

# Summary Report

---



Institute of Public Affairs

## Local Government Training Programs, Problems, and Needs in Iowa

The University of Iowa/Iowa City/1968

by Clayton Ringgenberg

IOWA  
352  
Rin  
Suppl.

IOWA STATE TRAVELING LIBRARY  
DES MOINES, IOWA

60			
JUN 24 1975			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Suppl.

Ringgenberg, Clayton  
Local government training  
programs, problems, &  
needs in Iowa: Summary  
report





---

Summary Report

Local Government Training Programs,  
Problems, and Needs in Iowa

by Clayton Ringgenberg

---

Institute of Public Affairs

The University of Iowa/Iowa City/1968

---

The printing of this report has been financed in part  
through a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development under Title VIII of the Housing  
Act of 1964, as amended.

IOWA STATE TRAVELING LIBRARY  
DES MOINES, IOWA



IOWA

352

Rin

Suppl.



## Foreword

Local governments and educational institutions in Iowa should give increasing attention to the in-service training needs of city and county officials and employees. That is the major conclusion of the three-part report written as a result of a year-long survey made by the Institute of Public Affairs of The University of Iowa on training programs, problems, and needs.

The full report is summarized in this publication to acquaint readers with the report's highlights. It may be obtained without charge from the Institute.

The report should be of considerable interest to key officials in local government—mayors, councilmen, managers, county supervisors, and other county officers—for it deals with one of the most challenging responsibilities they have: how to attract, build, and keep capable personnel to handle the crucial job of providing a high level of local services. A major part of this responsibility of key officials is to find ways to help develop their people.

One of the best ways to develop people is through on-the-job (in-service) training, through education programs and learning experiences that meet real needs and have major impact on the attitudes, motivations, and performances of the people who take the training. The report can be of particular help to local government officials because it makes suggestions for what they can do individually and collectively to bolster existing training and to provide a proper climate for training.

Why is this so necessary? What can improved training of public officials and employees in cities, towns, and counties do? It can help (1) build them as individuals for their own advancement and job satisfactions, (2) bolster local government through their improved performances, and (3) improve the image of local government service.

As noted above, the report, which was made as a result of a survey supported in part by a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as part of the Iowa Community Services Program, has three parts.

Part I, "In-Service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa," discusses the general need for in-

service training in city and county governments, lists the education and training programs now available, points out major training gaps, and makes suggestions for strengthening education and training programs for local government in Iowa.

Part II, "The Role of Title I in Providing Educational Programs for Iowa Communities," discusses progress and problems in the Iowa Community Services Program and offers suggestions for possible emphasis on in-service education and training programs for local governmental officials.

Part III, "Progress Report: Development of Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management," reports on the results of a questionnaire survey concerning the personal and educational backgrounds of local government officials in Iowa and their views about in-service training needs. The report also outlines the plans being developed during 1968-1969 by the Institute of Public Affairs for a program of in-service training in local government management which will be initiated in the fall of 1969 by the Institute in cooperation with other educational agencies and associations of local government officials in Iowa. This planning will be financed in part through a grant from the federal government under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

The Institute welcomes comments about the report and what might be done to improve training for local government in Iowa. The Institute is dedicated to excellence in the local public service and wants to work with all interested persons and agencies on training matters to help achieve excellence.

Dean Zenor  
Director  
Institute of Public Affairs

312476

4-4-69 Inst. Publ. Affairs - gift



## Background

Considerable attention is being focused in Iowa these days on ways to upgrade local governments, and many people who recognize how directly their city and county governments affect their daily lives will applaud the move. Special attention is being given to improving in-service training of city and county employees.

Good government comes largely by having good employees, of course, and thus it is important that Iowa's 30,000 local government employees be selected with care, directed with wisdom, and provided with opportunities for in-service training in order that they may make their best contribution to effective and coordinated government in their communities.

Much of the responsibility for providing good local government necessarily rests with the elective officials—some 950 mayors, 5,000 city and town councilmen, 350 county supervisors, and 600 other elected county officers. The responsibility also rests with an estimated 3,500 to 3,900 persons in management and supervisory positions in municipal and county governments in Iowa. All of these officials must have the vision and must give the time not only to handle their own work in an effective way, but also to give sustained direction and encouragement to the employees under them who are performing the many important jobs in local governments.

Even the most conscientious government officials, however, may face difficulties in maintaining well-qualified staffs. Well-trained employees are in short supply, and local governments, which must compete with the private sector for professional people and technicians, are finding themselves on the low end of the totem pole. In addition, in this age of technology, men are being replaced by machines for some governmental jobs. The result is manpower shifts and the need to train the shifted employees and their supervisors for new jobs. Both of these realities, the shortage of trained workers and the growing shifts in manpower, emphasize the need for in-service training of local government employees. Such training also is needed if workers are to advance to higher jobs, and it is needed to train staff to deal with the social and other complex problems of an increasingly urban society.

