FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A WILLIAM G. KENTON CENTER FOR GOVERNMENTAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES

Research Report No. 202

Legislative Research Commission
Frankfort, Kentucky

KENTUCKY LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION

SENATOR JOE PRATHER
President Pro Tem

REPRESENTATIVE BOBBY H. RICHARDSON
Speaker

Chairmen

Senate Members

DELBERT S. MURPHY
Assistant President Pro Tem

JOE WRIGHT
Majority Floor Leader

GENE HUFF
Minority Floor Leader

DAVID K. KAREM
Majority Caucus Chairman

CLYDE MIDDLETON
Minority Caucus Chairman

HELEN GARRETT
Majority Whip

DOUG MOSELEY
Minority Whip

House Members

DONALD J. BLANDFORD
Speaker Pro Tem

JIM LEMASTER
Majority Floor Leader

RICHARD A. TURNER
Minority Floor Leader

WILLIAM (BILL) DONNERMEYER
Majority Caucus Chairman

EDWARD L. HOLLOWAY
Minority Caucus Chairman

JAMES R. DUNN
Majority Whip

WILLARD "WOODY" ALLEN
Minority Whip

VIC HELLARD, JR., Director

* * * * * *

The Kentucky Legislative Research Commission is a sixteen-member committee, comprised of the majority and minority leadership of the Kentucky Senate and House of Representatives. Under Chapter 7 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes, the Commission constitutes the administrative office for the Kentucky General Assembly. Its director serves as chief administrative officer of the legislature when it is not in session.

The Commission and its staff, by law and by practice, perform numerous fact-finding and service functions for members of the General Assembly. The Commission provides professional, clerical and other employees required by legislators when the General Assembly is in session and during the interim period between sessions. These employees, in turn, assist committees and individual members in preparing legislation. Other services include conducting studies and investigations, organizing and staffing committee meetings and public hearings, maintaining official legislative records and other reference materials, furnishing information about the legislature to the public, compiling and publishing administrative regulations, administering a legislative intern program, conducting a pre-session orientation conference for legislators, and publishing a daily index of legislative activity during sessions of the General Assembly.

The Commission also is responsible for statute revision, publication and distribution of the **Acts** and **Journals** following sessions of the General Assembly and for maintaining furnishings, equipment and supplies for the legislature.

The Commission functions as Kentucky's Commission on Interstate Cooperation in carrying out the program of the Council of State Governments as it relates to Kentucky.

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A WILLIAM G. KENTON CENTER FOR GOVERNMENTAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES

Mr. Allan Alsip, Chairman
Mr. Charles Curry
Mr. Rush Dozier, Jr.
Professor Malcolm Jewell
Representative Carolyn Kenton
Representative Jim LeMaster
Senator Joe Prather
Representative Bobby Richardson
Mr. Harry Snyder
Senator Joe Wright

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION STAFF
Janie Jones
Carole Suter
Linda Hughes

Research Report No. 202

Legislative Research Commission
Frankfort, Kentucky
October, 1983

This report was prepared by the Legislative Research Commission and paid for from state funds.

FOREWORD

The 1982 General Assembly created the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies. Its mission was to study the prospects for such a center and create a specific proposal for the 1984 General Assembly. The following report grew out of that committee's work. Because of time constraints and the quantity of data to be collected and analyzed, the committee secured the services of H. Milton Patton, State Research Associates, of Lexington, Kentucky, who prepared the report.

Vic Hellard, Jr.
Director

The Capitol
Frankfort, Kentucky
October, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword i

Table of Contents iii

Summary v

I. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES 1

II. FUNCTIONS OF A CENTER 5

- Findings 5
- Local and State Government Training 5
- Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) 10
- State Strategic Issue Development 14
- The National Dimension 17

III. GOVERNANCE 19

- An Independent Board of Governors 19
- Local and State Government Training 21
- Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations 22
- Strategic Issues Development 22
- National Advisory Board 23

IV. OPERATIONAL STYLE 25

- Networking 25
- Other Linkages 27
- Core Staff 28
- Finance 28

V. LOCATION 31

- Universities 31
- The State Capital 32
- The Spindletop Site 32
- Combination 33

APPENDICES:

A. House Resolution 52 35
B. Institutional Training and Public Service Resources 41
C. Study Inteviews 47
D. Resolution, Editorial, Letters 53

84/11/300

SUMMARY

The following recommendations reflect the consensus derived from the work of the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies. The recommendations are discussed separately in the text of the report.

Functions of a Center

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) That a primary function of a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies be the training of local and state government officials, working through the existing network of training service providers and such programs as may be established in the future.

2) That a primary function of the Center be the creation, staffing and support of a Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

3) That a primary function of the Center be the examination of emerging strategic issues facing Kentucky in the intermediate-term future, and that this function be performed through research, public forums, education, and information dissemination.

4) That the enabling legislation for a center recognize the possibilities for future program development relating to national collaborative research and information on state governmental policy and program development, foundation funding, and demonstration programs using Kentucky as a "laboratory" state.

Governance

(5) That the Board of Governors of the Center be composed of seventeen individuals, as follows:

- The Governor.
- The Speaker of the House.
- The President Pro Tem of the Senate.
- The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- The Chairman of the Council on Higher Education.
- A representative of the Kentucky Municipal League, to serve a four-year term.
- A representative of the Kentucky Association of Counties.
- A university president selected by the Council of University Presidents, to serve a four-year term.

- Four citizens appointed by the Governor for staggered four-year terms.
- Three citizens appointed by the Board of Governors for staggered four-year terms.
- A member to be selected by the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Council of Area Development Districts, to serve a four-year term.

(6) That the Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be composed of twenty-one individuals, to serve staggered four-year terms, as follows:

- Two elected county officials nominated by the Kentucky Association of Counties and appointed by the Governor.
- Two elected city officials nominated by the Kentucky Municipal League and appointed by the Governor.
- Two elected school officials nominated by the Kentucky School Boards Association and appointed by the Governor.
- Two members of the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Council of Area Development Districts appointed by the Governor.
- Two state executive branch officials appointed by the Governor.
- Three private citizens appointed by the Governor.
- Three state senators appointed by the President Pro Tem of the Senate.
- Three state representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- Two judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Operational Style

RECOMMENDATIONS

7) That the Center utilize the networking principle in implementing its program, seeking to support and enhance existing programs. The Center would not replace or duplicate ongoing research, training or public service activities. The Center would cooperate with the Council on Higher Education in the creation and support of a special research and development committee for university research and public service coordination.

8) That the Center receive full initial funding in order to develop programs and demonstrate effectiveness at the earliest possible time. Public funding should be supplemented with an endowment raised from private sector contributions.

Location

RECOMMENDATION

9) That the newly appointed Board of Governors be charged with selecting a suitable location for the Kenton Center conference and office facility, using the following criteria:

1) Symbolic independence from any individual university.
2) Symbolic independence from political factionalism or influence, especially to ensure maximum citizen involvement, participation, and financial support.
3) Central location for greatest possible accessibility by car.
4) Location near one of the three major airports in Kentucky.
5) Availability of hotels, motels, and restaurants.
6) Accessibility to state agencies.
7) Accessibility to research resources.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

The 1982 General Assembly created the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies. Its objective has been to identify needs and to develop a specific proposal for consideration by the 1984 General Assembly regarding the establishment of a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies, which would serve the Commonwealth by enhancing the knowledge of its citizens on matters of government and by developing the effectiveness of its public officials to deal with emerging issues.

Those who served with or knew Speaker Kenton believe that a center of this kind would not only be a suitable memorial to him, but would promote the kinds of change he championed during the 1970's for a more effective and responsive government, one which is capable of innovation and which continually anticipates the future.

Through 1982 and early 1983, the Committee solicited recommendations and suggestions from a variety of sources, especially local government associations and universities. In many states, institutes of government typically serve local government officials and universities and are often the dominant provider of services. In Kentucky, significant training efforts are in place at the universities, among the various local government associations and within the various state government departments and agencies. Hearings of the Committee identified many of these activities as well as need for additional resources.

Perhaps the most significant finding during this period was that fragmentation is pervasive among the various efforts and that there is no focus on development of a coherent, efficient and effective program to meet future needs.

Proposals from the universities varied greatly in purpose, approach and organization. However, the proposal from Eastern Kentucky University sparked widespread interest and a vision of "what might be" among the Committee and those who have followed its activities. The EKU proposal stated that:

> The Center should be free of any single institution and would probably be most effective with a board of directors appointed especially for the Center operation. The Center should be a new operation and not placed within an existing organization. There are too many examples of existing organizations using the same old methods, favoring the same programs and using the same personnel they have worked with for years, rather than utilizing new innovations, meeting the needs of the future or seeking out new people to provide services or assistance . . .
>
> In summary, the Kenton Center should provide a broad range of pro-

> grams that will serve the many needs of the Commonwealth for training, technical assistance, research and policy development. The Center should be open, independent and dedicated to attracting the best talent available within the state.
>
> We have the opportunity here and now to take the steps that will make Kentucky a leader in public sector training and education. Steps that will ensure that Kentucky will have the long range policy innovations needed for the 1990's and beyond. I hope that this Committee has the foresight and the courage to take these steps.

The Committee determined that it must search further for ideas and information if it were to meet this challenge. In June, H. Milton Patton, Principal Partner, State Research Associates, was asked to assist in shaping a proposal for the 1984 General Assembly. The following activities were completed:

1) Interviews with more than fifty individuals throughout the state to identify needs, possible functions of a Center, suggestions for operational approaches, location, and funding.

2) Working with state agencies, universities and local government associations, developing background on existing training, exemplary operations and activities currently in place or planned, and suggestions for potential linkages in a network of resources which could be focused through a Center.

3) A survey of similar activities in other states and among various national associations and organizations.

4) Distribution of five hundred copies of a preliminary report for comment, review and suggestions for improvement to legislators, universities, associations of local officials, and others. (All responses in writing are included in Appendix D for reference.)

A review of experiences of other states indicates that there is no "ideal" model for a state center for government and political studies. Each has been designed for its unique setting, time and purposes. For example, the often cited Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina was only a part-time interest of one faculty member during the 1930's and 1940's; it later became institutionalized by the University. It is only one of a number of interrelated organizations in North Carolina which contribute to informed state development.

The Institute of Government at the University of Georgia was also developed during the 1930's and 1940's to specialize in training and limited research. The Mississippi Research and Development Center was one of a number of special centers created in the early 1960's to serve economic development. Spindletop Research in Kentucky was established at this time and sought to emulate the research complex serving Boston's technology firms, but did not attempt to serve government until its later years. In recent years, comprehensive schools of public administration have been created by some universities, such as the Lyndon B. Johnson School at the University of Texas and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota.

The challenge for Kentucky is to build an institution designed to serve its unique needs both now and in the future. It must be fashioned appropriately for its time and place. It must not be a monument to earlier people and concepts, but a living, vital public enterprise bringing together both people and ideas. Most of all, rather than replacing or duplicating existing resources, it must creatively harness and support the existing institutions, activities and other critical resources involved with training and policy development. It is within this framework of objectives that the Kenton Center can be built.

While the experience of other states provides no ideal model for Kentucky, there is one clear lesson which must be remembered. Many centers of public affairs created in recent decades have failed, and are now forgotten. The principal reason for these failures is that there was no widespread commitment among public and private leadership and the necessary resources were not committed during the early years to assure their usefulness and to establish their credibility. It has been clear from the outset of this study that unless the state is prepared to make the commitment and provide the resources to implement the objectives of the 1982 resolution of the General Assembly, there is little chance for success.

The interviews were designed to identify needs and the extent of commitment on the part of those who contributed. While each individual emphasized certain functions more than others, there was consensus on need, function, networking structure and independence. There are many who are prepared to contribute to the creation of a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies. The following sections report findings, identify differences on particular points, and make recommendations which are supportable on the basis of information available at this time.

Comments and suggestions received during the review of the preliminary report have been incorporated as much as possible.

CHAPTER II

FUNCTIONS OF A CENTER

Why a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies? What should be its purposes? What would it do? Why is it needed? Would it make a difference to the Commonwealth? Are there not sufficient institutional resources already? Answers to these and related questions have been the central issues before the Committee.

FINDINGS

1) There is a universal feeling that many local government officials in Kentucky are inadequately informed of their roles, responsibilities and leadership opportunities and require a continuous program of education and training.

2) There is a recognition among most observers that the structure of state and local government and their interrelationships ought to be constantly monitored and evaluated in the interest of continuing to meet emerging needs in such areas as taxation, financial management and the delivery of services.

3) A majority of observers, especially those with the longest view of public affairs in Kentucky, strongly urged the creation of a mechanism which would research and inform, and involve a broad range of citizens and officials in major issues facing the state in the intermediate future, such as the direction of the state's economic future and the status of its educational system.

4) About one-half of the observers saw Kentucky as potentially filling a national role as a "laboratory" state, in terms of its links with foundations, public interest groups and other national organizations in research related to state and local government.

Local and State Government Training

Clearly and persistently throughout this review, the first or second response to the question, "What should be the function of the Kenton Center?" was the answer, "Training of local government officials." The reasons behind this response varied widely. One respondent said that "The current indictments coming down on local officials is reason enough." Another, a legislator and former school board member, explained: "School board members are typically elected because they are against something which happened to them personally. They have little idea of their role or responsibility or any idea of what to look for in hiring a superintendent." Several pointed out that, "Elemental local services are at the point of breakdown in such basic areas as solid and hazardous waste disposal, water and education. Without effective local government management and performance, Kentucky will not be able to compete for development with other states."

The Department for Local Government, long charged with assisting and supporting the development of efficient local government management, stated clearly in a report to the Committee that:

> The role of local government administrators has undergone a period of dramatic change during the past few years. The 'restructuring' of the federal/state/local government partnership has resulted in greater program control, creativity and legislative/administrative compliance requirements at the local level. The new partnership has enhanced the role of local governments as policy innovators, program initiators and program administrators. . . However, proper training for local government officials and employees to enable development of management capacity has not been possible due to lack of funding, personnel and expertise in specific areas.

Without in any way intending to criticize the many training efforts currently under way in many quarters throughout the state, the Kentucky Municipal League reported to the Committee that:

> Fragmentation of training throughout Kentucky is rampant. Universities, Area Development Districts, State Government, and even the Kentucky Municipal League all share in good faith efforts to address training needs; but our uncoordinated scheduling and delivery of programs provides minimal assistance to local officials who need both broad and in-depth training programs.

That observation of the status of local government training in Kentucky was followed by an admonition to the Committee: "As you consider the important and numerous aspects of developing such a Center, it will become even more obvious that you are not only developing a Center, but you are developing the future of government in Kentucky."

An average citizen or one not broadly informed in government might ask: "Don't we get what we vote for? Why should an elected or appointed administrator require special training and education? Our structure of government was established to be run by ordinary citizens elected periodically to represent the people." True! But, the complexities of contemporary America are reflected in the responsibilities of government. At the turn of the century, very small local neighborhoods got together to hire one teacher for their children. If the teacher did not perform well, he or she was fired and another hired. As the need for education expanded, in response to economic needs and expanding populations, the enterprise of education became more complex. Today in Kentucky alone, more than $1.25 billion each year must be managed effectively by school boards and their appointed officials. Public education is currently the largest local government responsibility run by locally elected officials.

