

State Chief Administrators: The Lynchpins in State Government Reform

By Paul Campbell and Michael E. Snyder

State governments are facing a fiscal crisis, the worst since the Great Depression. Unprecedented challenges seem overwhelming when change requires working with state bureaucracies so large and entrenched that state administrators are unable to affect meaningful improvements. State administrators are, in fact, an integral part of state reform.

Introduction

Does management matter in the public sector? Norma Riccucci, a professor of public administration at Rutgers University, writes in her award-winning book that, “Although there is abundant evidence that management makes a difference in the operations and productivity of public sector bureaucracies, there is another body of literature purporting that management does not matter. This research paints a very pessimistic picture of the ability of administrators and managers to redirect the juggernaut of modern society—large, entrenched bureaucracies.”¹

If better management can help states restore fiscal stability, can it also help convince the public that tax dollars are being spent wisely? Recent studies, including several from the Pew Center on the States, show the general public is losing faith in the state and federal governments’ ability to manage itself effectively.²

The National Association of State Chief Administrators, known as NASCA, believes management does matter and state chief administrators can play a significant role in reforming and restoring the public’s faith in government. Eggers and Campbell add that the “... issue of trust transcends the mere balancing of budgets ... and the public seems skeptical of the competence and integrity of their public leaders.”³ NASCA believes effective management of the core business functions for any organization, public or private, will determine the overall performance and efficiency of the entire organization.

Former Georgia Gov. Sonny Perdue set out in 2002 to reform several state administrative functions with the goal of making Georgia one of the best managed states within five years.⁴ Perdue was named as one of the “2010 Public Officials of the Year” by *Governing* magazine because of his business-like management of state operations and his approach to running some functions of

government like a business.⁵ State chief administrators across the country can use their business expertise to support major reform initiatives that can dramatically improve the operations of state government.

Defining State Chief Administrators and their Role in Government

Responsibilities of a chief administrator vary greatly from state to state. The most commonly held view of the position’s responsibilities is the management and delivery of a state’s administrative or business functions on behalf of other state agencies. In other words, the chief administrator runs the back office business functions of state government. These functions include roughly 60 different services across all 50 states.⁶ As a result, chief administrators have been at the center of a move in state government toward shared services and consolidation over the past decade.⁷

Throughout the past 10 years, many states have looked to the shared-services model when organizing the core business functions of state government. According to a survey on shared services in state and local government conducted by Government Technology, the most common reason for shared services is saving money.⁸ The model has no doubt played, and continues to play, a significant role in the management philosophy of state government. Moreover, whether part of a shared services strategy or not, agency consolidations have been used to save money and shrink government. Since 2009 alone, at least 17 states have consolidated or eliminated agencies that have been identified as duplicative or nonessential.⁹

Throughout all the consolidations and reorganizations, however, the old axiom remains true: To know one state is to know one state. This holds especially true when trying to describe the various responsibilities of state chief administrators.

ADMINISTRATION

The type of functions that fall under the jurisdiction of chief administrators are diverse and numerous. NASCA identifies roughly 60 different functions, not counting miscellaneous programs and boards that are often relegated to a chief administrator's department. Yet, despite such a large number of functions, the average number of functions a state chief administrator is responsible for is only 15, which illustrates the diversity of responsibilities among the position in the states. Administrative agencies in Florida (25 functions), New Jersey (23 functions), Alaska (22 functions), Kentucky (21 functions) and Louisiana (21 functions) are responsible for the most functions. Conversely, agencies in Maryland and Texas, both with six functions, have the fewest number of responsibilities.

Despite this diversity in responsibilities, there are some common trends. Of the more than 60 functions state chief administrators face, many share a predominant set of common responsibilities; the most common functions are procurement services (44), building and facility maintenance (43), and construction (40). More than 30 chief administrators are responsible for managing the state's vehicle fleet (36), auctioning state and federal surplus property (36 and 30 states, respectively), leasing agreements (33), printing (31) and risk management/state liability insurance (30).

