank program effectiveness on a scale of 1 to 5, Director Trubee responded the program ranked "5" as highly effective in terms of establishing networks in state government. For overall results, she rated the program "4," citing the constant interest in improving and upgrading the content and quality of presentations (Personal interview, April 20, 1990).

Professor Ahn cites as prime benefits of MEI to date: contacts gained by participants, creation of the feeling of team spirit, and team building; friendships gained; and creating the sense among managers that they are special. He suggested these factors were perhaps more important than the specific skills

learned through MEI.

According to Dr. Ahn, the success of the program is indicated by the strong network which has been established and the esprit de corps that develops. One notable example of the latter occurred in 1988 when that class wanted to hold a prom before their graduation ceremony. Ahn believes this represents an unusally postive reaction from a group of normally reserved and otherwise dignified adult managers! On the other hand, efforts to establish reunions, followup programs, monthly meetings and other continued participation by alumni have been more difficult to achieve. The survey of other states indicates that greater availiability of full-time institute staff helps foster continued participation.

The success of MEI has led to the creation of a separate program -- the Maine Management Institute for mid-level managers. This program has a similar objective and also is jointly sponsored by the Bureau of Human Resources and the Bureau of Public Administration. The curriculum is divided into four core areas which are critical to the personal and professional development of a successful manager: leadership, managerial communication, team building, and performance appraisal. The MMI is designed to provide mid-level managers with an overview of the State of Maine's management philosophy, practices, knowledge of current management theories, and skill development.

III. THE EVALUATIONS

In each of the three years of the Maine Executive Institute,

organizers have asked participants to fill out written evaluations of the just-ending program. The evaluation questionnaires used in the three years of the Institute have varied somewhat in presentation and content. For example, the first evaluation form in 1987 asked participants, "How do you feel about the staff assistance during the program?" The evaluation forms used in 1988 program changed the inquiry slightly: "How do you feel about the program administration and staff support?"

Most of the other inquiries, however, were either the same or very similar from year to year.

A. Overall Ratings

The major information sought by the evaluation surveys related to the participants' feelings about the overall worth of the MEI experience. ("How do you feel about your overall experience with the Maine Executive Institute?") Very consistently, the participants gave the program high ratings on a five-point-scale, ranging from "Not Satisfied-1" to "5-Very Satisfied." In 1987 and 1988 the program rating averaged 4.88; in 1989, it averaged 4.8.

The second most important inquiry -- "To what extent has the program met its objectives?" -- evidenced only slight differences in overall ratings from year-to-year. In 1987, participants' responses on a scale ranging from "Not At All-1" to "5-A Great Deal" averaged 4.6. In 1988 the rating climbed to 4.8 but then fell to 4.5 in 1989.

The results of both of the major inquiries as to the participants' feelings about their MEI experience suggest the program represents a positive experience for the approximately 30 state government executives participating each year. In fact, in both 1987 and 1989 the evaluation survey asked whether or not participants would recommend the MEI be continued in the future. In both years in which the inquiry was made the response was unanimously affirmative.

Each evaluation question provided respondents an opportunity to offer additional written comments. In the case of such additional responses to the central inquiry of rating overall experience with MEI, respondents offered comments such as the following (year of the program in parentheses):

*My expectations were a 2 (final rating was 4). (1988)

*Perhaps the most rewarding experience of my civil service career... (1987)

*Has provided much need motivation for me. (1987)

*The single best experience of my 19 years in state government. (1989)

*I will take a number of very interesting ideas, theories, and suggestions back with me. I believe I have been well served by participating. (1989)

*I got a lot of useful information from MEI. Some sessions weren't worthwhile for me but overall the content was excellent. (1989)

*Self-satisfying, feel honored having been selected. (1988)

In reply to the question asking participants to evaluate whether or not MEI "met its objectives," the written comments were less positive, particularly in 1989:

*I would have benefited a little more if the others in the program were more oriented to my field. (1988)

*For me, I had no real objectives, so I feel very satisfied. For others, I am unsure. (1989)

Following the 1988 program, the comments were far more favorable:

*It has begun the process. Opened up new horizons and opportunities for me to look at, think about, and address the workplace from many different facilities.

*It greatly exceeded my expectations. Top speakers, relevant subject matter. A rare chance to think and reflect.

(No written comments were provided in the evaluation survey results summary for 1987.)

B. Accomplishments

In asking what participants felt "is the most important accomplishment of the program," respondents in each of the first three years of the program most frequently listed "networking" and meeting other state government managers as central program accomplishments.

"Networking" was mentioned only twice in the responses to the accomplishment question in 1987, nine times in the 1988 evaluation responses to the same question, and four times in 1989.