Local school boards are fortunate, by contrast with city and county officials, because there is a strong state oversight function regarding standards in such areas as performance, finance and administrative practice. City and county officials run widely

divergent communities with regard to size, financial resources, geography, potential development, and special needs. In addition to efficient management with limited personnel resources, they daily face the need to assure effective transportation, water and sewer services, recreation, utility regulation, solid and hazardous waste disposal, police and fire protection, zoning and development control, tax systems, promotion of economic development, bond programs and a variety of services for state government.

One could ask: "Is it reasonable to expect that the typical locally elected official should be able to perform his or her duties without adequate training and current information?"

Local officials are not unique in this need. Over the past twenty years nationwide corporations and public interest groups have instituted regular training programs designed to keep their employees or members informed on not only the basics of operational duties, but on emerging changes and responsibilities. In an "age of information," regular training has become routine in complex organizations. Even governors undertake "basic" training and regularly share information on both the regional and national level through the National Governors' Association. A newly elected governor will attend a seminar conducted by NGA to teach such basics as how to run a governor's office, how to answer mail efficiently and promptly, and how to select effective appointees.

Public duties are often foreign to the experience of a newly elected official. Regardless of the substantive issues facing the body to which the official is elected, the decision-making process often differs fundamentally from the official's experience. The Kentucky Municipal League pointed out that:

> Generally, elected officials need to know the basics of governing. The Kentucky Municipal League has historically provided a school for newly elected city officials. We assume that these city officials have no knowledge of the important aspects of group decision making and public policy making. As independent businessmen, professionals, et cetera, these elected officials make many decisions on a unilateral basis. Being a member of a city council, or being mayor, necessitates "give and take" just as in any legislative body.
>
> It is important for these newly elected officials to recognize this group decision making process prior to taking office and prior to issues being put before a council. The school for newly elected officials, which the League offers, emphasizes these kinds of basic and rudimentary techniques which greatly assist officials in carrying out their responsibilities efficiently and properly. This basic approach would hopefully be the case with any curriculum developed by the Center.

A review of efforts to train and inform the more than 5,000 locally elected officials in Kentucky demonstrates the widely shared view of need. Recognition of the need for training is manifest in the number of exemplary efforts currently in place and contemplated. (Some of these programs are more completely described in Appendix B.)

The Kentucky Municipal League, in its statement before the Committee, outlined

its current program of training and cooperative efforts with others, but demonstrated the need for a greatly expanded program, including in-service, short-term, long-term and other training efforts to serve its constituencies far beyond the capacities of the Association itself. The Kentucky School Boards Association stated that training should be its central activity, but the current program is largely confined to its annual meeting. The Kentucky Association of School Administrators has recently instituted the Kentucky Academy for School Executives, but is obliged to find a suitable institutional location for it after its initial creation.

At the state level, many departments are engaged in various training efforts with local officials to support program initiatives and to fulfill the mandates of law requiring specific standards of performance. The Department for Local Government and its predecessor agencies, working with Area Development Districts and others, have performed various training functions over the past twenty years to assist in the evolution of Kentucky local governments. Their role in identifying training needs, developing and supporting training efforts and evaluating training effectiveness has often been the envy of the nation. However, as stated previously, "proper training for local government officials and employees to enable development of management capacity has not been possible due to lack of funding, personnel and expertise in specific areas." The judicial system, following its reorganization, instituted an extensive program of training and retraining. Discussions are currently under way concerning the possibilities for mandated continuing education for lawyers and others involved in the court system.

State government personnel need continuing education and training as well. This need has been recognized in recent years and a significant beginning has been made in state training programs. Further development of this initiative will require sensitive programming, development of training resources, and continuing support tailored to individual agency and employee needs.

Universities, traditionally the public system for innovative training programs, have in place a variety of programs for both training and technical assistance. It is estimated that approximately five percent of the expenditures for the state university system are devoted to "public service." This figure represents over $30 million and hundreds of faculty and staff.

The University of Louisville's new College of Urban and Public Affairs reflects a creative restructuring of activities to focus resources efficiently for both students and the community. The University of Kentucky's Martin Center not only honors Kentucky's best known public servant, but coordinates academic resources for excellent graduate training in public affairs. UK's many other colleges and institutes, including its College of Education, provide important special training and service. Eastern Kentucky University is a center for law enforcement training (in conjunction with the Justice Cabinet), and the University conducts many special workshops and seminars, including the summer Taft Institute to train teachers in public affairs. Northern Kentucky University serves its fragmented urban com-

munities by addressing their special management problems and Morehead State University likewise serves its rural and small town environment. Murray State University and Western Kentucky University provide similar services. Kentucky State University is in a unique position to serve the state government community. The community colleges extend this network even further through the state, providing reasonable accessibility to all local communities.

Kentucky Educational Television (KET) also provides important training for local officials and citizens through special information programs, television courses on government and public affairs and other media services. KET is known as the best educational television system in the nation and, with adoption of newer technologies, offers exciting prospects for expanding service in government and public affairs in Kentucky.

Private sector organizations also contribute meaningfully to the network of training. The recent annual meeting of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce held in Louisville was devoted to the critical issues of jobs, technology and education. The substance and impact of that forum on education significantly illustrates the importance business and lay people in general place upon an understanding of government and public affairs.

One might ask: "With all these public and private resources devoted to training and information, why is there a consensus on the need for creating a center for local and state government training?" The answer: "Fragmentation of training throughout Kentucky is rampant."

Observers conclude that there must be an effective focus for training programs in Kentucky, for a variety of reasons:

1) To effectively utilize the network of resources already in place.
2) To provide a mechanism for joint and cooperative programming.
3) To attract both public and private funding to ensure the availability of resources needed for training.
4) To provide the special expertise which supports instructors in effective training.
5) To develop specialized packages of instructional materials on emerging issues and problems of service delivery.
6) To utilize new technologies for information dissemination.
7) To continually evaluate experiences and innovations of other states for possible application in Kentucky.

RECOMMENDATION

That a primary function of the Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies be the training of local and state government officials, working through the existing network of training service providers and such programs as may be established in the future.

A Kentucky Advisory Commission On Governmental Relations (ACIR)

The standard by which our county boundaries were drawn was a one-day round-trip to the county seat by horse and wagon. The standard for cities was a location for stores, lawyers, sufficient number of houses requiring a water system and a policeman, and a dream of future economic development. Counties and cities were established under laws of the state and a system of governance which assigned various roles for conducting public business. We continue to govern under structures and intergovernmental relations established to serve an agrarian, frontier society of the early nineteenth century. This intergovernmental system may not be adequate in all respects for the remaining few years of the twentieth century or for the rapidly approaching twenty-first.

Our industrial markets are now worldwide, our people communicate instantly and routinely around the world, our students are bombarded with the nation's culture through television and have access to the world's store of knowledge through computers and similar information transfer. Our public systems, however, lag far behind those of the private sector and behind the knowledge we share regarding modern organizations, technology and concepts of efficiency. While such Kentucky businesses as IBM, Humana, General Electric, Ashland Oil and Island Creek Coal contribute new concepts in a worldwide economy, state and local government in Kentucky remain hampered by outdated systems requiring continual review and change.

Each session of the General Assembly brings changes to the laws and structure of the Commonwealth. From time to time, major revisions occur, such as the rewriting of the Constitution in 1891, reflecting its particular day.

What is lacking is an ongoing monitoring and review of state and local government systems. Nowhere within our system is there a continuous process of objective evaluation, development of reasonable alternatives for change, and the development of information for the Legislature with regard to intergovernmental relations. Although such informing happens from time to time and through various means, it is not a central item of business within the Commonwealth. While it is everyone's business, it is also the business of no one.

Speaker Kenton, while chairman of a local government committee in the House, conducted a remarkably simple, straightforward review of local government and intergovernmental needs. Rather than pursuing the traditional and often "after the fact" legislative hearings before his committee in Frankfort, he loaded the committee, its staff, and local government association staff onto a bus and toured the state, asking local officials about their needs and seeing first hand the problems they faced. Significant changes occurred as the result of that process. Those changes reflected contemporary needs as seen by local officials themselves. They were not the result of special cases or special pleading, so common in a widely divergent state with 120 counties, 462 cities and numerous special districts. They were the result of a comprehensive, first-hand review of current needs.

The work of the General Assembly and many special task forces during the past decade bear witness to the need for the continual monitoring of local needs and intergovernmental relations. The approval of the Lexington/Fayette Urban County government in 1974 provided Kentucky with a tangible demonstration of the political feasibility of an alternative to traditional local structures. This and other circumstances have led many state and local leaders to a growing awareness that an outmoded and fragmented statutory base and constitution have become a serious impediment to effective local government.

Those concerns were expressed formally in 1976 when two statute revision commissions, one for cities and one for counties, were created by the Kentucky General Assembly and Governor Julian Carroll respectively. While the reason for each commission grew out of different political and historical circumstances, both groups quickly focused on the need for greater statutory flexibility for general purpose local government. Also emerging from these efforts were a growing number of questions about the allocation of functional responsibilities between and among governments. While operating under separate charters, the two panels worked together on a daily basis.

Although both commissions reported to the General Assembly in 1978, they were generally unsuccessful in having their recommendations implemented, because of the controversial nature of some proposals and the need to further investigate others. As a result, the General Assembly, by joint resolution, combined and continued the work of the two panels through the establishment of a 32-member Local Government Statute Revision Commission, composed of state legislators, city, county, and area development district officials and citizens. Specifically, the new panel was directed to "study and review the laws pertaining to units of local government and to carry out a continuing survey of the needs of local government from the perspective of statute revisions," and to report its recommendations to the 1980 General Assembly.

The commission began its work at mid-year with an annual state appropriation of $100,000 and a staff of three. It also had the services of staff members from the Legislative Research Commission and from the Department for Local Government on a part-time basis. Organizationally, the commission divided itself into three task groups, basically paralleling the three focal points of the two previous study groups: municipal, county and intergovernmental issues.

The first priority of the commission was the reconsideration of the comprehensive municipal code that failed during the 1978 session. The panel endorsed the general concepts of the proposed comprehensive code calling for the grant of shared powers to cities and the unification of statutes covering such areas as municipal organization and fiscal management. However, the commission differed with its municipal predecessor about the format of its proposals. Rather than presenting a single comprehensive measure, the commission opted to present eleven separate proposals. This strategy, it was hoped, would help forestall the possibility of one segment of the proposed code endangering the passage of the others. The eleven bills covered such areas as home rule, city organization, general taxing powers

and an optimal sales tax, incorporation, boundaries and classification, civil services, and financial administration.

The commission also monitored the implementation of county modernization legislation enacted in 1976 and 1978. Of particular interest were proposals which dealt with the weaknesses or omissions which had been detected in these earlier statutes. In addition, the panel addressed the question of county jail and sheriff fees, which the earlier commission had been unable to resolve. The county task group also reviewed proposals dealing with special districts in Kentucky. A uniform special district bill that called for a common basis for such issues as the methods of creation and dissolution, composition of governing boards, and taxing and borrowing powers did not receive broadly based support. However, a measure concerning the fiscal accountability of the districts and authorities received at least tentative support.

A third task group focused on intergovernmental issues. Of particular interest to this panel were measures calling for greater flexibility in developing cooperative arrangements among local governments, the establishment of a clearer definition of city and county jurisdiction in the financing and provision of local services, and the implementation of procedures to assess the impact of state administrative and legislative actions on local governments. The group also considered the establishment of a permanent, ongoing mechanism that essentially could continue the work initiated by the temporary commission.

The Statute Revision Commission's report and recommendations were a major focus of attention during the 1980 General Assembly. On the positive side, substantial revision of Kentucky's laws governing local units of government was realized through the commission's work. For example, cities and counties have been granted broad local legislative authority under the "shared powers" concept, and all remaining laws governing cities have been simplified and unified. In addition, a total restructuring of county government that will enable county government to make a much more substantive and positive contribution to the solution of local and areawide problems has been authorized. And newly enacted fiscal reporting and management requirements for local governments will enhance the ability of the state to guide intergovernmental fiscal relations.

On the negative side, the commission failed to secure enactment of a comprehensive special districts act, primarily because of opposition mounted by library and special district interests. In addition, a commission proposal dealing with state mandates and calling for a fiscal note procedure was defeated. And finally, the commission could not reach a consensus on two major interjurisdictional problems: double taxation and annexation.

On balance, however, the commission's efforts, building upon the groundwork provided by its predecessor study groups, should be rated highly. Seventeen of its twenty-one recommendations were enacted by the General Assembly, thus creating a new statutory framework for local government in Kentucky. Additionally, the commissioner's work helped to expand awareness of the need to address intergovernmental issues in a more comprehensive and systematic manner.

During an interview on the potential of a Kenton Center, former Governor Julian Carroll observed the lack of continuity for dealing with systematic intergovernmental problems. The governor, limited to one four-year term, cannot carry forward initiatives begun during his or her term. Governor Carroll noted that the task force he created to consider intergovernmental problems reported late in his term, too late to fully implement its recommendations before a new governor with a different agenda took office. Many others interviewed in the course of this study emphasized the lack of policy continuity in Kentucky as a fundamental structural problem affecting many aspects of government, a weakness inhibiting responsiveness to emerging problems.

A permanent Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) should be a major component of a center for governmental and political studies to provide a forum for the discussion and the proposed resolution of intergovernmental problems. This Commission would bring together governmental officials and citizens to study and report on existing, necessary and desirable relationships among the various units of government.

During the past ten years, all states have dealt in some way with the growing complexity of intergovernmental issues. The state ACIR approach is growing in popularity. For almost twenty-five years, the United States Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) has served as the focal point for research and recommendations regarding the operation of the American federal system. It reports to the Congress, the President, and the states for action, but is not accountable to them. It is an independent body which derives its effectiveness from the relevance of its recommendations and its perspective as an objective monitor and evaluator of the intergovernmental system. The Commission is composed of a broadly representative group of national, state, and local officials, as well as private citizens. All major reports are reviewed and approved by the Commission and others before their release as recommendations. This process assures objectivity, care and thoroughness, and provides the information base and direction for legislation and administrative action.

Since 1974, the Commission has recommended that states create their own ACIRs as permanent, bipartisan forums to "probe, ponder and propose solutions to intergovernmental problems." Nineteen states now have state advisory committees or commissions, thirteen based on the ACIR model.

While there is considerable diversity among state ACIRs, they share five main functions:

1) As a forum for consultation by legislative and executive state and local officials.
2) As a clearinghouse for information on intergovernmental issues.
3) Research and publication.
4) Advocacy for Commission recommendations.
5) Providing technical assistance.

A few states, including Texas, which has one of the most comprehensive state programs, include specific training programs for government officials as one of the major responsibilities.

A recent evaluative review of state ACIRs concluded that neutrality, continuity, objectivity and credibility are the essential elements of an effective ACIR. On the other hand, lack of sufficient staff, representative membership, and leadership can substantially limit the effectiveness of a state ACIR. Emphasizing the commitment of state leaders and resources, the report notes that:

> The full fledged state ACIRs are beginning to emerge as effective intergovernmental forums because of several factors: program permanency and continuity, broad representation from all levels of government, the development of a track record of credibility and experience, and the opportunity to pursue a multiyear research, information and implementation program.