At least half the state chief administrators are responsible for human resources (28), health insurance benefits (25), statewide accounting services (25) and information technology (26). Additional major functions managed by less than half the chief administrators, but by more than 10, include supplies purchasing (20), state budget services (18), nature conservation (13), and telecommunications (12). Chief administrators are required to manage roughly 40 additional responsibilities, such as the state audit (12), archives and record keeping (9), or wireless communications (8).

The role of a state chief administrator can be broken down into four categories based on their common primary functions—infrastructure, personnel, finance management and general services.

The infrastructure category includes those chief administrators whose primary responsibilities are maintaining state infrastructure, including construction, maintenance, telecommunications and information technology, and building and grounds management. The personnel category includes chiefs with primary responsibilities around human resources, health care benefits, professional devel-

opment and insurance. The finance management category includes departments that primarily focus on services related to accounting, budget, debt, audit and other similar financial services. Finally, the general services category is for all other services, such as printing, mail, fleet, archiving, storage, travel assistance and procurement.

**Table A:
Common Responsibilities of
State Chief Administrators**

<i>Area</i>	<i>Percentage of members that have the responsibility</i>
General Services	
Procurement	88%
Fleet	72
Mail	70
Printing	62
Supplies	40
Infrastructure	
Facilities	86
Construction	80
Information Technology	52
Telecommunications	24
Finance Management	
Risk Management	60
Accounting	50
State Insurance	50
State Budget	36
Audit	24
Personnel	
Human Resources	56
Benefits (Health)	50
Professional Development	36

Source: Compiled from "Areas of Responsibility for NASCA MEMBERS 2010" database.

The data also show some interesting regional patterns in the responsibilities of state chief administrators.¹⁰

Tables A and B show that general services are significant responsibilities compared to the other categories. Infrastructure is a close second, but

Table B:
Common Responsibilities, by Region, of State Chief Administrators

<i>Region</i>	<i>General Services</i>	<i>Infrastructure</i>	<i>Finance Management</i>	<i>Personnel</i>
West (13 states)	85%	54%	38%	54%
Midwest (12 states)	92	50	42	67
Northeast (9 states)	78	33	44	67
South (16 states)	69	31	25	56

Source: Compiled from “Primary Functions of NASCA MEMBERS 2010” database.

only general services manage to beat out all other categories for every region of the country in terms of the number of state chief administrative offices with this responsibility. Personnel is the next most common category—it’s the second most common responsibility in all regions except the West, where the percentage is tied with infrastructure. Financial management responsibilities are the least common, with less than 50 percent of the chief administrators having those responsibilities in all regions.

This information is helpful to understand who is accountable within each state for many key business functions. The more important role of a state chief administrator, however, is the way they manage these core business functions to support major statewide reforms.

Primary Responsibilities and How They Impact Overall State Functionality

The chief administrator’s greatest impact on the operations of state government will not come from simply reducing the cost of administrative functions. For example, administrative functions typically represent about 10 percent of the total state budget.¹¹ If a savings initiative targeted at the administrative functions saved 10 percent, that 10 percent equals 1 percent of the overall budget.¹² Cuts in a state chief administrator’s budget, therefore, are simply not large enough to have an appreciable effect on a state deficit. While savings anywhere are helpful these days, states will not dig themselves out of their budget holes by expanding video conferencing and sourcing commodities alone.

Massive budget cuts alone are also not likely to restore public faith in state government. A Pew Center on the States study found citizens “... are

more likely to say their elected leaders ... could deliver services more efficiently than to complain that state government is too big.”¹³ Therefore, to restore fiscal stability as well as public trust in state government, states will need to find innovative ways to reinvent government.

The chief administrator’s most important role is to support and at times lead, major change management initiatives that reinvent government. If any state wants to tackle real game changers—such as privatization, true shared services or public-private partnerships—all paths lead through the state chief administrator’s office. For example, any public-private partnerships will require a much more sophisticated approach to procurement, where 44 of the chief administrators have primary responsibility.¹⁴ Innovative new approaches will require a more highly trained and skilled work force and 27 state chief administrators manage human resources. Any successful new program or initiative must have strong information technology support involving 25 of the administrator’s offices. In 15 states,¹⁵ the state chiefs are responsible for all three functions. In the end, the ability of the state chief administrator and his team to support major management initiatives will determine the overall success of any state reforms.