The term is not defined in the evaluation responses but is taken to mean the creation of a system of informal contacts from among the Institute participants that is available to each participant for future use. It may be that the terminology was

in vogue as a "buzzword" in 1988 more than in either 1987 or 1989, thus accounting for its more frequent mention in evaluations. On the other hand, it may be that the institute program itself gave more emphasis to networking in 1988 than in the other two years, meaning respondents were more apt to offer the term as a program accomplishment.

Regardless of the use or lack of use of the word networking, it is clear from an analysis of the evaluation results from the first three years of the program that meeting other state officials was widely perceived as a program accomplishment. Given that the MEI is for state government executives only, this appears a rather obvious answer which, taken at face value, carries no particular significance. However, the comments often qualify the participants' responses concerning their interaction with their peers. For example, several participants in 1988 described their appreciation of an opportunity "to meet and discuss our problems with our peers"; of "having uninterrupted time to talk with them"; of "building relationships"; and of "team-building--getting good ideas about solving common problems." Virtually all of the comments offered in response to "the most important accomplishment of the program" question in 1987 mentioned the experience of developing relationships with other state government executives. Further, a majority of comments offered in 1989 similarly suggested such relationships as a program accomplishment.

The frequency of the peer interaction responses in the MEI evaluations may be useful information for top state

administrators to ponder. The responses could be taken as evidence that the state should be endeavoring to develop more opportunities for its top managers to interact in settings away from the state capitol. Several MEI participants have, through their evaluations, indicated a need to "recharge their batteries" on occasion, and seem to find it helpful to do it in both sympathetic company and a neutral environment.

C. Recommended Improvements

A number of participants in responding to an inquiry asking for recommended changes in the MEI program ("What would you recommend to improve the program? Please be specific.") suggested the programs should deal less with theory and more with reality:

> *I think the skill level of participants is higher than many of the presenters seem to be aware. Would suggest presentations have shorter "theory" and [be] more practical and problem-solving. (1988)
>
> *A session that would allow us to discuss individual problems and seek possible solutions from other group members. (1988)
>
> *More politcal information and methods for dealing with political realities. More methods of dealing with the media, news services. (1989)
>
> *Better speakers, more time together in journal situations. (1989)

Other participants suggested the lecture/presentation material offered during the institute be raised to a higher level ("Some presentations need to be raised to the 500-600 levels" - 1988); more or better presentations on media relations (1989); and additional discussion on women in management (1988).

D. Continuing MEI

The final inquiry we will examine in analyzing the MEI evaluations asks whether program participants "would...recommend that the Maine Executive Institute be continued in the future?" In all three years, participants who filled out evaluations unanimously endorsed continuation of MEI.

In 1987 comments included the following:

*Definitely -- it would be a crime to let it die.

*Continuation is imperative. One of the best things to happen to state government in years.

*Absolutely and Alumni of MEI will make sure you do.

From 1988 evaluations the following comments were gleaned:

*Absolutely -- I would also recommend reaching beyond the executive level to mid managers.

*Without exception.

*Should be offered to less serious managers in a similar format. We need help in educating our supervisors.

And, finally, from 1989, these remarks:

*A breath of fresh air. It's great that the administration is investing in its managers. We need skills for change.

*By all means -- a very positive program for state government.

*The Institute is an excellent respite from the normal job functions. All upper and mid-level managers in state government should be afforded an opportunity to attend MEI.

E. Conclusions

Our analysis of the evaluations of MEI offered by its first 90 participants clearly indicate that the program has been

largely successful in meeting its objectives. Only in 1989 did the rating for program objectives fall below 4.8 on a five-point scale. Even in 1989, the overall rating of the program was 4.5, still evidencing a high level of satisfaction with the program by participants.

But our analysis, particularly when reviewing evaluation responses to questions on recommended improvements, found some concern about both the quality of, and teaching methodology employed, in some training sessions. Some participants also expressed a desire for less concentration on theory and more emphasis on practical training for real-world situations.

Some participants encouraged the development of a similar training program for mid-level managers and supervisors, believing that the program would be helpful both to the executives and managers/supervisors. Also suggested was the need for such a program to be held more than once a year.

Finally, participants appeared to be both honored to have been selected for the program and pleased to have the opportunity to interact with their peers in a location away from the state capitol.

IV. PUBLIC EXECUTIVE TRAINING IN OTHER STATES

A. Other Studies

Executive development programs in other states were reviewed to identify programs which are comparable to the Maine Executive Institute. The programs selected were then surveyed and the

results analyzed.