Location of a Kentucky ACIR in a new center for governmental and political studies would have significant advantages. The Center would provide permanency, continuity, and staff to implement the program. The Commission would also benefit from interaction with the other program components of the Center, both in formulation and implementation of recommendations. The Center could give the ACIR function visibility and an appropriate institutional context.

The Commission would have the following functions and duties:

1) Serve as a forum for the discussion and resolution of intergovernmental problems;
2) Research and investigate intergovernmental issues;
3) With the Legislative Research Commission, draft and disseminate legislative bills, constitutional amendments and model local ordinances related to its recommendation; and
4) Encourage and, where appropriate, coordinate studies relating to intergovernmental relations conducted by universities, state, local and federal agencies, and research and consulting organizations.

RECOMMENDATION

That a primary function of the Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies be the creation, staffing and support of a Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

State Strategic Issue Development

The function which sparked the most intense interest was issue development. "We need the equivalent of a Brookings Institution for Kentucky," said one. "Kentucky faces

critical issues during this decade which will determine its long-term future. We have no mechanism for examining the intermediate-term issues and in developing policy choices." Another observed, "Our policies have a life of two years. A new governor institutes his or her campaign platform in the first year, but always makes a major mid-term correction by the third. Within two years, a new governor is establishing yet another set of policies. We need greater continuity in order to overcome an obsession with immediate crisis situations. Until our governors can succeed themselves, we will not have planning as in other states. The term is too short. Why should they care what happens five years from now?"

Those interviewed for this study were asked: "What do your believe are the dominant issues for Kentucky in this decade?" Education, the economy and community services, in varying orders, were the answers given by all. No one was optimistic that any of these issues are currently being evaluated in a way which promises effective solutions for the future. Some took the cynical position that unless an individual governor happens to have a particular issue on his or her agenda, it will be neglected. One called the alienation of Kentucky citizens from politics and policy making the result of poor education regarding the importance of public choices for the future.

It was recognized by many that the geographical, social and economic fragmentation of Kentucky makes for a "balance" of interests, but does not serve well in developing an informed consensus on common public policy problems, both among elected officials and the general citizenry. The need for "communication" and "involvement" was stressed repeatedly. In short, those interviewed pointed to a "vacuum" in Kentucky's institutional structure which must be filled if the state is to effectively face its emerging problems. Many said that this is the most critical and exciting possible function for a new Center for Governmental and Political Studies.

An executive of a major Kentucky corporation said: "Strategic planning? We do it routinely. Our key executives throughout the corporation spent all last week engaged in strategic planning. They will return again next week to spend two days with the planning and forecasting staff modifying the plan." It was noted by another respondent that the recent historic educational reforms in Mississippi would not have happened had it not been for a series of information forums throughout the state which engaged more than 13,000 citizens in discussions on needs and solutions.

It was suggested that a Center should not attempt to be all things to all people, but to select one or two areas for in-depth examination and discussion. For example, education has been raised to a high level of visibility. There is keen competition for the right "solutions." Each sector of the public and the educational community views the "problem" from a specific, limited perspective. At times like this, a host of "quick fixes" surface and there is competition before the Legislature to advocate one solution or another to the exclusion of other actions of merit. Rarely is there a system-wide evaluation of problems or impact. The result is often a series of unrelated, short-term solutions which do not serve the student or the state well in the longer term.

Under the best of circumstances, the state should have had a mechanism which identified education as a serious emerging issue requiring sustained examination and evaluation of fundamental changes required to serve both students and the 1980's economy. The State Board of Education, the Council on Higher Education, ad hoc groups like the Pritchard Committee, members of the related legislative committees and others could have been brought together to seek consensus on an agenda for evaluation. From the private sector, business interests, education associations and interested citizens could have participated in an examination. Staff experts, university personnel and others (both from Kentucky and elsewhere) could have been brought together to pursue a research program which would define the status of the educational system, identify promising changes, evaluate system impacts and develop alternative courses of action. Through broadly based forums for both leaders and others, this information could have been refined and could have led to common agreement. The result—more informed policy-making for both the Legislature and administrative officials, a broad base of public consensus embracing both the "expert" and the layperson, and a more informed public, determined to assist educational changes at all levels.

Most public policies have only long-term payoffs. For example, the illustration above on educational policy changes would not reap full benefits until the year 2000, the year those entering kindergarten in 1983 would graduate from college. Most agree that "quick fixes" derived in the white heat of popular and media attention may not be entirely adequate to prepare an individual for his entry into the work force in the next century. A new Center for Governmental and Political Studies could help to increase the time and depth of policy development in Kentucky and assure widespread citizen understanding of the issues that affect them. A policy area such as education may be too important to leave to the "experts."

The economy of Kentucky is seen by many as in a long process of erosion. Coal, tobacco and manufacturing all have special liabilities. The dominant, long-term policy for economic development in Kentucky is industrial promotion. Many states throughout the Southeast have pursued this approach for the last fifty years, a time of rapid growth in manufacturing in America. Many states, however, are recognizing that there are limits to this approach, as a new world economy is taking shape. Future growth will require very different public policy approaches. In many states, new investments and systems in education are seen as critically necessary. New technology and information development are also considered necessary for future competition, not only among states, but around the world. Various enterprise development programs, expanded research, and the development of a state's human resources are considered essential for future growth. There is no focus in Kentucky at this time on considering these issues as they confront the state in this decade. Where will these problems be examined in a coherent way? What will influence policy decisions beyond the immediacy of election campaigns?

RECOMMENDATION

That a function of the Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies be the examination of emerging, strategic issues facing Kentucky in the intermediate-term future, and that this function be performed through research, public forums, education and information dissemination.

The National Dimension

A few of those interviewed pointed out that a new Center for Governmental and Political Studies should not ignore the national dimension. At one time, Kentucky was considered a national innovator in state policy. Over the years it has adopted many innovations tested in other states. Communication among other states on matters of policy and change and within the national research community is no longer a luxury, but a necessity. It occurs in a variety of ways, including participation in state public interest groups, such as the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Governors' Association, and related associations of state officials. It occurs among local public officials' associations, such as the National League of Cities, the National Association of County Officials, the American Public Works Association and many related organizations. It occurs through professional associations and academic disciplines. Foundations are a major contributor of new ideas, as well as funding. In a new "information age," access to ideas and research throughout the nation is as important for public management as it is for private corporations.

For more than a generation, Kentucky was the leading producer of public administration professionals, under the leadership of Dr. James W. Martin at the University of Kentucky. In 1969, Kentucky provided a headquarters site for the Council of State Governments, at a cost to the state of over $1.4 million. The state, however, has not taken full advantage of these extraordinary assets.

Several of those interviewed suggested that the Center have a "national board of advisors" with experts from around the country to "maintain high expectations of the Center's staff." Others noted the potential of collaborative research on state policy problems with CSG, NGA, NCSL, the Duke Center on the Governorship and various foundations. One suggested that through a Center, Kentucky could be a "laboratory" for all the states, somewhat like the urban observatory program of a few years ago. KET already produces many programs aired in other states on matters of common public interest. Cooperation between the Center and KET on informational and educational programs on public affairs could serve residents of not only Kentucky, but of other states as well.

While efforts such as these cannot be mandated, this function could be extremely important to the quality of a new Center's performance and to its funding. The national dimension could serve the state well in the sharing of ideas, the transfer of information, and in its reclaiming its position as an innovator in the American federal system.

RECOMMENDATION

That the enabling legislation for a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies recognize the possibilities for future program development relating to national collaborative research and information on state government policy and program development, foundation funding and demonstration programs, using Kentucky as a "laboratory" state.

CHAPTER III

GOVERNANCE

Testimony before the Committee has emphasized the need for a Center to bring together the many individuals, groups and institutions involved in Kentucky public affairs: academics and practitioners, elected officials and citizens, private sector executives and public administrators, students, scholars, experienced professionals and concerned citizens. According to an EKU spokesman, "In order to accomplish this goal the Center must be provided with an independent base of operation. The Center should be free of any single institution and would probably be most effective with a board of directors appointed especially for the Center operation. The Center should be a new operation and not placed within an existing organization."

While the EKU recommendation captured the imagination of the Committee and was supported by many others with an interest in the creation of a Center, there was great concern that an independent, freestanding operation would threaten existing institutions, particularly the universities. Therefore, an early purpose of this study was to test this recommendation with the principal administrators of a majority of the universities and with other agencies, organizations and individuals which have a direct interest in a Center as clients or service providers.

Additionally, because of the several recommended functions of a Center and because of the involvement of numerous service constituencies, other forms of program advisory committees, representation on an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, ad hoc strategic issues development task forces, a national board of overseers and other related approaches were examined.

An Independent Board of Governors

There is a nearly unanimous agreement that a new Center for governmental and political studies should be an independent, freestanding operation, in order to achieve objectivity and visibility and serve as a "neutral" place where ideas and opinions may be exchanged without institutional contraints. In addition, a Center must be in a position to coordinate a network of existing institutional, agency and organizational resources in the performance of its functions. (Additional discussion of the use of existing resources and the approach to networking may be found in Chapter IV, Operational Style).

Among university presidents, nearly everyone agreed that the Center should not be operationally attached to a university. "That would kill it quicker than anything else," said one. "Our administrators need the kind of training and service that a Center would provide in public affairs as much or more than anybody else," said another. "Our public

and community service activities must be more effectively coordinated," said a third. "The Center could provide that function far more effectively than we can by ourselves."

Non-university people repeatedly underscored the need for independent governance. Many, especially private sector individuals, emphasized the need for independence from political factions and single administrations of state government. They noted that private support would be dependent upon the achievement of objectivity.

Achieving "objectivity" and "independence" while maintaining "relevance" and "leadership" is always a delicate matter in the appointment of a board. Much is dependent upon the quality and vision of the individual board members themselves.

During this study, including review of the preliminary report, there has been more discussion about the possible composition of the Board of Governors than any other element of the Center. The following criteria are central to consideration of Board composition:

- The Board must be small enough to serve as an active governing board, setting policy, providing oversight, and securing staff and financial resources necessary to the Center's operation.
- Board members must include the leadership of the three branches of state government, the primary units of local government, and key education service providers, as well as citizen leadership.
- Terms of board membership must be long enough so that the Board can pursue a coherent program of development for the Center.

It should be emphasized that, in addition to the Board of Governors, the Center would have a variety of advisory boards including service providers, client organizations, citizens and state and local officials, as suggested in later sections of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Governors of the Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies be composed of seventeen individuals, as follows:

1) The Governor
2) The Speaker of the House
3) The President Pro Tem of the Senate
4) The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court
5) The Superintendent of Public Instruction
6) The Chairman of the Council on Higher Education
7) A representative of the Kentucky Municipal League, to serve a four-year term
8) A representative of the Kentucky Association of Counties, to serve a four-year term
9) A university president selected by the Council of University Presidents to serve a four-year term

10) Four citizens appointed by the Governor to serve staggered four-year terms
11) Three citizens appointed by the Board of Governors to serve staggered four-year terms
12) A member to be selected by the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Council of Area Development Districts to serve a four-year term.

Local and State Government Training

Development and delivery of effective training requires the active involvement and participation of both recipients and providers. It is clear that a variety of advisory committees will be required to determine a training agenda, to allocate resources to various university and organizational providers, and to develop materials and approaches suitable to needs. Mechanisms for determining needs and evaluation of results will require widespread participation in the Center's operation.

The most sensitive area of concern during review of the preliminary report was that expressed by some university providers of training and research, that the creation of a Center with staff and resources might supplant existing resources at the universities. Such a development would be contrary to the concept of the Center. A focus of coordination would enhance capacities and effectiveness of existing centers. More extensive discussion of this approach is provided in Chapter 4, under the section on networking and operational style. What is important here is the need to actively involve users and providers in determining programs and in allocating responsibility for implementation. Appropriate advisory committees for selecting priorities, developing programs, coordinating personnel and institutional resources, implementing programs and evaluating results should be a total system duty.

State agencies which already are both providers and recipients of training services, such as the Department for Local Government, should be actively involved in program development and followup. Area Development Districts, long active providers of training and technical assistance, should play an important role. University representatives from a variety of applicable disciplines should participate in the planning and implementation of programs, most effectively allocating their resources and manpower.

Thus, among those local government organizations which seek to enhance training efforts, at least the following should be included in advisory structures:

Kentucky Association of Counties
Kentucky Municipal League
Kentucky School Boards Association
Kentucky Association of School Administrators
Area Development Districts
Department for Local Government
Universities
Others: Library Boards, etc.

Private sector organizations with interest in public affairs training and information, such as the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce and the Kentucky Farm Bureau, should be involved in advisory roles as well.

It would be the obligation of the Board of Governors and the staff of the Center to create, coordinate and maintain appropriate, active advisory committees of users and providers of training services for program development and implementation.

Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

The Kentucky ACIR, like the Board of Governors, should be an ongoing commission requiring a designated membership representative of both state and local government. With two exceptions, the following twenty-one member composition for a Kentucky ACIR follows recommendations of the USACIR. The exceptions are the inclusion of appointees by the judicial system and from education.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be composed of twenty-one individuals, to serve staggered four-year terms, as follows:

1) Two elected county officials nominated by the Kentucky Association of Counties and appointed by the Governor.
2) Two elected city officials nominated by the Kentucky Municipal League and appointed by the Governor.
3) Two elected school officials nominated by the Kentucky School Boards Association and appointed by the Governor.
4) Two members of the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Council of Area Development Districts appointed by the Governor.
5) Two state executive branch officials appointed by the Governor.
6) Three private citizens appointed by the Governor.
7) Three state senators appointed by the President Pro Tem of the Senate.
8) Three state representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
9) Two judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Strategic Issues Development

Selection of central public policy issues for research and development will require background reconnaissance by staff. The choice of issues should be made by the Board of Governors. Only one or two major issues should be under development at one time. Special advisory and ad hoc committees should be selected for each issue on the basis of interest, knowledge and potential contribution.

In the course of the performing of local and state training and examining of issues relevant to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, central issues requiring development should emerge and be recommended for special attention. Involvement of appropriate official and citizen interest around a strategic issue would follow the general pattern discussed above in "Local and State Government Training." The general rule should be inclusiveness and the broad dissemination of information.

National Advisory Board

Should it be desirable to have a National Advisory Board, appointments should be made by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Director of the Center. Members should be selected on the basis of their nationally recognized achievement or scholarship in the field of public affairs and their potential contributions to the quality of the Center's operations. It is recommended that the Executive Director of the Council of State Governments be a member of this board, in order to enhance cooperation between the Center and CSG.

CHAPTER IV

OPERATIONAL STYLE

The primary mission of the Center should be to identify needs, and see that they are met in those areas where resources do not exist. This function requires sophisticated leadership and staff capable of organizing resources and finding ways to implement programs through cooperation with many organizations and institutions. On the one hand, the Center should provide a focus or "lightning rod" in Kentucky for training and related functions; on the other, it must deliver services through a decentralized system of resources already in existence and build upon those resources as needed.