Moreover, the state chief administrator, through effective execution of reforms, can act as an example and help restore the public’s faith in government. The Pew study on public trust confirms a growing frustration with government.¹⁶ This frustration will not be curtailed by political rhetoric coupled with a token trimming of state budgets. If people are to have faith in government again, government needs new solutions to old problems and the public needs

**Table C:
Primary Functions of State Chief Administrators**

State	State Chief Administrative Office	General Services					Infrastructure			
		Procurement	Fleet	Mail	Printing	Supplies	Facilities	Construction	Information Technology	Telecommunications
Alabama.....	Dept. of Finance	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Alaska.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★
Arizona.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	...	★	★	★	★	★	★
Arkansas.....	Dept. of Finance and Administration	★	★	...
California.....	Dept. of General Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	★	★	...
Colorado.....	Dept. of Personnel and Administration	★	★	★	★	...	★
Connecticut.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	...	★
Delaware.....	Office of Management and Budget	...	★	★	★	★	★	★
Florida.....	Dept. of Management Services	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Georgia.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	...	★
Hawaii.....	Dept. of Accounting and General Services	...(c)	★	★	★	★	★	★
Idaho.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Illinois.....	Dept. of Central Management Services	★	★(d)	★	★	...	★	★
Indiana.....	Dept. of Administration	★(e)	★	★	★	...	★	★
Iowa.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Kansas.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★(f)	...	★	...	★	...	★	...
Kentucky.....	Finance and Administration Cabinet	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Louisiana.....	Division of Administration	★	...	★	★	...	★	★
Maine.....	Bureau of General Services	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Maryland.....	Dept. of General Services	★	★
Massachusetts.....	Office for Administration and Finance	★	...	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Michigan.....	Dept. of Technology, Management and Budget	★	★	★	★	...	★	★	★	...
Minnesota.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	...	★	★	★
Mississippi.....	Dept. of Finance and Administration	★	★	★	★
Missouri.....	Office of Administration	★	★	...	★	★	★	★	★	★
Montana.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Nebraska.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Nevada.....	Dept. of Administration	★	...	★	★
New Hampshire.....	Dept. of Administration Services	★	★	★	...	★
New Jersey.....	Dept. of the Treasury	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
New Mexico.....	General Services Dept.	★	★	...	★	...	★	★
New York.....	Office of General Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	★
North Carolina.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	★
North Dakota.....	Office of Management and Budget	★	★	★	★(i)	★(i)
Ohio.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	★	★	...
Oklahoma.....	Dept. of Central Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	★
Oregon.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	...	★	...	★	★	★	...
Pennsylvania.....	Office of Administration	★	★
Rhode Island.....	Dept. of Administration	★	...	★	★	★	★	★
South Carolina.....	Budget and Control Board	★	...	★	★	★	★	...
South Dakota.....	South Dakota Bureau of Administration	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Tennessee.....	Dept. of General Services	★	★	★	★	...	★
Texas.....	Facilities Commission	★	★	★
Utah.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	★
Vermont.....	Agency of Administration	★	★	★	★	...	★	★
Virginia.....	Dept. of General Services	★	★	★	...	★	★	★
Washington.....	Dept. of General Administration	★	★	★	★	★
West Virginia.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	...
Wisconsin.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	...	★	★	★	...
Wyoming.....	Dept. of Administration and Information	★	★	★	★	★	★	...
Total Number of Functions		44	36	35	31	20	43	40	26	12

See footnotes at end of table.