Not all city and county officials recognize the advantages of in-service training and accept their responsibility for advancing it. Those who do see the value may need advice and help in planning and carrying out job-training programs, for they are busy people, many of them part-time officials.

Help is becoming increasingly available. One of several new sources of help comes from the Iowa Community Services Program, which is financed in part by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under it a state plan is prepared as a guide for funding educational projects of higher educational institutions relating to community needs. One of the major areas of community needs under the current state plan in Iowa is increased training for local government officials and employees. Another new federal program, just funded in 1968, provides money to help train employees of public agencies involved in community development. This is known as Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

The Title I and Title VIII educational programs are, of course, only a part of the total in-service education now available to local governments. Significant training programs existed before their advent, but with these new sources of financing, interested parties have pointed out the need to stop and take a look at what is being done in local government in-service training, what the major unmet training needs appear to be, and what might be done to meet the needs by using existing and new training resources.

This look has been taken, and the result is a three-part report prepared by the Institute of Public Affairs at The University of Iowa and published in the fall of 1968. That report is the one whose three parts were briefly described in the foreword to this publication.

(The report was prepared by Clayton Ringgenberg, Associate Director, Institute of Public Affairs, The University of Iowa. The report may be obtained free from the Institute of Public Affairs, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.)

This three-part report gives a comprehensive picture of in-service training realities and goals in Iowa and tells what federal financing and state planning can and will do to help local governments help themselves. This publication summarizes some of the highlights of the report.



# **Part 1**

---

## **In-Service Training for Local Government Officials and Employees in Iowa**



In-Service Training for

Local Government Officials and

Employees in Iowa

### **Types of Training**

In-service training may be informal or formal. Informal training occurs when supervisors and others teach employees on the job. It may be done almost unconsciously, but officials need to be conscious of its importance and should be sure they provide it.

Formal training falls into the following categories: (1) orientation training, to orient new officials and employees into their jobs and work environment; (2) job skills training, usually offered in short courses by professional organizations or educational institutions; (3) general education beyond high school, usually taken in adult-education programs, courses of area colleges, and correspondence courses of colleges and universities; (4) management and supervisory training, relating to administration, human relations, and policy making; (5) mid-career education, pursued in time away from the job to take specialized courses or work toward degrees; (6) general public policy training, or public (community) leadership training; (7) advisory services and technical services, for officials of smaller governmental units.

(For an evaluation of these categories of training, see pages 19-26 of the full report.)

City and county officials would be wise to promote these training programs and employee participation in them, for they are beneficial to the local government as well as to the individuals who receive the training.



## Objectives of Training

The goals for benefiting the individual trainee through in-service municipal training, as stated by the International City Managers' Association in its 1961 publication, "A Report on the In-Service Training Programs for Key Personnel," are as follows:

(1) to equip him with the skills he needs to perform more effectively the duties of his position; (2) to attune him to the tasks he is called upon to perform in a changing world and to adjust his outlook and methods to new needs and demands; (3) to instill in him an awareness of the relation of his work to the service rendered by his department and government; (4) to prepare him for other duties (his next job), and when appropriate, develop his capacity for higher work and greater responsibilities (for a different job); and (5) to broaden his outlook.

---

Objectives for indirectly benefiting county and city government through in-service training of employees are listed as follows:

(1) better job performance, which improves production and the image of the city or county; (2) development of persons from within the ranks to take on additional responsibilities as vacancies occur; (3) longer tenure of properly motivated employees; and (4) improvement of the government's ability to fulfill its increasing and new roles because it has a better-equipped staff.

## Agencies That Provide Training in Iowa

In-service training opportunities to Iowa local governments, besides those provided by cities and counties themselves, are available from a variety of agencies.

(For a listing of available in-service programs for local government in Iowa, see Appendix A of the full report.)

State associations of city and county officials and national associations of public officials sponsor conferences and workshops. The three state universities sponsor conferences and offer short courses and correspondence courses, largely through their extension services. The fifteen public area schools have adult-education courses and vocational-technical classes. Several state government agencies provide in-service training, such as welfare training by the Department of Social Services and public works training by the State Highway Commission.

Suppliers of office equipment and public works machinery provide training in the use of their equipment. Private companies give short courses adaptable to local governmental training needs. A few federal government agencies, such as the U.S. Public Health Service, have programs in which local officials and employees participate.

Congress recently has provided money to states to assist with local governmental training. Money granted to universities and colleges to provide educational programs for local governmental officials and employees under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was mentioned earlier. In addition, money was granted in 1968 under the Housing Act of 1964 (Title VIII) for training programs to upgrade local governmental personnel involved in community development and



renewal. Under Title IX of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 money has been made available which can be used in part to provide technical field services and information to local units of government. And lastly, money is available under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 which can be used in part for training of persons who are employed to upgrade them for advancement. This federal aid is making it possible for the state universities and other educational institutions in Iowa to offer greater help than in the past to local governments.