Networking

Networking is a term used in modern management and communication to mean the linking together of many elements into a cohesive system. It is a means of supporting and enhancing the effectiveness of the program elements. An extensive discussion of networking as an operational principle of the Center is not necessary here. However, because of the importance of university resources in public affairs activities, the ensuing discussion illustrates the necessity for close working relationships among the universities and the Center. Appendix B, "Institutional Training and Service Resources," identifies some of the many program elements currently in existence in Kentucky, some of which could be served by the Center.

Through networking the Center can provide an opportunity to implement the recommendation of the Prichard Committee Report to the Kentucky Council on Higher Education, "In Pursuit of Excellence," that "Special incentives should be provided in the budgetary process to encourage faculty involvement in innovative and extensive public service activities, particularly those that focus on the emerging needs of the Commonwealth and of local communities."

This 1981 report summarizes the critical issues affecting higher education in the 1980's, as identified by thirty Kentuckians representing a wide spectrum of interests throughout the Commonwealth. In addition to the major attention devoted to teaching, the report highlights the importance of research and public service. Research and public service, the report notes, are the means used by universities and colleges to provide "knowledge and technical expertise directly to citizens, business and industry, and government." The report emphasizes the need for citizens and government to make informed decisions. Universities need to play an important role in generating and disseminating the relevant knowledge and expertise to help government operate more effectively and efficiently. The report stresses the need for creative ways to apply the talents of university personnel to the emerging issues and needs of the Commonwealth and its communities through

innovative programs, enhanced cooperation and specialization and increased state funding.

Calling for bold new ways for universities and government to work together in research and community service, the Prichard Committee concludes that:

> First, cooperation between and among our universities and all levels of government and private business and industry needs to be increased. Kentucky's universities should examine innovative ways to share resources, projects and problem solving with each other and with business and government.
>
> Second, the past relationships between state government and universities is marked only by haphazard and sporadic cooperation. This committee believes that the economic development of Kentucky could be enhanced by a more systematic organization of university/state government relationships and cooperation and by increased public awareness of the expertise available on the state's campuses.
>
> Third, there is a need for colleges and universities as collections of talent to directly apply that talent to the needs of their communities and the larger society. Kentucky and the nation will confront and address substantial social and economic issues in the years ahead. Through their public service roles, universities and colleges have contributed to many areas, such as elementary and secondary education, agricultural and industrial production, health care delivery, energy development, and understanding the environment.
>
> Faculty should be encouraged to develop new ways of serving society through application of their expertise toward solving problems of government, schools, business and industry.

Thus, while not using the term "networking," the report does underscore the need for cooperative mechanisms to link university research and public service programs.

In order to attain maximum benefits from the research and service available through Kentucky's universities, the Prichard Committee recommends the establishment of a special research and development committee. It would be appropriate for the Kenton Center to work with such a committee to coordinate public service research and development by devising strategies for:

> Assessing the emerging needs for research in the Commonwealth and bringing those needs to the attention of universities and their faculties and other research personnel.
>
> Developing and maintaining an inventory of the existing research at Kentucky's universities and disseminating this inventory.
>
> Assisting in the efforts by Kentucky's universities to attract financial support for research projects from federal and other national sources.
>
> Encouraging financial support from private business and industry for research related to the economic development of Kentucky.

Disseminating to the general public information on research and public service activities at the state's academic institutions.

Increasing cooperation and collaboration in research activities between private industry and universities (through a special panel representing private business and industry).

The Prichard report highlights the importance of maintaining faculty vitality. The Kenton Center would provide an important opportunity for faculty exchange among colleges and universities, state and local government, and business and industry, which the report sees as necessary to stimulate faculty vitality and creativity.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Kenton Center utilize the networking principle in implementing its program, seeking to support and enhance existing programs. The Kenton Center would not replace or duplicate ongoing research, training and public service activities. The Kenton Center should work in cooperation with the Council on Higher Education in the creation and support of a special research and development committee for university research and public service coordination.

Other Linkages

During the course of interviews for this study, a number of other possible resource linkages were suggested. These could offer unique combinations for programing, research and information dissemination for Kentucky. Except for KET, they are beyond the direct control of the state and would require special commitments to the joint program of a Center from the private sector or separate public agencies.

Kentucky Educational Television. KET was created by the state more than twenty years ago and has become one of the foremost systems in the country. It has outgrown its facilities and is in need of expanding its technical facilities to keep up with the "state of the art." It is actively engaged in public service and information programing, in cooperation with higher education institutions. For example, the College on TV project, begun in 1978, has enrolled 9,100 Kentuckians in 52 telecourses at 32 of the state's participating institutions. The Telecommunications Consortium has become one of the most effective statewide mechanisms in the nation for serving the educational needs of adult learners. Preliminary conversations with KET leadership suggest that there are unique potentials in the development of a combined facility and program with a new Center. Such cooperation could enhance both operations on many points of common interest, assure the application of contemporary communication technology, and provide for less costly operations.

Shakertown. By charter, Shakertown must serve educational purposes. The restored facilities and the unique site are outstanding for small conferences of several days' length devoted to discussion and the development of strategic issues. With a special com-

mitment of private resources, the Center could develop high-level conferences and leadership seminars to be held at Shakertown on critical issues of government and public affairs. Special publications could result from these conferences, similar to those once produced at the Center for Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara.

Council on State Governments. The Council on State Governments, headquartered on Spindletop Farm, will celebrate its fifteenth anniversary in Lexington this fall. Despite having suffered from organizational fragmentation during the past decade, it continues as the central focus of information about the American states. With an initial Kentucky investment of $1.4 million in a building, CSG moved to Lexington from Chicago in 1969. In an economic development sense, the state has never taken advantage of the potentials of its information, expertise or visibility. Neither has it sought to link together in a meaningful way the research about state government which CSG has conducted over the years. General Arthur Lloyd, the individual most responsible for bringing CSG to Kentucky, saw great potential for the clustering of other related organizations in proximity to CSG. That remains an unrealized potential. With a new CSG executive director currently being selected, it would be timely to explore the future potential linkages between CSG and a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies.

Core Staff

Appropriate staffing should be determined by the Executive Director of the Center and the Board of Governors, guided by program agenda and the ability to network existing resources. However, a number of those interviewed strongly recommended the development of a highly qualified center staff. Clearly, a balance between internal and external resources will be required.

The personnel structure of the Center should be highly flexible, to assure the right skills in the right place at the right time. It should permit bringing in outside expertise when needed, provide opportunities for faculty on leave from the universities, permit students access to the learning resources of the Center through internships and provide practitioners the opportunity to teach. At the same time, it must maintain a competent core staff to assure effective program development and continuity.

Finance

Considerable assistance was provided by the Council on Higher Education and the Legislative Research Commission during this study to establish reasonable comparative budget figures for training and public service. No entirely accurate current budget figures are available, but the dimension of current state investment in these functions has been identified.

Appendix B identifies major university and state programs directed toward public affairs education and training. They do not represent a comprehensive inventory of university or state government training activities, nor reflect specialized public policy research, nor include all training undertaken by local government associations. Yet Appendix B programs alone represented a public investment of $7,500,000 in 1981-82.

A conservative estimate of university public service expenditures is that about five percent of total budget, or $30,000,000, is directed to this function. Other estimates of the use of faculty time and other resources for public service might double this estimate. It is difficult to isolate an accurate number because of the scheduling of faculty and the allocation of support and overhead.

It has been mentioned several times earlier in this report that the Center should serve to focus existing resources for a more effective state response to training needs. Since estimates indicate that the state now invests more than $30,000,000 in this and related functions, it is not difficult to justify significant expenditures in a Center designed to provide coordination and focus to this ongoing, large-scale public enterprise.

Two other comparisions are appropriate. Those most interested in local government training look to the Georgia Institute of Government and the North Carolina Institute of Government as models for Kentucky. In 1981-82, the Georgia Institute of Government had a budget of $1,716,205, fifty-five percent state funded. In the same year, North Carolina's Institute of Government had a budget of just under $3,000,000, of which $2,000,000 was from state appropriations.

While three-fourths of all training programs of the Georgia Institute are conducted in the participant's home community or in a nearby regional center, the remainder are held at the conference center of the University of Georgia. It has offices on the campus, at a rural development center, and in the state capitol. The North Carolina Institute of Government is housed in a building financed by a grant from the Joseph Palmer Knapp Foundation and a matching appropriation by the North Carolina General Assembly. Designed to make the Institute a self-contained unit, this building comprises offices, a library, classrooms, conference rooms, special service facilities and a residence hall that accommodates 88 people. The Institute's legislative reporting materials are prepared by Institute faculty members from a base in the State Legislative Building in Raleigh as well as from the campus in Chapel Hill.

It is premature to develop a budget for the prospective Center until its functions and mode of operation are determined. However, given the scale of current activity and the experience of similar centers specializing in local government training, general estimates of funding can be made.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Center receive full initial funding in order to develop programs and demonstrate effectiveness at the earliest possible time. Public funding should be supplemented with an endowment raised from private sector contributions.

CHAPTER V

LOCATION

A conference and office facility is viewed by many as essential to the concept of a Center. While many center functions would be performed in a decentralized manner throughout the state, the value of a specific locale for conferences and inter-personal exchange was noted by many and implied by most during the interviews. This concept follows the North Carolina and Georgia models.

The history of every state's decisions in locating state facilities, such as prisons, capitals, and universities, would be voluminous. At one time, communities chose to fight for prisons rather than universities, because they meant more economically and were easier to control. Today, everyone wants a university and few willingly take a prison. Alternative locations for a center are discussed below to provide a basis for a decision by the appropriate authority. A summary of criteria for location mentioned by those interviewed follows:

1) Symbolic independence from any individual university.
2) Symbolic independence from political factionalism or influence, especially for maximum citizen involvement, participation, and financial support.
3) Central location for greatest possible accessibility by car.
4) Location near one of Kentucky's three major airports.
5) Availability of hotels, motels and restaurants.
6) Accessibility to state agencies.
7) Accessibility to research resources.

Universities

Many institutes of government have been located on university campuses and have both benefitted and suffered from the special environment this provides. The results have been mixed and the opinion of most individuals (university and non-university alike) involved in this study is that a university location is not appropriate for this Center at this time.

Chapter III, "Governance," discusses the consensus among those interviewed on an independent Board of Governors. While various universities would welcome the Center's location on their campuses, most believe that it should be an independent, freestanding facility, so that it is not the captive of any individual institution. This independent stature, it is believed, is essential to assure the full cooperation of all universities and to assure the independent identity of the Center itself.

Kentucky State University has offered the use of an aging dormitory which could be renovated for about $1,500,000. The University of Kentucky would prefer that the Center be located at UK, in proximity to other resources of the Lexington campus, but has

pledged its cooperation with an independent facility and program. The University of Louisville has indicated an interest in having the Center located near its new College of Urban and Public Affairs, but strongly urged that it be located on an independent site.

The State Capital

Those most closely affiliated with state government in Frankfort strongly recommended that the Center be located in the state capital. Appendix D contains a letter from the Mayor of Frankfort taking this position. One individual suggested that the Center be built in conjunction with a new legislative building in Frankfort.

There is no question that the functions of a Center would bear an important relationship to the roles of various state agencies, and the executive, legislative, and judicial officials of the state. Any site should facilitate interchange with all these entities, while at the same time fostering the involvement of universities, local officials, private organizations and citizens.

Several individuals pointed out that if one argues that the Center should be independent of university campuses, the same logic should apply to Frankfort and state agencies. Just as there is a "Potomac fever," some think there might be a "Kentucky River fever." One long-time state official—with an eye toward a possible private endowment for the Center—indicated that private gifts would not likely be forthcoming if it were located in Frankfort.

Results of the study indicate that Frankfort has substantial but not overwhelming support as a site for the Center, and meets some, but not all, location criteria.

The Spindletop Site

Another possible site for consideration is Spindletop. The Center is to be neither another state agency nor another university activity, although it requires access to both agencies and universities. Spindletop provides an attractive location, meeting all the criteria stated above.

Currently on the site are the Council of State Governments, the Kentucky Department of Energy, the Institute of Mines and Minerals Research and the headquarters of several Kentucky associations. Temporary office facilities could be made available in existing space for start-up operations of the Center and for local government associations which choose to locate with the Center.

Location of a new Center on the site could provide not only an attractive physical location, but the opportunity for a "synergism" with the Council of State Governments on common problems of information development and public information. Should KET be in a position to expand its facilities on a new site, this location would be highly suitable and

provide an excellent opportunity for sharing program and facilities. The combination would be unique in the country.

Critics point out that the Spindletop site is too closely identified with the University of Kentucky, and the legacy of Spindletop Research, and not closely enough with state agencies.

Combination

Based on the analysis in this report, the Center should embody a multilocation strategy. The Center should be ubiquitous in the Commonwealth. Decentralized service delivery through universities, area development districts, community colleges and other entities should be the rule. Primary identity must be through program, service and performance.

All of these identities are relevant and should serve existing institutions in useful ways. As in the Georgia and North Carolina models, perhaps it is possible for Kentucky to have the Center identified in multiple locations. For example, a primary site could be chosen for a conference and office facility, while maintaining a continuing presence in Frankfort and many other places throughout the Commonwealth simultaneously. This is the essence of what many see as the educational and leadership objectives of a Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies.

RECOMMENDATION

That the newly appointed Board of Governors be charged with selecting a suitable location for the Kenton Center conference and office facility, using the following criteria:

1) Symbolic independence from any individual university.
2) Symbolic independence from political factionalism or influence, especially for maximum citizen involvement, participation, and financial support.
3) Central location for greatest possible accessibility by car.
4) Location near one of the three major airports in Kentucky.
5) Availability of hotels, motels and restaurants.
6) Accessibility to state agencies.
7) Accessibility to research resources.

APPENDIX A

HOUSE RESOLUTION 52

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

REGULAR SESSION 1982

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 52

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1982

The following bill was reported to the Senate from the House and ordered to be printed.

A JOINT RESOLUTION directing the Legislative Research Commission to create a select committee to study the establishment of the William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies.

WHEREAS, William Gordon Kenton, Speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives 1976-81 was from earliest childhood a student of government and politics; and

WHEREAS, Speaker Kenton fully realized the art of politics, properly applied, improved government and thereby substantially and postively benefited the lives of our citizens; and

WHEREAS, Speaker Kenton a dedicated public servant, whose vision and comprehension encompassed the functioning and role of government at all levels, recognized the need for technical, academic, research and advisory assistance to government and its officials at all levels; and

WHEREAS, it was Speaker Kenton's strong belief that trained, informed and properly assisted public officials are not only desirable but necessary to our continuing governmental processes;

NOW, THEREFORE,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. That the Legislative Research Commission establish a select committee to study the creation of a William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies.

Section 2. Membership of the committee shall comprise the following: two members of the House of Representatives, recommended by the Speaker; two members of the Senate, recommended by the President Pro Tem; one member recommended by the Governor; one member recommended by the Council on Higher Education; and three additional members appointed by the Legislative Research Commission.