Primary Functions of State Chief Administrators—Continued

State	State Chief Administrative Office	Finance Management					Personnel	
		Risk Management	Accounting	State Budget	State Insurance	Audit	Human Resources	Professional Dev. Training
Alabama.....	Dept. of Finance	★	...	★	★	★
Alaska.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★
Arizona.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★
Arkansas.....	Dept. of Finance and Administration	★	★(a)	...
California.....	Dept. of General Services	★	★
Colorado.....	Dept. of Personnel and Administration	★	★	★	★
Connecticut.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	...	★	...	★(b)	...	★	...
Delaware.....	Office of Management and Budget	★	★	...	★	★
Florida.....	Dept. of Management Services	★	★	★
Georgia.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★
Hawaii.....	Dept. of Accounting and General Services	...	★	★
Idaho.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★
Illinois.....	Dept. of Central Management Services	★	★	...
Indiana.....	Dept. of Administration
Iowa.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★
Kansas.....	Dept. of Administration	...	★	★	★	...
Kentucky.....	Finance and Administration Cabinet	★	★	...	★	★
Louisiana.....	Division of Administration	★	★(g)	★	★(g)	★
Maine.....	Bureau of General Services	★	★
Maryland.....	Dept. of General Services
Massachusetts.....	Office for Administration and Finance	★	★	...
Michigan.....	Dept. of Technology, Management and Budget	...	★	★	...	★
Minnesota.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	...	★	...	★	...
Mississippi.....	Dept. of Finance and Administration	...	★	★	★	...	★	...
Missouri.....	Office of Administration	★	★	★	★	...	★	★
Montana.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★	★
Nebraska.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	...
Nevada.....	Dept. of Administration	★	...	★	★	★	...	★(h)
New Hampshire.....	Dept. of Administration Services	★	★	★	★	...	★	...
New Jersey.....	Dept. of the Treasury	★	★	★	...	★	...	★
New Mexico.....	General Services Dept.	★
New York.....	Office of General Services	★
North Carolina.....	Dept. of Administration	★	...
North Dakota.....	Office of Management and Budget	★	★	★	★(b)	...	★	★
Ohio.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	...	★	★
Oklahoma.....	Dept. of Central Services	★
Oregon.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	★	★	★(j)	...	★
Pennsylvania.....	Office of Administration	★	★
Rhode Island.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	★	★(b)	★	★	...
South Carolina.....	Budget and Control Board	★	...	★	...
South Dakota.....	South Dakota Bureau of Administration	★	★
Tennessee.....	Dept. of General Services
Texas.....	Facilities Commission
Utah.....	Dept. of Administrative Services	★	★	...	★
Vermont.....	Agency of Administration	★	★	...	★	★	★	...
Virginia.....	Dept. of General Services
Washington.....	Dept. of General Administration
West Virginia.....	Dept. of Administration	★	★	...	★	★	★	★
Wisconsin.....	Dept. of Administration	...	★	★
Wyoming.....	Dept. of Administration and Information	★	...	★	★	...
Total Number of Functions		30	25	18	25	12	28	17

See footnotes at end of table.

Primary Functions of State Chief Administrators—Continued

Source: Compiled from “Areas of Responsibility for NASCA MEMBERS 2010” database.

Note: Total Number of Functions is by definition the total number of each area of responsibility. It does not include attached boards and commissions that may perform some of these functions.

Key:

★ — Responsible for function.

... — Not responsible for function.

(a) Employment only.

(b) Workers’ compensation only.

(c) This function is performed by the Procurement Policy Board, which is attached to the Department of Accounting and General Services.

(d) Repairs and maintenance only.

(e) Except the Indiana Department of Transportation.

(f) Through Enterprise.

(g) Limited agency coverage.

(h) In the area of budgeting.

(i) Capitol building only.

(j) Currently unstaffed and being revised.

Procurement—Aid or management of other state agencies in purchasing a wide variety of goods or services.

Fleet—Department that covers management of fleet services including both state-owned vehicles and fleet services provided by private vehicle rental companies.

Mail—Provision of interagency general mail services, and sometimes managing the distribution of mail from other mail services so that they reach the proper agency.

Printing—Responsibility to provide general printing and copying needs for state agencies.

Supplies—The provision or aid in purchasing general supplies, general of that nature of office supplies, for other state agencies.