Three sources of information were used to identify the state programs to be surveyed:

1. A paper entitled, "The Education and Training of State Government Managers: The Case of Maine Executive Institute." The paper includes a chart comparing MEI to executive training programs in seven other states. All seven of those states were contacted as part of this study. The paper was prepared by Kenneth Ahn, Charles Morrison, and Haywood J. Talcove for presentation at the 1988 American Society for Public Adminstration, Regions I and II Conference in November, 1988.

2. The "Report on University-Based Executive Education Programs for Public Sector Executives," by Suzanne Haberland of the Cascade Center for Public Service, University of Washington. This 1988 report is an excellent reference for many different management training programs across the country. Not all of the programs included in the report have the same objectives as MEI. Some of them are targeted to different audiences, have different purposes, include courses for local and city governments, law enforcement, degree programs, and others. An additional eight states were selected from this study.

3. The State Training Resource Directory, published by the National Association of State Training and Development Directors of the Council of State Governments, 1989. This directory is a biennial survey of state training efforts. It is the first comprehensive review of training programs offered by state governments. The Directory is divided into eight program cateogries: management/supervisory, career/occupational skills,

safety/health, labor relations, literary/basic skills, organization effectiveness, training resource information, and miscellaneous. The directory includes listing from 36 states.

The states thus chosen for the survey were: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Washington. Three other programs also were included in this study: the executive education programs at Carnegie Mellon University; Social Science Research Institute in Dekalb, Illinois; and, the Public Administration Program at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon

Responses were received from eight programs in time to be included in this study. While those responses include the majority of the programs which are most applicable to MEI, it is possible there are additional programs which have similar objectives.

B. The Survey: Criteria and Selection of State Programs

MEI's prime objective is to provide training in executive leadership and managerial skills in the public environment for top managers in state government. In Maine, this is defined, in order of rank, as Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Associate Commissioner, Bureau Director, and Division Director. Also eligile are representatives of the Governor's staff and top managers in the legislative branch.

Thus, the prime criteria for selection of other state programs focused on the target audience and program goals. This

was essential in limiting the scope of the study since our review indicated all 50 states have professional development programs of some type for public employees. These, however, vary widely in both target audience and content.

Our review determined that any variations occur even between similar programs. Some of the principle variables are:

* Target audience: Many include county and local officials and private sector managers or are focused on lower levels such as mid-management or first-line supervisors.

* Content: Many programs focus on law enforcement objectives, budget procedures and other specific policy or skill areas.

* Degree vs. non-degree programs and those which offer graduate credit.

* Source of training faculty.

The states chosen were those which had executive development programs with the following characteristics:

* Target audience: Top management in state government.

* Curriculum: Executive leadership in state government.

* Format: Content, length and setting similar to MEI.

C. Survey Procedure

A survey form was developed which included the following criteria:

* Program name

* Contact person and address

* Sponsor/host organization(s)

* Target audience: federal, state, municipal, non-profit, private, other

* Level: department head, deputy, division/bureau director, mid-level, civil service, elected, legislative, other

* Number in course

* Degree credits

* Times per year offered

* Course length: residence, non-residence, consecutive, non-consecutive

* Cost

* Source of payment: agency funds, tuition, appropriation, participant, state training funds, grants, cost share

* Major curriculum areas: executive, leadership, managerial skill, political leadership, organizational development

* Presenters: state, university, faculty, state training core, professional trainers, consultants, state officials

* Unique factors: objectives, partnership, fundings, results, audience or any other interesting features.

* Program effectiveness: scale of 1-5

The survey was sent to the selected states with a personally-addressed letter. The states which had been referenced in the 1988 ASPA paper were sent copies of the comparative chart from that paper and asked to update the listing for their state (see Appendix B). States which were listed in the 1988 Cascade Center study were sent the description of their program from that study and asked to update it.

The material received was reviewed. Brief descriptions of the results which were pertinent to MEI follow. These are not intended to be full descriptions of each of the state programs. Due to the variation in information received, the sections are not necessarily uniform in treatment, nor has there been quantitative analysis of the information provided. Key findings form the surveys are included in the "Recommendation" section of this paper, outlining ideas from other states which could be incorporated in MEI.

D. Review of State Programs

ARIZONA

Arizona State University will attempt to conduct a 12-day non-residential, non-sequential program for executives in the fall of 1990. The program as envisioned would be a 12-day non-residential, non-sequential program for senior public sector executives. The Director of the School of Public Affairs says the school hopes the program will be conducted, but indicates that it is not yet a certainty.