Section 3. The committee shall determine the ways and means of the establishment of a William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies, including but not limited to, those to be served, the scope of its activities, location and financing, and report its findings and recommendations to the Legislative Research Commission not later than July 1, 1983.

Section 4. Staff services to be utilized by the committee are estimated to cost $12,000. These staff services shall be provided from the regular commission budget and are subject to the limitations and other research responsibilities of the commission.

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

AND

PUBLIC SERVICE RESOURCES

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING AND PUBLIC SERVICE RESOURCES

The value of training and public service is widely recognized in Kentucky and a number of exemplary programs have been created. There are numerous training and public service programs such as those within professional schools (Engineering, Law, etc.) and Cooperative Extension which make valuable contributions to the state but do not fall directly within the scope of this study. The following is a brief description of the training and service programs which most directly relate to programmatic concerns of the Kenton Center.

KENTUCKY TRAINING AND EDUCATION NETWORK

The Kentucky Training and Education Network (KNET) was formed in 1980 to provide professional development and management training programs for local government officials. For two and a half years a matching Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) grant helped fund the network through which the Kentucky Department of Local Government set policy, the Martin Center for Public Administration coordinated program activities, the Area Development Districts monitored the needs assessment and state university and college personnel taught the courses. From 1980 to 1982 over 100 workshop sessions were held for 1708 local government officials and employees. The comprehensive Local Government Needs Assessment which provides a valuable guide to designing programs to meet the perceived needs of local officials has been one of the most significant contributions of this program.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF LOCAL OFFICIALS

State associations use a number of means such as workshops, conferences and newsletters to help to inform their members and to improve the quality of service delivered at the local level. The Kentucky Association of Counties, for example, has sponsored county administrative code training sessions. The Kentucky Municipal League provides a school for newly elected city officials which emphasizes group decision-making and public policy formulation. Sessions are scheduled on the basic skills needed to perform the duties and responsibilities of various local offices.

In order to provide a state-wide program of professional skills development for practicing school administrators, the Kentucky Association of School Administrators is in the process of establishing the Kentucky Academy for School Executives. The Academy will provide a variety of conferences, workshops, and contracted services to upgrade skills and disseminate up-to-date information to school administrators.

GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES CENTER

The Governmental Services Center is a free standing agency of the executive branch of state government, located on the campus of Kentucky State University, which provides training services to state agencies. Management Awareness, Stress Management, Supervisory Training, Computer Programming, Secretarial Training and Human Relations Workshops are examples of the extensive on-going training program which focuses on technical training and management skills. Administration of state employee education incentives and benefits programs is

also a responsibility of the Governmental Services Center. The Services Center is the largest governmental training program in the state, employing 20 full-time employees with a budget of $980,000 annually.

JAMES W. MARTIN GRADUATE CENTER FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The James W. Martin Graduate Center for Public Administration is responsible for interdisciplinary public administration graduate education, research, technology dissemination and government training at the University of Kentucky. With its own resources the University has established and nurtured a rigorous Master of Public Administration Program. The MPA program in the Martin Center, which has a good track record in attracting and placing high quality graduate students, has grown steadily since its founding in 1976. The Center has recently developed a proposal to offer a Doctorate of Public Administration in cooperation with Kentucky State University. The interdisciplinary character of the Martin Center allows it to offer several areas of concentration including public finance and budgeting, health administration, general government, higher education, social work-human resources, and urban/regional development.

One of the most readily available data retrieval systems for business and public sector agencies in the state is available through the Martin Center's NASA/UK/TAP program operated on contract for NASA. This public service program provides technical information to governments and businesses. The Bureau of Policy Research within the Martin Center initiates and disseminates interdisciplinary research on public policy issues. The Martin Center also has a program of continuing professional development and training for the public sector and the Center staff has played a role in the Kentucky Training and Education Network's professional development and management training programs for local government officials.

THE APPALACHIAN CENTER - UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Since its creation in 1977, the Appalachian Center has provided a wide range of services and programs to the university community and public and private agencies in the Appalachian region. The Center's program is divided into three primary functions. First, research such as coal research, community studies, manpower estimates, public education financing and government program evaluation, is carried out for various government agencies and foundations. Section, curriculum development is directed at creating an understanding within the university community of the Appalachian region, encouraging the establishment of Appalachian Studies programs and courses. Third, public service activities including poetry workshops, publication of Sojourner, a national conference on the status of Appalachian Studies, workshops, seminars and concerts are an important component of the Center.

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The School of Public Affairs, Kentucky State University, includes the academic unit that offers a Masters of Public Affairs and the Institute of Public Affairs that offers training, applied research and technical assistance programs. Institute activities covering a broad spectrum range from a policy Conference on Health Care Cost Containment to a training session on career development to technical assistance for the Kentucky Commission on Women.

COLLEGE OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The University of Louisville recently formed the innovative College of Urban and Public Affairs to promote creativity and flexibility in approaches to community affairs and urban services. The multi-disciplinary teaching, research, and public service program hopes to foster a public/private partnership for more effective utilization of resources within the urban environment. The new college includes the Kent School of Social Work, the School of Justice Administration, the Systems Science Institute, the Urban Studies Center and the Institute of Community Development.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

The Institute of Government at Eastern Kentucky University is the research and public service are of the Political Science Department. The Institute is designed to provide research on, and consulting services to local and regional governments. For the past six years the Institute, in cooperation with the Kentucky City Managers Association and the Kentucky Municipal Finance Officers Association, has sponsored a state-wide practitioner oriented conference on the "Management of Local Government." Managing Local Government, the Institute's technical bulletin, grew out of the conference and is used to disseminate ideas and information about problems and concerns of local and regional government.

GEOGRAPHICAL STUDIES AND RESEARCH CENTER

The Geographical Studies and Research Center at Eastern Kentucky University has an extensive program of geographic and planning technical assistance and public service activities.

GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES INSTITUTE

The Governmental Services Institute is being established at Northern Kentucky University to enhance the capacity of local government in northern Kentucky through a program of research and evaluation, education and training, consultation, and the development of suitable publications and manuals.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The Appalachian Development Center is the major arm of Morehead State University responsible for regional services in four areas: business development, community services, regional research and Appalachian studies. Projects of the Appalachian Development Center range from operating a Displaced Homemaker Program to conducting studies on taxing policies in eastern Kentucky.

INSTITUTE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Institute for Rural Development at Murray State Unviersity was created to serve as a focal point for applied research, consultation, information retrieval, continuing education, and public service activities that will enhance the economic and societal development of west Kentucky. The Center maintains a data resource base for economic analysis and rural development, develops a systematic procedure for analyzing alternative strategies for economic development, and makes a comprehensive analysis of rural development and rural needs for use by the Governor and the General Assembly.

APPENDIX C

STUDY INTERVIEWS

APPENDIX C

STUDY INTERVIEWS

Special thanks are due those many individuals who have contributed to this study. In all cases, they contributed willingly of their time, ideas, experience and hopes for the Commonwealth. For the interviewer, it was a pleasure to hear the offers of support and encouragement in the shaping and implementation of this concept. Among those interviewed are:

Dr. A. D. Albright
President, Northern Kentucky University

Allan F. Alsip
Chairman, Select Committee

Frank Bailey
Executive Director, Council of State Governments

Robert Bell
Ashland Oil Company

Dr. Jack A. Brizius
Duke Center for the Governorship

Dr. Raymond Burse
President, Kentucky State University

Dr. Terry Busson
Chairman, Department of Political Science, Eastern Kentucky University

The Honorable Julian Carroll
Former Governor

Richard Cole
Kentucky Department of Local Government

Dr. Gary Cox
Council on Higher Education

Fred Creasey
Executive Director, Kentucky Association of County Officials

Charles W. Curry
Attorney, Lexington

Dr. J. Price Foster
Acting Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs, University of Louisville

Edwin L. Griffin, Jr.
Executive Director, Kentucky Municipal League

David Grissom
President, Citizens Fidelity, Louisville

Vic Hellard, Jr.
Director, Legislative Research Commission

Dr. Malcolm Jewell
Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky

Dr. David Keller
Executive Director, Kentucky School Boards Association

Edward Kelley
National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C.

Representative Carolyn Kenton
Lexington

Representative Jim LeMaster
Lexington

Representative Henry Clay List
Lexington

General Arthur Lloyd
Lexington

Edward Logsdon
Executive Director, Kentucky County Judge/Executives' Association

Representative Terry Mann
Covington

Leonard Marshall
Secretary, Kentucky Public Protection and Regulation Cabinet

Bruce McDowell
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D. C.

William Nallia
Executive Director, Kentucky School Administrators Association

Dr. Morris Norfleet
President, Morehead State University

Dr. J. C. Powell
President, Eastern Kentucky University

Senator Joe Prather
Vine Grove

Wilburn J. Pratt
Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction

O. Leonard Press
Executive Director, Kentucky Educational Television

Edward F. Prichard, Jr.
Attorney, Versailles

John Purcell
National School Boards Association, Washington, D. C.

H. Clyde Reeves
Springworth Farm

Dr. Wimberly Royster
Dean, Graduate School, University of Kentucky

Dr. Edgar Sagan
Dean, College of Education, University of Kentucky

Peggy Satterly
Director of Training, Kentucky Department of Local Government

Dr. Robert Sexton
Staff Director, Prichard Committee

Dr. Otis Singletary
President, University of Kentucky

Al Smith
Publisher, London

Jay Spurrier
Kentucky Utilities

The Honorable Robert Stevens
Chief Justice, Kentucky Supreme Court

Dr. Donald Swain
President, University of Louisville

Phillip Thompson
Executive Director, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce

Harry Lee Waterfield, Sr.
President, Investors Heritage Life Insurance

Senator Joe Wright
Harned

Wilson W. Wyatt, St.
Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, Louisville

APPENDIX D

RESOLUTION

EDITORIAL

COMMENT LETTERS

APPENDIX D
RESOLUTION, EDITORIAL, LETTERS

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS: THE KENTUCKY GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON APRIL 2, 1982 ADOPTED HOUSE RESOLUTION 52, AND

WHEREAS: THIS RESOLUTION CALLS FOR A STUDY OF THE CREATION OF A WILLIAM G. KENTON CENTER FOR GOVERNMENTAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES, AND,

WHEREAS: THE STUDY IS TO INCLUDE A LOCATION, AND

WHEREAS: THE CAPITAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY IS THE CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE ENTIRE STATE,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

THE FRANKFORT BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB

ENDORSES THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WILLIAM G. KENTON CENTER FOR GOVERNMENTAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES AS A MEANS OF PROVIDING BETTER INFORMED LEADERS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, AND

URGES THE CONSIDERATION OF KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY AS THE LOCATION FOR SUCH A CENTER INASMUCHAS THIS UNIVERSITY IS LOCATED AT THE SEAT OF STATE GOVERNMENT, IS UNDERGOING A DIRECTIONAL CHANGE TO RESPOND TO OTHER GOVERNMENTAL NEEDS AND HAS ALREADY ASSUMED TRAINING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR STATE GOVERNMENT.

DONE THIS NINETH DAY OF NOVEMBER, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-TWO.

Marilyn Eaton
MARILYN EATON, PRESIDENT

Darlene Goodrich

COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE TO BE SENT TO: THE LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE, VIC HELLARD, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION, THE COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION, THE PRESIDENT OF KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY, REP. C. M. "HANK" HANCOCK AND SEN. FRED BRADLEY.

FRANKFORT STATE JOURNAL

EDITORIAL

SEPTEMBER 22, 1983

Only place for Kenton Center is Frankfort

We quite frankly were surprised to learn this week that there apparently is some question as to where the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs will be located. There is only one location for the center, which is being designed as an independent institution for the training of local and state government officials and research into public affairs issues. That location, of course, is the seat of state government, the capital city of the commonwealth, Frankfort.

Obviously, we have a special interest in taking that position, but well beyond any particular hometown bias we might have, the purpose of the Kenton Center is such that it *must* be located in Frankfort if it is to fulfill seriously its stated purpose. Any academic or research institution which is closely aligned with government affairs on the local and state level by necessity will have almost daily contact with state agencies and officials and those agencies and officials likewise will be closely tied to the work of the center. To locate the Kenton Center, then, in Lexington at the Spindletop research facility — as one consultant has suggested — or anywhere else would merely erect a geographical barrier between state government and the center which would succeed only in isolating one from the work taking place at the other. Indeed, there once was a research institution located at Spindletop supported largely by state tax dollars that ultimately collapsed and one of the primary reasons for that collapse was its isolation, both in theory and in practice, from the everyday workings of state government in Frankfort.

Kentucky State University, of course, which offers graduate study programs now in public administration for state officials and employees, is the most logical local site for the center. KSU has offered the independent center space and we have no doubt that offer will be accepted as the most economical and sensible course of action.

While we are surprised that no firm decision has been made to locate the Kenton Center here, we are pleased that a special committee established to study creation of the center is focusing on setting down guidelines for its purpose and operation rather than haggling over specific sites. As we pointed out, there is no question where the center should be located and the committee's time is better spent — as it has been — working out the specifics of the Kenton Center's program.

The experience in other states — most notably North Carolina — has been that such institutions as the Kenton Center can show measurable improvement in the quality of service rendered by elected officials through educational and research programs. Certainly, such programs are badly needed in this state, and the success of the center would be the finest memorial to the late Speaker of the House of Representatives William Kenton, whose public career could stand as a model for those future public officials who are served by the Kenton Center.

RESPONSES FROM:

Edwin L. Griffin, Jr.
Executive Director
Kentucky Municipal League

O. Leonard Press
Executive Director
Network Center

Otis A. Singletary
President
University of Kentucky

Charles D. Whitlock
Executive Assistant
Eastern Kentucky University

Raymond Barber
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Department of Education

H. Clyde Reeves
Springworth Farm

David L. Keller
Executive Director
Kentucky School Boards Association

Betty M. Daniels
President
Kentucky Library Trustees Association

Clyde Middleton
State Senator
24th District of Kentucky

John R. Sower
Mayor
City of Frankfort

Bruce D. McDowell
Senior Analyst
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Paul D. Blanchard, Ph.D.
President, Kentucky Political Science Association
Eastern Kentucky University

Richard D. Cole
Commissioner
Office of the Governor
Department of Local Government

Donald C. Swain
President
University of Louisville

S. Kenneth Howard
Executive Director
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Frank H. Bailey
Executive Director
The Council of State Governments

Harry M. Snyder
Executive Director
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Council on Higher Education

Sam Dibble
Chairman
Kentucky Council of Area Development Districts

Donald W. Zacharias
President
Western Kentucky University

James M. Everett
County Judge/Executive
Fulton County

Gene Stinchcomb
City Administrator
City of Berea

Evelyn Fleming
Louisville, Kentucky

ROBERT F. STEPHENS
CHIEF JUSTICE

SUPREME COURT OF KENTUCKY

ROOM 231, STATE CAPITOL, FRANKFORT 40601

(502) 564-6753

October 5, 1983

Mr. Allen Alsip, Chairman
The Select Committee to Study Creation of
the William G. Kenton Center for
Governmental and Political Studies
c/o Speaker's Office
Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Allen:

After reading the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee to Study Creation of the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs, I commend Mr. Milt Patton on his thorough research and well reasoned analysis of ways to improve the political and governmental process in the Commonwealth. Having served in various capacities as an elected official for over fourteen years, I heartily endorse the efforts of the Legislature to establish a well-coordinated training program for local government officials.