Facilities—General maintenance and upkeep of state property, such as providing groundskeeping, general maintenance, and utilities.

Construction—Provides review and management of construction contracts for the construction of state facilities and infrastructure.

Information Technology—Provision and administration of information technology infrastructure and services. Includes elements related to provision of computer networking, Internet, and computer software support.

Telecommunications—Provision and management of the state’s communications infrastructure.

Risk Management—Office that aids other state agencies by reducing risk to state assets and finances, and often includes state insurance against liability claims and workers’ compensation.

Accounting—General accounting process such as preparing and maintaining financial reports.

State Budget—Responsible for the state budget, and providing budget proposals for the Governor’s office.

State Insurance—Administration of state liability insurance for state property and personnel, including state liability for workers’ compensation claims.

Audit—Oversight over other state agency accounting, budget, or other functions as an attempt to eliminate government waste and prevent fraud.

Human Resources—A resource agency for state employees to get information and assistance with a wide range of topics, but generally include payroll, hiring, retirement benefits, and insurance.

Professional Development—Agencies provide periodic training sessions to help state employees develop job-related skills, often related to management skills.

to see managers in government can successfully execute these new strategies. As Thomas Edison said, “vision without execution is hallucination.” This is the area where the management skills of chief administrators will play a critical role in substantially improving the functionality of state operations.

Georgia’s approach is again worth noting. Gov. Perdue created the Commission for a New Georgia and included senior business executives that were influential leaders in the state.¹⁷ He added a chief operating officer to the state, a role that many chief administrators already play within state government. Georgia’s administrator was recruited based on his “extensive expertise in purchasing and supply chain management.”¹⁸ “It’s an approach to government that allowed Perdue to keep the state’s fiscal house in order in the midst of the worst financial crisis to hit the nation—and Georgia—in generations.”¹⁹

“What are the skills necessary for an SCA to play such a transformative role? Is the job more operations or politics?” One could argue the state chief administrator is the least political job in the governor’s cabinet because it’s a pure operations role. On the other hand, when managing large con-

tracts, hiring and budgeting, a chief administrator should understand the political landscape if he or she plans to help change the view. This is the primary reason the role can be so difficult to fill. Governors must find someone with an understanding of both the business and political world. As Eggers and Campbell point out, “Our nation’s new governors take office at a difficult time. These newcomers have to balance their budgets, but they also need to reform how state government operates.”²⁰ In 2011, with dozens of new chief administrators entering state government, and nearly every state headed toward a fiscal cliff,²¹ the administrators must be effective managers with a track record of successful innovation.

Conclusion

The critical business functions state chief administrators manage places them squarely at the center of state operations. The question is whether they will use their role to push for real reforms in state government. As state government wrestles with the worst fiscal climate since World War II, officials will have real opportunities to challenge the status quo and execute real change. State chief administrators can play a central role in that transformation.

Notes

¹Norma M. Riccucci, *How Management Matters: Street Level Bureaucrats and Welfare Reform*. (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 2005).

(Norma M. Riccucci is a professor in the Graduate Department of Public Administration at Rutgers University, Newark; and author of “Managing Diversity in Public Sector Workforces” and “Unsung Heroes: Federal Executives Making a Difference.” “How Management Matters” draws upon two years of personal interviews and national surveys to examine how public management matters in government organizations.)

²Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, “Distrust, Discontent, Anger, and Partisan Rancor: The People and Their Government,” (2010). <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1569/trust-in-government-distrust-discontent-anger-partisan-rancor>.

Pew Center on the States, “Facing facts: Public Attitudes and Fiscal Realities in Five Stressed States,” (2010). http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/report_detail.aspx?id=60803.

³William D. Eggers and Robert N. Campbell III, (2010). “How New Governors Can Renew Public Trust,” *Governing*. <http://www.governing.com/columns/mgmt-insights/new-governors-renew-public-trust.html>.

⁴Michael D. Keats and Jason L. Owens. “Procurement in the State of Georgia.” Presented at the National Association of State Chief Administrator’s Institute on Management and Leadership, Atlanta, (2010).