The Advanced Public Executive Program in the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University conducts the Certified Public Manager Program for middle- and upper-level managers. The director of the program filled out the survey, but indicated that program is not targeted to top management.

The training program has a full-time administrator, full-time administrative assistant, and one and one-half program

coordinators.

Program effectiveness is rated as 4 on a scale of 1-5.

Unique Feature: Executive Briefings are conducted for the Cabinet on a pro bono basis. These are provided approximately four times per year for one-and-one-half hours each.

CALIFORNIA

The State and Local Executive Institute is offered by the Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley for upper level public managers in state and local government in California and other western states. It is co-sponsored by the University with the State Training Center of the California Department of Personnel Administration. The program is offered for elected, appointed, and civil service managers above mid-level. Participants have included officials from the Netherlands, Puerto Rico, and possibly the Province of Quebec in 1990. The program is a two-week residential course for 40-50 participants, offered once a year. Each agency pays for its participants. Limited scholarships are available, particularly for participants from local government. The curriculum focuses on executive leadership and managerial skills. Presenters come from all sources. The program, being new, was not included in the Cascade study or ASPA paper. Effectiveness was not rated. A descriptive brochure was provided.

Unique Feature: The "Personal Consulting Program" gives the participants a structured opportunity to obtain consultation on problems of particular interest to them -- and to provide consultation to other group members. Another feature is

that the program includes officials from other states.

COLORADO

The Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Colorado at Denver offers training for public sector executives through the Center for the Improvement of Public Management and the Center for Public/Private Sector Cooperation. The programs stress leadership and mediation skills, but also provide instruction on key areas of public administration, such as policy, formulation, fiscal policy, and program evaluation.

The senior management seminar/program management seminar are annual training programs for senior and mid-level executives in Colorado state government. Emphasis is on learning leadership skills and management techniques and on understanding state systems and procedures. The program runs for 10 days spread over three months. Participation varies from 25-40 per session.

Admission is competitive. Some scholarship assistance is available through private companies and foundations. Three hours of credit are available, with payment of an extra fee and upon completion of a paper.

The program is co-sponsored by the Colorado State Managers Association which also co-sponsors an alumni group. The program was rated at 4.5 on a scale of 1-5. The curriculum outline for fall 1990 was provided.

Unique Feature: State Managers Association co-sponsors an alumni group.

Also offered is the Rocky Mountain program, a 10-day residential management development seminar sponsored by the

Graduate School of Public Affairs. The Rocky Mountain Management Series is a short-term, tailored training program for state and local government agencies with content varying dependent on agency needs. Program material notes that, "A consistently high quality executive program cannot be administered part time by a faculty member with other responsibilities and performance measures." Descriptive information about the Rocky Mountain Program was submitted.

Colorado also offers the Western Institute for Police Administration, The Chiefs' Administrative Program course on "the politics of being a chief law enforcement administrator" and the Senior Commanders' Program for upper level law enforcement officials. Program materials were submitted for each of these seminars.

The Center for the Improvement of Public Management, which coordinates these programs, is staffed with eight full-time professionals, three full-time support staff, and four part-time graduate and/or contract employees. Alumni are increasingly being used for teaching, research and consulting.

MARYLAND

The Maryland Government Executive Institute began in 1986 as an annual program to increase the leadership and management effectiveness of the Maryland state executive and to provide that executive with a broader framework within which to make decisions. The program is a cooperative effort of the University of Maryland's School of Public Affairs, the College of Business

Management, and the Aspen Institute. It is designed for senior executives in state and local government. The program is residential for three non-consecutive weeks for 35 participants. Instructors include graduate faculty of the University of Maryland and selected guest speakers. Effectiveness was rated at 4 on a scale of 1-5.

Participants have included representatives from state and municipal governments and from regional water and sanitation authorities. Funding has been provided by a combination of direct appropriation, agency funds, and state training funds. Descriptive information was provided. Also provided was a paper entitled, "The Maryland Government Executive Institute: Description and Lessons" by William L. Powers, Associate Dean, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, 1988. The paper urges that "the candidates' ability to engage in focused debate" be included among criteria used to select participants. It also notes that participants are given reading material before each session and that the added cost of a desirable setting is well worth the expense. The paper contends that "the most useful learning occurs when the discussants attempt to wrestle with the issues with one another."

Unique Feature: Alumni meet annually for a weekend retreat which includes substantive presentations.

NORTH CAROLINA

The Executive Leadership Training Program in North Carolina is considered a good model in public sector training. The Governors Center at Duke University sponsors programs to improve

leadership, management, analysis, and decision making in state government.