The only suggestion I would offer relates to the process for appointment of the Board of Governors. As an alternative I would propose that the Board of Governors of the Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs be appointed by the Legislature. This would insure a broader range of interest, experience and background in the composition of the Board.

I congratulate you on your efforts and offer my support and assistance to you in this laudatory undertaking. With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

Bob

Robert F. Stephens
Chief Justice

RFS:11

KENTUCKY MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
CITIES UNITED FOR KENTUCKY'S FUTURE

Post Office Box 22736
Lexington, Kentucky
40622
(606) 257-3285

Mayor J. R. Miller, President
Mayor William D. Gorman, 1st Vice-President
Mayor Herbert Caldwell, 2nd Vice-President
Edwin L. Griffin, Jr., Executive Director

August 23, 1983

Mr. Allen Alsip, Chairman
The Select Committee to Study Creation
of the William G. Kenton Center
for Governmental and Political Studies
% Speaker's Office
Capital Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Mr. Alsip:

The incredibly complex task of considering the public service and public policy needs of Kentucky has been admirably accomplished in the development of plans for the William Kenton Center of Government and Political Affairs. The Select Committee is to be commended for undertaking such a far reaching perspective of government's needs - so that government may better render services to the citizens of the Commonwealth.

I have reviewed the preliminary report prepared by Milt Patton and would like to offer several comments with respect to details of the report. The researcher has synthesized well the observations and recommendations of members of the Select Committee and of those representing interested parties in this venture. That alone was indeed a challenge.

The report reflects a balanced view of those who would seek the services of the Center and the expectations of those who may financially support its operation. The issue of "Training" obviously ranks highest on our priority and is appropriately discussed as to the impact that well trained and prepared public officials will have on the future of Kentucky. The discussion of "Core Staff" notes the laudable goal of appropriate staffing that is critical to both the long and short term credibility and the successfulness of programs, services, research and ultimately the Center itself. The conclusions drawn regarding location reflects a practical approach that geography may play an advantageous role in complimenting the efficient operation of the Center while not allowing location to overshadow the primary mission of the Center.

The Kentucky Municipal League pledges its support to the goal of establishing a coordinated, quality training program and a forum for public policy discussion and debate. These goals are specifically identified and approved as a part of the

1984 KML legislative package. We look forward to working with you in realizing the fruition of these goals and accordingly the bettering of Kentucky.

Truly, what the Kenton Center is all about is developing the future of government in Kentucky.

Sincerely,

Edwin L. Griffin, Jr.,
Executive Director

ELG/blc

600 Cooper Drive
Lexington
Kentucky 40502
(606) 233-3000

August 19, 1983

Dr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200, 861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Dr. Patton:

Your preliminary report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affair seems to me to be a superbly researched, reasoned and articulated assessment of viable options.

In respect to your references to the part KET might play in such a development, I am struck both by your quick and comprehensive grasp of KET's resources and activities and with its potential in such a mix.

Many of the activities to which the Kenton Center would address its efforts are activities to which we also address our efforts...for example, training and information dissemination. And the target audiences the Center would serve are target audiences KET has and/or would like to serve...namely, government officials at all levels. What KET offers, a statewide channel of communication, is a synergistic complement to what the Kenton Center would offer, namely substantive training and data.

KET has offered itself, and has been used effectively, for in-service training by the Kentucky State Bar Association, the Kentucky Nursing Association, Kentucky Realtors, and most recently by the Kentucky Department of Personnel. The Department of Personnel needed to orient and instruct its 5,000 supervisors in recently promulgated policies and in good management practices in general. It did this by teleconference using KET to reach those supervisors grouped at television sets in public buildings around the state. More than 3,000 were reached in two consecutive Mondays in July of 1983. Personnel Commissioner Dee Maynard professed delight with the effectiveness and cost benefits of this method.

Preliminary estimates indicated that something more than $100,000 was saved over line conferencing. And KET has held discussions with the Kentucky Municipal League's Executive Director Ed Griffin about possible statewide training for municipal officials by KET.

In short and in so many ways, a common site and shared facilities between the proposed Kenton Center and KET seem at the least symbiotic and at best will add up to more than the sum of their parts. Some of the spaces that KET needs would serve equally, it seems to me, the functions proposed for the Kenton Center; e.g., seminar rooms equipped for television and audio origination and recording, a small theater equally equipped, studios designed for telephone and television, teletext and data initiation facilities and space for related personnel and equipment.

May I presume to suggest that timing could be very important in enhancing the prospect of launching such a project: it is not inconceivable that something might be accomplished before the end of this administration if an architectural program for a building to encompass these joint and several functions could be executed very quickly.

I would like to compliment you again on a thorough and lucid research and survey report.

Cordially,

O. Leonard Press
Executive Director

OLP/rpn

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0032

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

August 26, 1983

Dr. H. Milton Patton
Principal Partner
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Dr. Patton:

This is a response to your invitation to review the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs and provide an expression of general support or objections and suggestions.

We would have preferred the Center be created at the University of Kentucky. The University already has established programs for a technology dissemination system for governments and business, government training and research activities in public policy and an interdisciplinary public administration graduate program.

If it is not the wish of Select Committee to place the Center at the University, we can support the Kenton Center as an independent free standing institute whose primary function is the training of local officials, working through the existing networks of training service providers. Further, the location of the Center on the Spindletop site could facilitate collaboration between the Center and the University's public administration and public policy programs.

In regard to other recommendations in the report, we see a weakness in the governance of the Center in that there are no institutional representatives on the committees, yet one of the primary functions is networking, presumably utilizing institutional resources.

Since the primary function of the Center is to be government and public affairs with emphasis on local government, it is unclear the role the Committee perceives for the Center in research and development in the sense of devising strategies and implementation in the broad areas suggested by the Pritchard

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

Committee. These activities impact state agencies, business and institutions of higher learning in many ways. A more precisely defined set of activities, consistent with the primary goals and missions of the Center, is needed.

Let me say again, we support the concept of the Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. We would prefer it be created at the University of Kentucky, but otherwise be pleased to see it located at Spindletop.

If I, or any of my staff at the University, can be of assistance in the creation of the Center, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

O. A. Singletary

Otis A. Singletary
President

kh

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

RICHMOND, KENTUCKY 40475

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

August 24, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
Principal Partner
State Research Associates
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

Thank you for the copy of your preliminary report on the Kenton Center and your request for our reactions prior to development of the final report. President Powell is absent at a professional meeting and has asked that I submit to you our reactions which are based on a review of your preliminary report by our staff.

On the whole, we are in agreement with the substance of the report and the recommendations contained therein. The majority of the recommendations seem to reflect our concern for a broad based, comprehensive and independent Center to meet the future needs of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The only real point of concern is in the size of the Board of Governors. Our staff feels that the Board should be enlarged to represent more areas of interest and to provide opportunity for a broader input in policy recommendations and innovative ideas.

An alternative could be that the Board of Governors of the Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs be composed of twenty-nine individuals as follows:

1. Three (3) members of the Kentucky House of Representatives.
2. Three (3) members of the Kentucky Senate.
3. Three (3) members appointed by the Governor.
4. Chief Justice of the Kentucky Supreme Court or Designee.
5. Two (2) Representatives of municipal government.
6. Two (2) Representativees of county government.
7. Representative of Kentucky School Boards Association.
8. Chairman of the Council on Higher Education or Designee.

9. Two (2) University Presidents, selected by the CHE Conference of Presidents, for two-year terms.

10. Eleven (11) private citizens approved by the Governor for five-year staggered terms.

Eastern Kentucky University supports the establishment of the William Kenton Center and stands ready to assist in the creation and development of the Center. If we at Eastern can provide you with additional information and support on the Center, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely,

Charles D. Whitlock
Executive Assistant

ncb

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FRANKFORT, KY. 40601

RAYMOND BARBER
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

August 25, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
961 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

I appreciate your furnishing me a copy of the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs.

I have reviewed the report and was impressed with the great potential the center has in educating and preparing state and local leaders to face emerging issues. If properly particiated in by all agencies, the center would be very worthwhile in improving the quality of government in Kentucky.

Sincerely,

Raymond Barber

Raymond Barber, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

H. CLYDE REEVES
Springworth Farm, Rt. 3, Frankfort, KY 40601

Aug 22

Dear Milton

I have read with much interest your excellent report relating to a Kenton Center and unhesitatingly recommend its approval as probably the most forward looking step that could be taken to foster the economic, political, and social welfare of Kentucky.

The incorporation of the ACIR and strategic planning concepts will set the Kenton Center apart in a way that should attract public appropriations and private gifts. Thanks for sending me a copy.

Sincerely,
Clyde

KSBA KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

ROUTE 3, BOX 96A • ENGLEWOOD OFFICE PARK • FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601 • (502) 695-4630
TOLL FREE-1-800-372-2962

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
President
Robert V. Evans
Ft. Thomas
Vice President
Mary Cohron
Bowling Green
Past President
Charles J. Brauch
Bardstown
Directors-at-Large
Joe Walters
Jenkins
Leonard Elrod
McCracken County
Harold L. Steele
Fayette County
Luther Mason
Scott County
Joe Daugherty
Jessamine County
Dr. Warren Proudfoot
Rowan County
Fannie Louise Maddux
Christian County
Jimmy Weathers
Todd County
Ronald Gunning
Dayton
Dr. Jack Sanders
Trigg County
Sherry Jelsma
Jefferson County
Eddie Sipes
Meade County
Regional Chairmen
Tot Waldon
Ballard County
Vickie Stovall
Daviess County
Becky Goad
Edmonson County
James Aldridge
Hardin County
John W. Smith
Henry County
Arles Hale
Russell County
Gene Allen
East Bernstadt
Ray Back
Letcher County
Robert L. Hyatt
Anderson County
Charles J. Stander
Ludlow
Ronnie Graves
Carter County
Bene Smith
Martin County

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
David L. Keller
DIRECTOR
GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
Larry D. Powers
DIRECTOR
MEMBER SERVICES
L. Kendrick Scott
DIRECTOR
INSURANCE PROGRAMS
Janis P. Scott
ATTORNEY
J. Stephen Kirby
POLICY CONSULTANT
Rhonda L. Eversole
OFFICE MANAGER
Jan Frazee

August 19, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton, Principal Partner
State Research Associates
Suite 200, 816 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Milton:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. I think your report shows a great deal of study and groundwork for which I commend you.

I have only one specific suggestion, at this time, for a change in the report. On page 19, the recommended membership of a Kentucky Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is listed. In paragraph #1, you list "two school officials". I would strongly urge that this be changed to reflect similar language used earlier in the paragraph to read "two elected school officials". Obviously, this would mean school board members, but I think this is in keeping with the rationale you have used for specifying elected county and city officials. I believe this would strengthen such a commission and would certainly make it much more attractive from our organization's standpoint.

I would be happy to discuss this with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

David Keller

David L. Keller
Executive Director

Kentucky Library Trustees Association

145 Tower Place
Fort Thomas, KY 41075

August 31, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, KY 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

Thank you for the opportunity to read the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. I am sorry to be late in responding as I was out of town when the report came.

As I read the FINDINGS on page 8 referring to local government officials being inadequately informed for their roles, responsibilities and leadership opportunities, it seemed that this very well describes the activities our Trustees Association has been implementing.

The American Library Trustee Association established a Workshop in Library Leadership demonstration in Minneapolis in April, 1982, which was opened to observers from other states. Attending this with Ellen Hellard, Field Services Director for the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, I found it to be an excellent two-day session covering roles and responsibilities of trustees, policy making, public relations, stretching the dollar and similar topics. Materials were provided for replecating the workshop and our Kentucky Association held its first ALTA-WILL workshop in April, 1983, for 100 Trustees. Another is being planned for April, 1984.

As there are 625 appointed public library trustees, serving for a term of 4 years each, there are many persons who need and want to attend such sessions. If there is a way to include such public servants through the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs, it would surely be beneficial to the individuals who are appointed to serve in their counties and have the responsibility of managing this important educational facility for all ages and interests. While not facing the exact problems as elected city or county officials, appointed library trustees do need training in legal and financial matters as soon as they have been appointed to their terms of service. The expense involved in traveling to the KLA meetings (Louisville, Owensboro, or Ft. Mitchell) where the workshops are held in conjunction with state library meetings become a very expensive item for a small library budget. Therefore, if the Kenton Center staff were to make possible a traveling team of experts to address the necessary topics and present the material in a region or ADD district, a number of city, county, and library leaders might find it possible to attend.

The report covers so many areas of need for leadership development, I would like to suggest that public library trustees be included in such opportunities.

Sincerely,

Betty M. Daniels

Betty M. Daniels
President KLTA

BMD:bll

State Senator - 24th District of Kentucky

CLYDE MIDDLETON
P. O. BOX 546
COVINGTON, KENTUCKY 41012

MEMBER OF:
Legislative Research Commission
Committees on:
Education
Health and Welfare
Highways & Traffic Safety
Judiciary - Criminal

August 22, 1983

State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Attn: Mr. H. Milton Patton

Dear Mr. Patton:

I received today the report dated August 10 regarding the Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. I spoke to Carolyn Kenton while at the National Conference of State Legislatures meeting in San Antonio about the makeup of the Legislative Committee on this subject. I feel that the absence of any Republican representation gives the outward appearence of a partisan activity to this committee. I am sure that this is not intended to be the case, but I feel that it is a serious oversight.

About 29% of Kentucky's registered voters are Republicans. Furthermore, national and statewide elections regularly produce Republican votes well above this figure. Yet, when one looks at the list of persons interviewed, as shown on pages 4-6 of your report, there is not one identifiable Republican among them. There are, however, numerous identifiable party Democrat, both within and outside of the Legislature.

I feel that a provision to insure Republican party representation in this process should be included in any effort to create an advisory committee on Inter Govermental Relations. Thank you for your invitation to comment.

Very truly yours,

Clyde Middleton

CM:ecd
cc: Rep. Carolyn Kenton

CITY OF FRANKFORT *Capital of Kentucky*

John R. Sower, *Mayor*

August 29, 1983

Mr. Allen F. Alsip, Chairman
Select Committee
William G. Kenton Center

Dear Chairman Alsip:

I, and many others in Frankfort, have followed with interest the Kenton Center Development proposal since it was authorized by the General Assembly. We tended to think of it in terms of further enhancing the position and program of Kentucky State University.

While reading the report prepared by State Research Associates, I was struck by the acknowledged bias of the writer. While admitting to a bias of my own, I am compelled to take issue with the findings in the report. The criteria recited have the appearance of being created to support the conclusion. They are themselves trite and irrelevant except in a very broad general scope.

Spindletop is a fine facility but does not present any overwhelming features that constitute conclusive uniqueness. There are vastly more governmental offices, technical, educational and professional offices and installations in Frankfort than at the site mentioned.

The report measures the Kenton Center as a statwide program, but suggests a de-centralized headquarters. Frankfort offers every facility in abundance to embellish the Kenton Center and it would more easily obviate its service to the entire state at the center of state government.