⁵“Top Officials of the Year Named by *Governing Magazine*,” *Governing*. (2010) <http://media.navigatored.com/documents/POY+2010+Press+Release.pdf>.

⁶“Areas of Responsibilities for NASCA Members,” *National Association of State Chief Administrators*. (Available soon) at <http://www.nasca.org/Pages/resources.aspx>.

⁷National Governors Association, NGA Center for Best Practices, *State Government Redesign Efforts 2009 and 2010*, (2010). <http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/1010STATEGOVTREDESIGN.PDF>.

⁸Survey on Shared Services in State and Local Government, (2007). <http://www.oracle.com/us/industries/046114.pdf>.

⁹National Governors Association, NGA Center for Best Practices, *State Government Redesign Efforts 2009 and 2010*, (2010), 14-6. <http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/1010STATEGOVTREDESIGN.PDF>. Consolidations do not always accomplish the stated goal of creating efficiencies. As Petronius noted in 210 B.C., “we trained hard, but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up into teams we would be reorganized. . . . I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing and what a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralization.” As found in a recent McKinsey Study, “the tactics used most by the most successful organizations suggest that all organizations implementing a redesign would benefit from explaining to employees how the new design works, ensuring that systems and processes support it, and winning hearts and minds.” See: Giancarlo Ghislanzoni, Stephen Heidari-Robinson, and Martin Jermin, “Taking Organizational Redesigns From Plan to Practice: McKinsey

Global Survey Results,” *McKinsey Quarterly: The Online Journal of McKinsey & Company*, (2010). http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Taking_organizational_redesigns_from_plan_to_practice_McKinsey_Global_Survey_results_2721.

¹⁰State chief administrators might not be counted as having a significant emphasis for a category if that administrator only covered a minimum number of the responsibilities that constitute that category. Each state chief administrator was ranked according to the level of focus in a category by counting the number of functions under that category that the state has responsibility for. If a state chief administrator was responsible for about half of the functions of that category it was counted as having a significant emphasis on that category. Please contact the National Association of State Chief Administrators at <http://www.nasca.org/Pages/resources.aspx> for the most updated comprehensive list of each SCA’s responsibilities.

¹¹Bill Bott and Ken Miller, “Worse, Slower, Cheaper, But . . .” *Governing*, (2010). <http://www.governing.com/blogs/public-great/The-False-Promises-of-Consolidation-But.html>.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Pew Center on the States. “Facing facts: Public Attitudes and Fiscal Realities in Five Stressed States,” (2010). http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/report_detail.aspx?id=60803.

¹⁴Stephen Goldsmith and William D. Eggers, *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2004).

¹⁵AK, AL, AZ, FL, IA, KS, MA, MO, NE, OH, RI, SC, VT, WV and WY.

¹⁶Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, “Distrust, Discontent, Anger, and Partisan Rancor: The People and Their Government,” (2010). <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1569/trust-in-government-distrust-discontent-anger-partisan-rancor>.

¹⁷“The Businessman: Sonny Perdue,” (2010) *Governing*. <http://www.governing.com/poy/sonny-perdue.html>.

¹⁸See note 4.

¹⁹See note 15.

²⁰See note 3.

²¹National Association of State Budget Officers, *The Fiscal Survey of the States: An Update of State Fiscal Conditions*, (2010), <http://www.nasbo.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=C6q1M3kxAY%3d&tabid=38>.

About the Authors

Paul Campbell is a member of the Board of Directors for NASCA. He served as chief administrator in Illinois and previously as a federal agent and prosecutor. His private sector experience includes serving as partner with the law firm DLA Piper and national head of business development for UnitedHealthcare’s Public Sector Group state market. Campbell has his M.B.A. from Northwestern University.

Michael E. Snyder is a researcher for NASCA. He has also worked for the University of Illinois at Springfield’s Department of Political Science as a research assistant and assistant editor. Snyder holds an M.A. in political science from the University of Illinois at Springfield.