Three separate programs are being offered in 1990. The first, "Decision-Making for State Executive," provides mid-level managers with analytical tools necessary to choose between policy proposals to evaluate and improve ongoing programs, and to enhance decision-making.

The second, "Strategic Leadership for State Executives," is designed for Cabinet secretaries, senior gubernatorial staff, assistant commissioners, deputy department heads, and other state executives with responsibility for producing results, managing organizations, and implementing programs. The program focuses on concepts of leadership and management that are most critical to achieving the public purposes of state government. The program is a one-week residential program focusing on curriculum which includes executive leadership, managerial skills, and political leadership. The program is for one week in a residential setting. Participation varies from 20 to 70. Effectiveness was rated at 5.

A third program, "Effective Negotiation for State Executives," is designed for executives who wish to improve their ability to manage negotiations and bargaining inherent in their interactions with bosses, peers, staff and employees.

The Governors Center staff includes two administrators who devote about half of their time to running the programs.

Unique features: Programs attract a nation-wide audience. Participants from Maine have attended.

The Governors Center has undertaken an examination of recent innovation in executive education and development in state government. A report is being prepared but was not available at the time of this study.

TEXAS

The Governor's Executive Development program is for executives of Texas state agencies who have responsibility for deciding strategic direction of the organization. It is a non-consecutive, three-week, non-residential program. Each week focuses on a different area of management: human resources, strategic management, and leadership. The program is sponsored by the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. A one-time legislative appropriation helped establish the program which is intended to be self-sustaining. Revenue also is available from Alumni Refresher Seminars which are offered several times per year.

The Chief Executive Officers of the 12 largest state agencies were participants in the charter class and act as informal advisors to the program. The administrative staff of the Institute is made up of a part-time director, coordinator and controller, and a full-time administrative assistant.

Effectiveness was rated at 4.75. Curriculum material for 1989 and 1990 was provided.

Unique Features: Each class establishes Task Forces to address issues which will have future impacts on Texas state government. Reports are prepared and distributed by the task forces to all Texas state legislators and policy development

officials. The Task Forces present their research and recommendations to a legislative panel on those issues which will be discussed in the next biennium.

WASHINGTON

The Executive Management Program is an advanced training program for senior executives in state government. A number of graduates of this program now hold state cabinet offices. The program is 10 days in a residential setting for 40 participants. Program effectiveness was rated at 5.

The program is provided by the Cascade Center for Public Service at the Graduate School of Public Affairs of the University of Washington. The Cascade Center offers several other programs to enhance the quality of public management in the Northwest. It provides separate training for mid-level managers and a new program for municipal officials. The "New Members Workshop" is an intensive session co-sponsored by the University of Washington and the Washington State legislature, designed to assist newly-elected legislators to successfully develop and influence policies, and to work productively as a member of the legislature.

The Center is staffed by a faculty chairman, a full-time director, and four full-time staff. All faculty have either served as government officials or are currently advisors to government officials.

Descriptive materials were provided on both the executive management and legislator programs.

E. Executive Development in Other States

A 1988 report by the Texas Governor's Executive Development program indicated more than 40 states employ strategies to address development needs of their state executives. The report indicated 18 of these programs have strong executive development programs ("History and Background of Governor's Executive Development Program," 1988).

The New York State Office of General Services is development a comprehensive management development program from the supervisory level to top management. The intent of the program is to require managers to attend a minimum of five days of management training per year. (NASDAGS News, January-February, 1990).

V. KEY FINDINGS

* Continued support from top management is needed to achieve maximum effectiveness. States which have the direct participation of the Governor have the best experience. Leadership by doing does set the tone for a successful program.

* There is no "magic" curriculum. Content is evolutionary. Leadership is an art as well as an endeavor which requires specific skills. Course material may change as different challenges face the states.

* Two weeks is the minimum desirable course length; three weeks is preferable.

* Off-site, residential settings help achieve the most

successful results.

* The most successful executive institutes are operated by programs which have full-time adminstrative staff. Such staff can be available to establish other management training programs, create refresher courses for alumni, seek financial support and other administrative tasks needed to strengthen the program.

VI. OPPORTUNITIES FOR STRENGTHENING MEI

Based on this review of other state programs and our analysis of the MEI evaluations over the first three years of its existence, the following suggestions could be incorporated into MEI to increase its effectiveness in helping to advance professional management in state government:

* Re-focus the marketing approach to attract more participation from Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners.

* Promote participation by staff from the legislature, judicial branch, and constitutional agencies to strengthen inter-agency working relationships.

* Consider establishing direct financial appropriations for executive training. States which establish their executive institute with specific legislation and which provide direct appropriations appear to have some of the strongest executive development programs.