I sincerely urge the Committee to continue its analysis of Frankfort as a possible location with the belief that more favorable incentives exist here than at any other location.

Sincerely,

John R. Sower

John R. Sower
Mayor

JRS/dss

315 West Second Street, P.O. Box 697, Frankfort, Kentucky 40602 (502) 875-8532

ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20575

August 26, 1983

Mr. H. Milt Patton
State Research Asssociates
861 Corporate Drive
Suite 200
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Milt:

Thanks very much for sending me a copy of your preliminary report concerning the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs.

You have done a very thorough analysis and presented it well.

I certainly hope that it will be favorably received in Kentucky and bring some results in the very near future.

Sincerely,

Bruce

Bruce D. McDowell
Senior Analyst

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Richmond, Kentucky 40475-0959

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
Department of Political Science
317 Wallace Building

Institute of Government
606-622-5931

August 2, 1983

Mr. Milton Patton
State Reseach Associates
Lexington, KY

Dear Mr. Patton:

I understand that your consulting firm is investigating various alternatives in the establishment of the William G. Kenton Center for Governmental and Political Studies. As president of the Kentucky Political Science Association, I believe I can speak for most of the political scientists in the commonwealth in offering our hearty endorsement of such a center and our willingness to assist both in its development and in its programs after it is established.

Political science professors across Kentucky are, of course, committed to improving the political and governmental process in our state and we believe that the study, research, and training that would be conducted at the center would make for more effective public policy decisions as well as more knowledgable public officials. As professionals with substantial training and expertise in governmental matters, we would look forward to a cooperative and mutually productive relationship with the Center and its staff.

The Kentucky Political Science Association and its members would be pleased to work with you and the Select Committee as you move toward the establishment of the center. Please contact me if you have any specific ideas about how we can assist you.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Blanchard

Paul D. Blanchard, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
President, Kentucky Political Science Association

PB/lg

JOHN Y. BROWN, JR.
GOVERNOR

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601

RICHARD D. COLE
COMMISSIONER

September 2, 1983

Mr. Alan Alsip, Chairman
The Select Committee to Study
Creation of William G. Kenton Center
for Governmental and Political Studies
Office of the Speaker
Room 307 - Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Alan:

I have recently reviewed the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. As Commissioner of the Department of Local Government, I want to share my concerns and suggestions relative to some of the recommendations and their effect on Kentucky's delivery of local government training.

The Department of Local Government, through its daily contact with county and city officials is ideally suited to assist in assessing the training needs and priorities of Kentucky's local governments. In recognition of the importance of effective local government training delivery, I offer these suggestions on behalf of the officials and administrators of our local government constituent organizations.

I agree with the recommendation that local government officials training be a primary function of the proposed Kenton Center. It is essential that current training provision and future program development be coordinated effectively to ensure quality control. I am concerned, however, that the training provided by the proposed Kenton Center will be developed and presented in a manner which will be too sophisticated and academic for local government target groups. From our past experience, local government training is most effective when delivered in a basic, practical manner. It is my concern whether a center staffed to perform the sophisticated research functions of an ACIR or Brookings Institution type, would be able to develop and deliver basic local government training which will be received and accepted by city and county officials.

In regard to the recommended composition of the Center governing board, I am concerned about the number of local government official representatives. With primary emphasis on local government training for the Center, and the role of local governments in the ACIR and other recommended primary functions, a fifteen member governing board should reflect at least two county and two municipal government representatives.

CAPITAL PLAZA TOWER

Another concern I have, is the lack of direct representation from the Department of Local Government and the Area Development Districts on the governing board. The report recommends participation from DLG and the ADDs in advisory committees for local training. However, the role of these committees appears vague and indirect. This Department and the Area Development Districts are currently the primary local government training providers and are aware of training needs for Kentucky's cities, counties and special districts. It is my recommendation that this expertise be recognized and utilized to complement the role of the Kenton Center in local training provision.

If a coordinated approach to local government training is to occur, I have very much concern about Lexington, Kentucky being proposed for the Kenton Center location. As you are aware, virtually all state government agencies provide technical and administrative training to municipal and county officials. It would be essential and necessary for officials in these agencies to have a direct and consistent dialogue with Kenton Center training officials. Therefore, it would seem more reasonable for the core Kenton Center staff to be located in the Frankfort area.

The Department of Local Government is supportive of your mission regarding the Kenton Center and we will welcome the opportunity to assist you in any way we can to develop and implement the final recommendation of your Committee.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Cole
Commissioner

cc: Committee Members
Milt Patton

Office of the President

University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40292
(502) 588-5417

UNIVERSITY of LOUISVILLE

September 6, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

This letter concerns the Preliminary Report for the Kenton Center which I understand was submitted to the Select Committee at the August meeting. I appreciate your diligent effort in focusing the Committee's work and providing a well-thought-out and innovative proposal which allows the concerned parties to respond to substantive suggestions.

As you know, the University of Louisville did not receive copies of the proposal until August 19, and consequently a shortage of time made it difficult for those involved in this project to read and discuss the report's major provisions with the relevant parties. However, Dean J. Price Foster and Dr. Gary W. Sykes kept me informed regarding the responses from various members of the University community. At my suggestion, a group of high-level administrators and faculty met and considered the Report and made recommendations which we feel will strengthen the proposed Kenton Center legislation as well as contribute to the long term success of an effort on behalf of the Commonwealth.

Our recommendations are not intended as criticisms of your efforts, but are directed at specific concerns about the Report. Such exchanges nurture the likelihood of extensive support in the uncertain pathways through the committee process and in the legislature. Please allow me to outline our reactions and suggest

some changes for consideration in the final version to be submitted to the Select Committee at its September 7th meeting.

Major concerns:

1. The state universities and research agencies as components in the "network" system should have more direct representation on the proposed Board of Governors for the Center. Their cooperation is essential if the Center is to achieve the goals outlined, but more importantly, more direct representation would insure that administrative practices and policies adopted by the Center would reflect the information and expertise available in the various universities and agencies.

   RECOMMENDATION The proposed Board of Governors should include the President (or designee) from the "linkage" institutions comprising the network as specified in appendix of the Proposal. These institutions include the following from Appendix I (this is not meant to be exclusive of others): Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, Northern Kentucky University, University of Kentucky, and the University of Louisville.

2. The proposed location of the Center at Spindletop is not likely to contribute to the "symbolic" image of independence necessary to achieve the goals outlined by the specified functions for the Kenton Center. It is commonly perceived that the Spindletop facility is an appendage of the University of Kentucky even though it is not considered part of the campus. It is our feeling that an independent Frankfort location will not only achieve the symbolic independence as mentioned in the sixth criteria on page 32, but will have many practical advantages for the Center's operation. A Frankfort location should reduce travel costs because of its central location, especially the interaction with state agencies inherent in the training and research functions.

RECOMMENDATION Revise Section V with a view toward a more independent site for the proposed Center to enhance its symbolic independence. An independent location in Frankfort meets all the criteria outlined on page 32. In addition, since Frankfort is the state capitol and this proposed Center is state-wide in scope, and since the proposed agency is dedicated to the memory of someone whose public career was spent in that city, it is difficult to imagine any location other than Frankfort for such a "center for government and public affairs."

3. We strongly suggest that more specific language in the preamble in Section IV (p.27) would enhance the Center's mission by providing a clear mandate with delineated parameters. Such changes will allow for an innovative Center and at the same time insure that the "networking concept" will be maintained in practice. We also feel that any successful developing network must rely on existing programs and tap their strengths in order to avoid expensive duplication and unnecessary competition among state institutions for scarce research dollars. The Kenton Center's purpose, as we mentioned in our earlier letter of June 30th in support of the proposed Center's concept, should be to coordinate and enhance the capacity of the state in the areas of public service training and research through a cooperative arrangement.

RECOMMENDATION That the preamble on page 27 in the Section called "Operational Style" be revised to include the following:

OPERATIONAL STYLE

The central operational premise of the Center should be to serve in a role which is complementary to existing resources in the state. The Center's primary purpose should be to serve as a "lightning rod" for securing research, training and service funds on the one hand, and on the other as a "clearing house" for information about the research, training and service resources available in the state.

In this way the Center's basic responsibilities would be to serve as a "broker" for attracting funds to be used in the various state agencies and universities which have research, training and service capabilities. It would also serve as a central repository of information regarding the activities and capabilities of related projects and organizations state-wide.

A second premise is that the Center will conduct limited in-house research only in accordance with its role in the matrix of services already available in the state. That is, the Center should be in a position to conduct short term, issue-oriented research which requires organizational "neutrality." For example, position papers and certain types of studies for state agencies or commissions in which neutral (real or perceived) positions must be guaranteed would fall within the mandate of the Center. Therefore, the Center will not be in a position of competing with existing research/training or service programs in RFP's from state or national resources and will seek to implement these projects through existing programs in accordance with their assigned scope of responsibility.

Through careful design, the State of Kentucky can position itself to have a statewide "system" of universities, agencies and the Kenton Center which will be complementary rather than unnecessarily competitive. This will maximize our opportunity for attracting funds and our capability for policy development at all governmental levels through effective access and utilization of available information and resources.

The Center should have a limited, but critically important role in government and public affairs in Kentucky. Such a need can be performed only by a center neutrally positioned in the state and must not be

compromised by any association with political, economic or organizational interests.

Please review our ideas and recommendations as outlined above for consideration as part of the final version to be presented to the Committee in September. Dr. Sykes will be available for further discussions should the need arise. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Donald C. Swain

Donald C. Swain
President

DCS/dls

2935

ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20575

August 31, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
861 Corporate Drive (Suite 200)
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Milt:

It is a real pleasure for me to express enthusiastic official and personal support for the proposed Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. The U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has long supported creating comparable organizations within the states to promote better coordination and understanding among the many government entities a state comprises. Having an ACIR sustained by an organization such as the proposed Kenton Center is an extraordinarily good idea. Bon voyage!

On a personal note, having spent many professional years training public officials, I am confident that one can hardly overestimate the positive thrust a Kenton Center could give to this much-needed work. Kentucky has many resources that can be used more productively in this field, and the new Center would give tremendous impetus and stimulus to the entire training effort.

The Center should be extremely workable under the structure you have proposed. It balances needed independence with broad representation very well. The key from here will be the extent of financial and political support. Those vital ingredients must come initially from the persons to whom this proposal is being submitted and later from the performance of the Center itself.

The Legislature is to be commended for thinking such far-sighted terms, and you are to be congratulated for bringing so many good ideas together under the rubric of the Kenton Center. The educational television possibilities are particularly intriguing.

Congratulations on a fine proposal and good luck getting these excellent ideas implemented. We at ACIR stand ready to help in any way we can.

Sincerely yours,

Ken

S. Kenneth Howard
Executive Director

SKH/ef

The Council of State Governments

September 1, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

Dear Milt:

I appreciate the opportunity to present my ideas on the establishment of a Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. A center which provides training of local officials, promotes intergovernmental relations within Kentucky, examines important issues facing the state, and conducts research on state programs is an ambitious, yet very worthwhile concept.

Since its arrival in Lexington in 1969, the Council of State Governments has conducted research and provided information and technical service benefitting Kentucky state officials. However, as your report notes, the potential for collaborative research between CSG and Kentucky state government and other nearby institutions has not been fully realized. The Kenton Center could provide this linkage. Opportunities for cooperative work would be further enhanced if the center were located adjacent to the Council, as recommended.

While I cannot speak for the members of the Council's Governing Board, I am reasonably certain each of them would support the concept of a Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. The Council would be pleased to participate in future discussions on the Kenton Center. Contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank

Frank H. Bailey
Executive Director

FHB:esa

P. O. BOX 11910, IRON WORKS PIKE, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40578 - TELEPHONE (606) 252-2291

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION
FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601

August 31, 1983

Dear Milt:

The preliminary report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs contains a reference on two occasions to public service expenditures at the state universities being about 10 percent of their budgets. That figure struck me as being high, and I asked the Council finance staff to take a closer look at the public service category. Based on their review, I find that the public service appropriation as a percent of the total university appropriation in the current executive budget is about 5.5 percent and that the public service expenditure as a percent of total statewide expenditure for higher education is about 7 percent.

It is also important to note that the public service category includes many activities on a university campus other than service to state and local governments. As you complete your final report, I urge you to be cautious about references to the public service appropriations and expenditures on our campuses. It would be a tragedy for someone to read the report and infer that the higher education expenditures labeled public service go primarily to support state and local governments. Such a misconception would not be in the best interest of the committee or the institutions.

I look forward to reviewing your final report, particularly as it addresses financing of the Kenton Center.

Sincerely,

Harry M. Snyder
Executive Director

Mr. H. Milton Patton
Principle Partner
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Kentucky 40503

HMS:plb
cc: Kenton Center Study Committee Members
University Presidents
Gary S. Cox

KENTUCKY COUNCIL OF AREA DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Chairman
Sam B. Dabble, Jr.
P. O. Box 396
Elizabethtown, KY 42701
(502) 769-5041

Lincoln Trail ADD
702 College Street Road
Elizabethtown, KY 42701
(502) 769-2393

September 2, 1983

Allan F. Alsip, Chairman
Select Committee, Kenton Center
Office of the Speaker
State Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Allan,

I have recently read with interest and appreciation, the Preliminary Report To The Select Committee For The William G. Kenton Center For Government and Public Affairs, which I understand your select committee to have commissioned. Although neither review nor comment has been requested by either Mr. Patton or yourself, I hope you will allow me to share some concerns I have, and perhaps you will take into consideration a suggestion or two that I would like to make. I encourage you to accept my comments in the constructive spirit that they are intended.

First, let me concur with several of the contentions on which the report is predicated. The provision of training for local elected and appointed officials in the Commonwealth is in need of better coordination and quality control. There exists a clear and present need to provide a monument of kind to the memory of William Kenton. A Kentucky Advisory Commission On Intergovernmental Relations properly constituted and adequately funded could perform meaningful reviews of state and local government systems and concepts. Kentucky could indeed benefit from a "think-tank--Brookings-type" institution as suggested in the report. And, perhaps considerable benefits could accrue to locating the proposed center at the Spindletop site.

My concerns then, are not so much related to the espoused ends being pursued as they are with the exclusion of potentially significant contributions to the study process as it related to local government capacity building. More specifically, it seems ironic, based on the understanding that training of local government officials is a "cornerstone" on which the proposed center is to be built, that the Area Development Districts and the Kentucky Council of ADDs have been so conspicuously absent from the fact finding process. This seems particularly problemmatic when it is recognized that Area Development Districts and then locally based program structures provide a viable, if not the most viable, vehicles through which the intended training can be disseminated.