* Establish a foundation to help support the Executive Institute and related training efforts.

* Establish an "MEI Task Force" to help provide administration and strengthening of the program.

* Modify MEI curriculum to include some programs identified by a 1986 State Training Office survey as executive training needs but which have not yet been included on the MEI menu. (Note: many of those needs already have been addressed by MEI curriculum.)

* Conduct a survey of all MEI graduates to update their original evaluations and to obtain other data identified as valuable to the program.

VII. FEATURES FROM OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH COULD BE ADAPTED TO MEI

* Executive institute faculty and/or alumni offer Executive Briefings for the Cabinet as is done in Arizona.

* Institute the "Personal Consulting Project" used in California.

* Expand "alumni refresher" courses as conducted by the Rocky Mountain Program in Colorado.

* Seek a source to provide partial scholarship assistance as utilized in several states.

* Establish weekend retreats for alumni as in Maryland.

* Establish a cabinet level advisory board to the Institute, as is done in Texas.

* Have each graduating class create task forces to present recommendations to legislative panels on issues of relevance to legislative debate, as also is done in Texas.

Each of these program features requires additional effort and resources which may not be currently available to the MEI network. An assessment the availability of resources needed to undertake further examination of additional programs would be, in itself, worthwhile.

Further, a closer examination of both MEI itself and the above suggested "improvements" would have to be conducted. Closer inspection may reveal that some suggested additions are simply not practical for inclusion in MEI.

#

Postscript

***This paper was prepared for PAA 550, a graduate level course entitled, "Public Personnel Management." It is offered as part of the Masters of Public Administration Program (MPA) in the Department of Public Administration of the university. The MPA program is tailored to working professionals, especially in state, local, and county government.

The MPA program endeavors, as one of its primary objectives, to foster enhanced management of state agencies and public service. There is significant potential for papers written as part of this program to provide direct support to the state government operations. For this project in particular, the linkages are direct and present an opportunity the results to be incorporated into the Maine Executive Program. Dr. Kenneth K. Ahn is co-director of MEI. Mr. Meadows was a participant in the first MEI held in 1987.

Appendix A

REFERENCES CITED

Ahn, Kenneth, Charles Morrison and Haywood Talcove. "The Education and Training of State Government Managers: The Case of the Maine Executive Institute." A paper presented at the 1988 American Society of Public Administration Conference, November, 1988.

Anonymous. "The Governor's Executive Development Program of Texas." 1988.

Bauman, Paul. "Executive Education: Lessons Learned from the Rocky Mountain Program." A paper presented at the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management Reserarch Conference. Seattle. October, 1988.

Behn, Robert D., and Regina K. Brough. "The Four Keys to a Successful Executive -- Education Program: Curriculum, Logistics, Marketing, and Faculty," Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1990.

Haberland, Suzanne. "Report on University-Based Executive Education Programs for Public Sector Executives." Cascade Center for Public Service, Institute for Public Policy Affairs, University of Washington. A paper prepared for the Annual Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management. Seattle. October, 1988.

Powers, William. "The Maryland Government Executive Institute: Description and Lessons." A paper prepared for the APPAM Workshop on Executive Education. October, 1988.

Sylvia, Ronald and C. Kenneth Meyer. "An Organizational Perspective on Training and Development in the Public Sector." In Public Personnel Administration by Steven Hays and Richard Kearney, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1990.

Trubee, Elaine. Personal Interviews, March 14, 1990 and April 20, 1990. Augusta, Maine.

_____. "Executive Education for State Government. The Governors Center at Duke University. 1990." Pamphlet. Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University, Durham, N.C., Spring, 1990.

_____. "The Maine Executive Institute. Governor's Executive Development Program, 1990." Brochure. Maine Department of Administration. April, 1990.

Appendix A (cont.)

_____. "The Maine Management Institute., Spring 1990." Maine Department of Administration. March 1990.

_____. "The Maryland Government Executive Institute 1990." Pamphlet. University of Maryland. Spring, 1990.

_____. "New York Develops a Comprehensive Management Development Program." In, NASDAGS News, newsletter of the National Association of State Directors of Administration and Central Services. Vol. I-90. January-February, 1990.

_____. "State and Local Executive Institute." University of California at Berkeley. Brochure. 1990.

_____. State Training Resource Directory. National Association of State Training and Development Directors. The Council of State Governments. NASTDD. Lexington, KY. July, 1989.

FROM: "The Education and Training of State Government Managers: The Case of Maine Executive Institute." Ahn, Morrison and Talcove, 1988.