First Vice Chairman
Dexter H. Ge
1841 Owl Creek Lane
Anchorage, KY 40223
502 245 0214
502 245 4054
KIPDA

Second Vice Chairman
Paul H. Salyer
Judge Executive
Magoffin County
P. O. Box 430
Salyersville, KY 41465
(606) 349-2313
Big Sandy ADD

Secretary
Billy M. Shuffett
Judge Executive
Green County Courthouse
Greensburg, KY 42743
(502) 932-4024
Lake Cumberland ADD

Treasurer
Jennifer Jones
P. O. Box 362
Evarsville, KY 40977
(606) 248-2792
(606) 337-6171
Cumberland Valley ADD

Past Chairman
James H. Fallin
Judge Executive
Hancock Co. Courthouse
Hawesville, KY 42348
(502) 927-8137
Green River ADD

With constructive criticism as the desired end, allow me to challenge what I believe to be a weak starting assumption. It has been inferred, if not argued in the report, that local government training designed through the center's structures and processes, and delivered through the center in conjunction with the existing network of training service providers, will make a significant difference as contrasted with the present system. If one reflects on what can be gleaned from the North Carolina, Mississippi and Georgia "experiences" noted in the study report, perhaps there is room for marginal optimism. Nevertheless, let us make sure we understand the environment in which this venture is to be launched.

Local elected officials, as is well known, are now and hopefully always will be democratically elected citizen legislators and in certain instances, elected administrators. The learning curve exacts its costs to the system up front and electorial attrition and burnout contribute mightily in the end. Hence, turnover constantly chips away at progress made by existing institutions such as the university centers, the Area Development Districts, and the Department of Local Government.

Local elected officials are for the most part, part-time operatives. By far in large, and respectably so, their physical and psychic energies are prioritized as follows, in descending order: job or business, family and church, elective office, civic and recreational activities, rest and regeneration, and then perhaps, training of the sort presently under discussion. It is also worth noting with notable exception, that not all elected officials feel the need for training--some perceive emergence from electoral process as sufficient credentialing. In sum, as any experienced teacher will affirm, it's mighty hard to teach if the students don't come to class.

Many local government officials are uncomfortable in a training and technical assistance environment which they perceive to be "academic" in nature and orientation. This recognition may bring into question the validity of an organizational structure which seeks to deliver products ranging from the very basic and practical to the very sophisticated, such as would be expected from a "Brookings" staff. Some might reasonably question whether or not it is reasonable to expect a center staffed adequately to perform sophisticated research functions of the Brookings/ ACIR type, to also design and deliver basic local government training and to do it in a manner in which it will be received by the target groups.

A brief look at staffing philosophy and patterns at the ADD and DLG level may be instructive. The ADDs, along with DLG, KML and others have been in the business of delivering training and technical assistance to local governments for many years. Aided by the likes of Paul Combs and others in our university system, some enlightenment has been gained. Clearly, the success of any program initiative which seeks to build local government policy and administrative capacity, will be highly dependent on the presence of locally based, well trained but down-to-earth staff such as those which predominate the ADD staff structures. Training workshops, seminars, and other such ventures which do not meet the tests for practicality, conciseness, and participant comfort will be repeated to an empty house. A great deal of experience based

perception on this subject is vested in the Executive Directors and staff of the Commonwealth's fifteen Area Development Districts. This significant resource should be tapped to its fullest. Enthusiasm for the grand and exciting should not overshadow the need for adequate analysis and reality checking--if in fact, a major function of the center is to be capacity building at the local government level.

I am also concerned about the study recommendation as to the center's Board structure. I have three points here. First, the number of positions to be appointed by the Governor seems to be excessive and perhaps defeating to the notion of an "independent" Board and "free standing" institution. A Governor of any political persuasion can be expected to fill these positions with persons of his or her own political stripe. Again, it seems short sighted that representatives of the Area Development Districts and the Council of ADDs have not been included. Finally, and perhaps most important, the number of local elected officials should be increased on the Board. Parenthetically, it should be noted that specific mention of the ADDs has not been made regarding the advisory structure for local training (P.25).

Finally, I would like to summarize and make several specific suggestions. It concerns me greatly that the study process appears to have failed to sample the very significant body of knowledge vested within the Area Development Districts and their local government based Boards have been so conspicuously absent from the fact finding process.

A centrally situated free standing institution charged with development and coordination of local training may be helpful. However, centralization and sophistication has its point of diminishing return as does most things. The democratic selection process, hopefully, will not change that much in the future. Hence, we will continue to elect local legislators and administrators most of which will have limited background and time to apply to their new roles. Many elected officials are intimidated by academic institutions and suspicious of persons with "lofty" credentials. A center environment where ACIR and Brookings notions are merged with the very practical and down-to-earth need to design and attract local officials to training activities may prove to be self defeating.

Governing Board and advisory structures suggested in the report lack for local participation. My suggestion is that the Board structure be adjusted to include at least three elected county and three elected city officials along with the Chairman of the Kentucky Council of ADDs and the Chairman of the ADD Directors Association. It is also suggested that the report recognize the importance of the ADDs and the ADD structures to the purposes in mind by specifically including ADD representatives in the advisory structures. Serious consideration should be given to reducing the number of appointments subject to gubernatorial discretion.

Perhaps an alternative perspective is needed if the several worthwhile objectives delineated in the report are to be adequately addressed. Given the several problems which appear to exist with the proposed Kenton Center structure, it may be useful to consider "trading out" local government training and addressing that need in a different manner, and "trading in" state training. Doing so would seem to add rationality to the structures

proposed in the study, to include the governing Board structure with the suggested gubernatorial discretion. Given what has been discussed to this point, perhaps the local government training need could be better addressed through an enhancement of the present delivery system to include improved coordination and greater emphasis on the regional universities as satelites. I will leave discussion of this notion however, for another day and time.

I greatly appreciate your willingness to indulge my ramblings. The issues in question are important to the future of the Commonwealth and its people. I hope you will call on the Kentucky Council of ADDs whenever we can be of assistance.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Sam Dibble

Sam Dibble, Chairman
Kentucky Council of ADDs

SD/cc

cc: Kenton Center Committee Members

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

Office of the President

September 14, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, KY 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

Thank you for sending the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs and requesting our review of the document. I am sorry that we did not have an opportunity for earlier participation in this activity, but Western Kentucky University has great interest in the proposed Center and wishes to provide all possible assistance to the project.

Dr. Joe Uveges, a faculty member at Western, is a specialist in public administration, and I have asked him to review the Preliminary Report. His comments are enclosed.

Again, I appreciate your invitation for our comments and look forward to hearing further developments. Please let me know if you find other areas in which we may provide assistance.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Zacharias
President

DWZ:ewe

Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Donald Zacharias, President
Western Kentucky University

FROM: Dr. Joe Uveges

SUBJECT: Reaction to the Proposal: the William Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs

Date: August 29, 1983

I am aware of the arguments made for the creation of the William Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs and find them quite compelling. From the list of persons who contributed to the development of this proposal it is evident that such a plan has widespread support among public sector and private sector leaders alike. Moreover, the desire to provide for coordination and the elimination of fragmentation in public service education and development programs is very consistent with trends already being supported in the Higher Education Council's deliberations.

Nevertheless, several notes of caution are merited. The proposed Center is directed toward fully utilizing the existing resources for public service research and development. In addition, the Center is to direct and support innovations in programs aimed at meeting the future needs of the state. The proposal clearly recognizes the existence of many centers of activity (and power) throughout the state which provide public service programs. The proposal also indicates a willingness to assume that the preexisting program centers will accept the coordinating and developmental role given to the Center. To be successful, therefore, the Center must on the one hand provide state-wide leadership and coordination for these programs while on the other hand it must do so in a manner which will permit widespread support of its activities by the participating program units. This may well be a

more difficult task than assumed given the thrust to providing expertise and assistance to local governmental officials, especially where preexisting programs have already established territorial rights.

The call for the creation of a Kentucky Advisory Commission for Intergovernmental Relations (KACIR) is timely and necessary. As the report suggests, the tasks suggested for the KACIR are typical of other such commissions. A potential problem may be seen, however, if the relationships between the Center and the KACIR are not clearly spelled out. A check of the proposed membership for the KACIR shows that the basis for that membership will be from the ranks of "officials" from a variety of governmental units. Those officials represent already functioning power centers and may be desirous of having the Center's emphasis directed toward their needs. Given the diverse activities proposed for the Center, this would be a mistake.

The idea of a state-wide "think tank" is not particularly new or innovative. Such a unit could be very helpful, but as with the other two activities proposed for the Center, the state must be willing to provide a level of resources (financial and personnel) consistent with the level of expectation. I have no fear that the Center will seek to be all things to all people; rather, I am concerned that the Center will seek to be all things to some people. My impression is supported by the list of participants who took part in the development of the proposal. Each seems to represent an identifiable and well organized constituent group. Some effort should be made to insure that access to the Center's activities in issue development will be had by institutions and/or individuals which may not be as well organized or entrenched in the state's power setting.

As for the possibility of the Center attaining a "national" reputation, I feel this is of little concern and should not be emphasized. If the Center gets the support it needs from the state and from its participating organizations which will enable it to accomplish the goals set forth for it under the other three targets, the question of national reputation and credibility will take care of itself.

There can be no argument that the governance of the Center must seek to be objective and independent in its program emphases, its selection of staff, and in its leadership style. I have some reluctance regarding how well this can be accomplished given the manner in which the membership on the Board is determined. The selection of membership based on constituent units seems to provide for the systematic representation of those units in Board deliberations. The operating principle seems to be one of countervailing power; the decisions to be reached will more likely reflect objectivity and political reality rather than independence.

Which leads me to what I consider to be the question of greatest significance for Western Kentucky University. In reading through the proposal it became evident that WKU was not directly involved in the development of that document, either through an individual or by anyone representing an organizational unit from Western. Yet if you take the thrust of the networking approach to organizational style you will see that the apparent emphasis is upon links among organizational units rather than individuals. Thus specialized organizations and units within larger organizations, such as an Institute of Government or a Center for Public Affairs, will be the primary "contact" or

"contract agents" through which the Center will seek assistance.

I have no doubt that the Center will become a reality. I also believe that the Center will have a beneficial impact on the development and delivery of public service, research and development at the university level. WKU, I believe, can and should be an active participant in the Center's activities. Programs already exist at WKU which have a pointedly public service thrust. Other programs in education and business provide substantial support for professional research and development. In like manner, those programs stand to benefit greatly by Western's participation in the Center's programs as the knowledge and expertise gained from the Center's activities are transferred to the campus and the classroom. In addition, the expertise of Western's faculty is well established and through working in the Center's tasks may be further recognized and developed.

Fulton County Courthouse - 1903

James M. Everett
County Judge/Executive

FULTON COUNTY, KENTUCKY

Route 1, Hickman, Kentucky 42050
(502) 236-2594

September 12, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, Ky. 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

I wish to respond to your Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. The concept has potential with appropriate leadership and directional guidance.

Many county leaders are concerned the Center would add to the bureaucracy of state interactions rather than assist counties. Many concerns have been expressed about the role of the CJ/E's Association, KACO, etc. These concerns should not have a basis but instead the Center should be a positive influence and step in coordinating existing agencies and organizations. As with any idea, the staff will be the clue to effectiveness!

Training of county employees is an important asset the Center could serve. As a new County Judge/Executive I have wished for detailed staff training in many ares - community development, industrial contact, road, public image (relations), bookkeeping, administration.

The existing resouces and institutions should not be overlooked but integrated into the overall plan. For example, the Institute for Rural Development at Murray State has an excellent program of help to local governments!

I support the concept and offer my assistance to you in accomplishing the Center's proposal!

Sincerely,

James M. Everett

James M. Everett
County Judge/Executive

JME/cr

cc: Henry Hodges

Members of the City Council
Ervin Connelly
David Burgio
Larry Harrison
George T. Bryant
George Wyatt
Ralph Wagers
Charles McIntyre
Auldon Parker

CITY OF BEREA
BEREA, KENTUCKY 40403
CLIFFORD F. KERBY, M.D., MAYOR
(606) 986-8528/(606) 986-4976

Administrator-Coordinator
Gene Stinchcomb
City Attorney
James T. Gilbert
Chief of Police
Billie R. Moseley
Street-Sanitation Superintendent
Bill Hale
Fire Chief
Jerry B. Simpson
City Clerk
Patricia D. Abrams
Park & Recreation Director
Lally Jennings
City Treasurer
Diane Davidson

September 8, 1983

Allan Alsip
Legislative Research Commission
Capitol Annex
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Allan;

I have read the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee for the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs. Having been on the Kentucky local government scene for the last ten years as both a recipient and a provider, I would like to applaud the efforts of the Legislature to establish a coordinated effort in local government policy direction and training. I would offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. The report gives the Center a broad scope of purposes. I believe that the Center may be more successful if there is an initial concentration of effort on a narrower focus. With just two or three major functions the Center can concentrate on quality and effectiveness in order to establish credibility with local officials and the state level policy makers. With good credibility, the Center can develop a broad base of support for funding and for branching out into other related areas of endeavor.

2. As part of the focusing effort, I believe that the initial training programs should be focused on city and county issues. There is no State Department that deals directly with city and county issues. The Department for Local Government deals almost exclusively through the Area Development Districts and not on a regular or broad basis with the cities and counties. Whereas the Department of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction deal almost excusively with the functions of local school systems. A similiar situation exists with

the court system. There are issues of mutual concern which could and should be coordinated but the training of city and county officials seems to be more pressing to me.

3. A Kentucky ACIR would provide much needed long range local government policy recommendations to the administration and legislature. Recommendations from the KACIR would be appropriate on broad issues, long range proposals and in establishing policy framework. Detail and specific proposals could be developed by special committees or from the research arm of the Center working closely with the training program.

4. An important tangent to the establishment of credibility is that all aspects of the Center should be non-partisan. The non-partisan stance of political neutrality may not garner as much short range support as a party alignment or even a bi-partisan approach but over the long run respect and integrity can be preserved without any taints of special interests or favors. With establishment of credibility and a non-partisan approach the Kenton Center can make its mark with other similar institutions across the country.

5. On a tactical note, the Center should build linkages with the private and community colleges and Kentucky's Congressional delegation. Adequate funds should be made available to provide top notch staffing and their support activities such as training, travel and professional conferences.

These notes are probably repetitive and maybe vague but I am interested in this project and would be more than happy to be of any assistance you may believe I can contribute.

Sincerely,

Gene

Gene Stinchcomb
City Administrator
City of Berea

pc: Milton Patton

Miss Evelyn Fleming
4511 Blenheim Road
Louisville, KY 40207
September 2, 1983

Mr. H. Milton Patton
State Research Associates
Suite 200
861 Corporate Drive
Lexington, KY 40503

Dear Mr. Patton:

I have reviewed the Preliminary Report to the Select Committee on the William G. Kenton Center for Government and Public Affairs and am impressed with the thoroughness and detail of the work of the committee.

It seems to diagnose the need for such a center very well and would encourage support of those already knowledgable of this need. I respectfully suggest that more attention might be given to methods of motivating those who need this help but are not aware of their needs.

I am skeptical of the seeming priority given to concern for being the "first." While this would be nice, it would add little of value to the participants or recipients of the Center's services.

The number and quality of people interviewed is commendable, but before completing a curricula or program, it might be advisable to also interview a cross-section of "grass roots" officials who might be served by the center.

I extend my best wishes for your success in the culmination of the center. Thank you for the opportunity of reviewing this report.

Sincerely,

Evelyn E. Fleming '74

Evelyn E. Fleming

EEF:jsf