Update: April, 1990

Appendix B

Table 1 Selected State Executive Institutes

State/Program Name	Sponsors	Participants	Curriculum	Presenters	Length/Residence	Cost
Colorado Senior Management/ Program Management Seminar	University of Colorado at Denver - Graduate School of Public Affairs	30 mid & senior level executives in Colorado State Government; some others	Executive environment, leadership & managerial skills	UCD faculty, professional staff, and consultant	10 days over 3 months; non-residential; offered once a year	$ 525
Maine Maine Executive Institute	University of Maine and Maine Department of Administration	30 senior-level executives in Maine State Government	Executive environment, leadership & managerial skills	UM faculty, State officials, professional trainers	2 non-consecutive weeks; residential at off-campus facility; offered once a year	$1,395
Maryland Maryland Government Executive Institute	University of Maryland and the Aspen Institute	35 senior-level executives in Maryland State and Local Government	Executive environment, leadership & managerial skills	Graduate UM faculty; outside experts	3 non-consecutive weeks; residential at off-campus conference center; offered once a year	$4,200
*Masschusetts Managing People in Public Agencies	Brandeis University	40 senior-level State managers in Massachusetts	Managerial skills	Brandeis faculty	5 days; non-residential; offered twice a year	$ 950
North Carolina Executive Education Programs: Decision-making for State Executives Strategic Leadership for State Executives	Duke University: The Governors Center	Nationwide Participants 70 State Executives 70 cabinet secretaries and senior-level state executives	 Analytical skill Executive leadership Political leadership, managerial skills	 Duke faculty Duke faculty; State officials; private university officials	 5 days; residential off-campus classes; offered once a year. 5 days; residential off-campus housing, on-campus classes; offered once a year	 $2,000 $2,000
Texas Governor's Executive Development Program	State Management Development Center, Executive Development Council, and University of Texas at Austin	40 senior-level executives in Washington State & Municipal Government	Managerial skills; Executive style	Professional presenters; consultants; faculty; State officials; private executives	18 days over 3 non-sequential weeks non-residential; offered once a year	$3,500 + room and board
*Viriginia Virginia Executive Institute	Virginia Department of Personnel and Training	30 senior-level executives in Virginia State Government	Executive environment, managerial skills	State officials, academic, guest speakers	3 non-consecutive weeks; residential at conference facilities; offered twice a year	$ 400 not including room & board
Washington Executive Management Development Program	University of Washington under contract with State Government	40 senior-level executives in Washington State, municipal government	Executive environment, managerial skills	UW faculty, faculty from across U.S., State officials	10 days; residential at off-campus conference center	$2,850

*1990 Information Not available

Appendix B

Appendix C

MAINE EXECUTIVE INSTITUTE EVALUATION SURVEY

STATE:

Name of person responding to survey:

Title: Department:

Address: Telephone

Program Name:

Sponsor/Host Organization:
(university, agency, HDR agency, other)

Address:

Comments:

Target Audience: (circle all that apply)
Federal State Municipal Non-profit Private
Other (describe)

Comments:

Level: (circle all that apply)
Department Head Deputy Division/Bureau Director
Mid-level Civil Services Elected Legislative
Other (describe)

Comments:

Number in Course:

Comments:

Appendix C (Cont.)

Degree Credits:

Describe:

Times per year offered:

Comments:

Course Length:

Residence Non-residence Consecutive Non-consecutive

Comments:

Cost:

Source of payment: Agency Funds Tuition Appropriation
Participant State Training Funds Grants Cost Share
(describe)

Comments:

Major Curriculum Areas: (describe)

(executive, leadership, managerial skills, political leadership, organizational development, other)

Please list topics and enclose agenda if available

Comments:

Presenters: (circle)

State university faculty State training corps
Professional trainers Consultants State officials
Others (list)

Comments:

Unique Factors:

(objectives, partnerships, funding, results, audience, etc.)

Describe or attach:

Appendix C (cont.)

Program Effectiveness: (On scale of 1 - 5)

5 = highly effective
1 = would like to improve

Comments:

Other Comments:

Future plans or changes:

Most appropriate contact:
(if different than person filling out survey)

Name:

Address:

Telephone

Additional people to contact about your program: (co-sponsor, etc.)

Name:

Address:

Telephone

Note: Please enclose any descriptive material.

I would like to receive results of the Maine study. (check)____

Thank you.

Return to: **Ed Meadows, Commissioner**
Department of Conservation
Station #22
Augusta, Maine 04333

LIST OF CONTACTS

STATE	PROGRAM	ADDRESS
Arizona	Certified Public Manager	Montgomery Van Wart, Director School of Public Affairs Advanced Public Executive Program Tempe, Arizona 85287-0503 602-965-4005
California	State and Local Executive Institute	Eugene Bordach Professor of Public Policy Graduate School of Public Policy University of California Berkeley, California 94720 415-642-7422
Colorado	Senior Management Seminar	Wendy Green Program Director Center for the Improvement of Public Management 1200 Larimer Box 133 Denver, Colorado 80204 303-556-4846 Also: Kenneth H. Torp Executive Director
Maine	Maine Executive Institute	Kenneth J. Ahn Director The Roger Clapp Greenhouse Bureau of Public Administration University of Maine Orono, Maine 04469 207-581-4136 Also: Elaine Trubee, Director State Training and Development Program Bureau of Human Resources Department of Administration State House Station 4 Augusta, Maine 04333 207-289-4400

STATE	PROGRAM	ADDRESS
Maryland	Maryland Government Executive Institute	Stephen M. Block Director, Mid-Career Programs School of Public Affairs Morrill Hall University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 301-454-4993 Also: Dr. Pat Stocker College of Business and Management College Park, Maryland 20742 301-454-2406
North Carolina	Stretegic Leadership for State Executives Decision-Making for State Executives	Regina K. Brough Executive Director The Governors Center Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs 4875 Duke Station Duke University Durham, North Carolina 27706 919-684-4155/4477 Robert D. Behn, Director
Texas	Governor's Executive Development Program	Dr. Darrell T. Piersol Director L.B.J. School of Public Affairs Drawer Y, University Station Austin, Texas 78713-7450 512-471-0296 Dr. Carol J. Whitcraft Coordinator Lynn Chamley Administrative Assistance Co-Sponsor: Texas State Management Development Center P.O. Box 12428 Capitol Station Austin, Texas 78711

STATE	PROGRAM	ADDRESS
Washington	Cascade Center for Public Science Executive Management Program	Erica Schreiber Director Institute for Public Policy and Management Graduate School of Public Affairs University of Washington 323 Parrington Mail Stop DC-14 Seattle, Washington 98195 206-685-0523 Jon Brock, Chair

1988 MAINE EXECUTIVE INSTITUTE
Evaluation Summary
Session

Important: Your thoughtful feedback in regard to each major component as well as to overall program quality would be greatly appreciated. Your thoughts will help us in our efforts to meet the learning needs of our participants in future programs. Use the reverse sides of the pages if additional space is needed for your comments and suggestions. The entire completed Final Evaluation will be collected at the end of the program on Friday, September 30. Thank you.

How do you feel about your experience in each of the following? (Please circle the appropriate number.)

A. "Becoming an Effective Leader: Situational Leadership" (John Sample)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

B. "Management by Objectives: Organizational Development through Effective Leadership and Strategic Planning" (Charles Morrison)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

C. "Building Effective Relationships: Management Team Development in Your Agency" (Frank Sherwood)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

D. "Informal Conversation with the Governor" (Governor McKernan)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

E. "Building Effective Relationships: Developing Communication Skills" (Ronald Stupak)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

F. "Building Effective Relationships: Establishing Inter-Agency Networks of Executives" - A Joint Session of the 1987 and 1988 Classes

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

G. "Relations Between State Government and the University of Maine System" (Chancellor Woodbury)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

H. "Executive Health and Management of Stress in the Workplace" (Donald Callan)

Not valuable 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable

Comments/suggestions, if any:

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

A. How do you feel about the schedule as a whole? Please check one.

_____ Too tight _____ Too loose _____ Just right

B. How do you feel about the length of the program?

_____ Too long _____ Too short _____ Just right

C. How do you feel about the quality of the food served?

Session 1: Leavitt Hall Conference Center, MMA

Not satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfactory

Session 2: Sugarloaf Inn Resort

Not satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfactory

Comments/suggestions, if any:

D. How do you feel about the quality of the physical facilities?

Session 1: Leavitt Hall Conference Center, MMA

Not satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfactory

Session 2: Sugarloaf Inn Resort

Not satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfactory

Comments/suggestions, if any:

E. How do you feel about the program administration and staff support?

a. Ken Ahn Not helpful 1 2 3 4 5 Very helpful
b. Kay Godwin Not helpful 1 2 3 4 5 Very helpful
c. Others Not helpful 1 2 3 4 5 Very helpful

Comments/suggestions, if any:

F. How do you feel about your overall experience with the Maine Executive Institute?

Not satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Very satisfied

Comments/suggestions, if any:

G. 1. To what extent has the program met its objectives?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal

Comments/suggestions, if any:

2. What do you feel is the most important accomplishment of the program? Please be specific.