### **Some Comments About Existing Programs**

For the first time, through this report, a comprehensive picture of the training programs which local government officials and employees can take advantage of is available in a program-by-program categorized form. Among other benefits, this listing provides a basis for an overall appraisal of the local government in-service training situation.

Many programs are available in Iowa, most of them of the short course or conference type. However, the large number of programs may be more impressive than the coverage of them, for they must serve 30,000 persons in local government employment; they must help make up for a deficiency in preservice training; they cover many areas and problems of local government; and they are of a short-term nature, both in terms of length of training period and in their one-shot or irregular nature.

Except for job-skills training, the training tends to be broad in scope rather than particular in application. Thus, participants in conferences and short courses have the responsibility of applying (translating) what they learn to their own situation.

With a few notable exceptions, very little formal training is carried on by Iowa local units of governments for themselves. Increasingly, professional associations, state associations, and educational institutions are planning and carrying out the programs, but the programs tend to deal with problems and concepts generally rather than to meet the training needs of an individual city or county. Therefore, although local units of government may help to initiate programs, they do not have direct control of them; nor do they necessarily feel responsible for them.

This situation points up the need for better coordination of existing and new programs and more government involvement in program planning. Illustrative of what can be done is the involvement of a committee of public officials and another, of educators, in the development of the in-service education program in local government management, a program now being developed under the guidance of the Institute of Public Affairs of The University of Iowa.



## Training in Perspective

Training is important, but it is not a cure-all or an end in itself. It must be combined with other good personnel practices on the local scene. It cannot replace them. Training has to be combined with adequate salaries, possibilities for promotion to greater responsibilities, job achievement and recognition, and adequate retirement and other fringe benefits.

It has to be combined with a good image of employment in the public service. It has to be combined with aggressive recruitment practices, including encouragement of preservice education that will help steer young adults to public service. It has to be combined with recognition of the increasing professional nature of many positions in local government.

In-service training is stronger and is more likely to grow in a climate of these good personnel practices than when inadequate attention is given to these matters by legislative bodies and top administrators. It might be well for local units of government in Iowa to examine their current personnel practices, individually and collectively, to see whether there are shortcomings in these practices which may hinder the benefits of existing or new in-service training programs.

## Suggestions for Improving In-Service Training

Major suggestions for improving in-service training are given here.

(For specific suggestions regarding what local governments, associations of local officials and employees, universities and colleges, area community colleges, the State Department of Public Instruction, and high schools can do, see pages 34-38 of the report.)

A clearinghouse for information about in-service training programs should be established to provide information to local units of government about the availability of training programs and plans for new programs, to prepare calendars of upcoming conferences and courses, and to assist cities and counties in developing their own training programs.

A local governmental in-service training committee should be established, comprised of city, county, and state officials, persons in education, and persons responsible for administering statewide federally assisted programs. This committee should encourage a cooperative approach to planning programs and techniques for upgrading local government employment, identifying changing trends and needs affecting public-service education and training, and developing programs and techniques to improve the education and training of public employees. The committee also should encourage individual units of government to participate in these programs and should cooperate with educational institutions in developing more preservice educational programs designed to help supply qualified persons for state and local governments.

Local governmental units, individually, should take these steps: (1) designate a person to check periodically its training needs and the availability of training to fulfill those needs; (2) review its own facilities and potentials for providing its own in-service training; (3) investigate the resources of its area schools for providing in-service training programs.

Representatives of local governments, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the area community colleges should explore the possibility for one- or two-year post-high school programs of study designed to prepare persons for local



government employment, either of a general or a specialized type.

Additionally, local governmental units should take advantage of existing state and federal training programs, and in turn state and federal agencies should encourage local governments to participate, particularly in professional, technical, and managerial training programs. Another important suggestion is that local governmental units should give increasing attention to providing incentives to their employees for in-service training: (1) released time for training, (2) payment or reimbursement of tuition, (3) promotion related to training, and (4) pay increases related to training.

Educational institutions and professional groups should provide consequential training for local government officials and community leaders, applicable to their communities, to equip them as leaders, senior executives, and public policy makers. Educational institutions also should plan and carry out coordinated programs of in-service managerial and supervisory training with a sequence of course offerings designed primarily for middle managers and first-line supervisory personnel in city and county government.

Steps should be taken to augment the supply of instructors for educating and training local governmental personnel. Suggestions include the following: (1) giving regular teachers the training they need to teach specialized courses, (2) recruiting persons who have the specialized knowledge but are not regular teachers and training them for teaching, (3) preparing professional tailor-made course materials for these retrained and recruited teachers, and (4) making use of new teaching devices and techniques.

A final suggestion is that the financing of in-service training should be examined to see whether the various resources for financing an extended, coordinated program are adequate. It is proposed that consideration be given to an overall system that will spread costs equitably over local government as a whole. Such a system would encourage program continuity and wider participation in the training.



# **Part 2**

---

## **The Role of Title I in Providing Educational Programs for Iowa Communities**



The Role of Title I in Providing  
Educational Programs for  
Iowa Communities

### The Advent of Title I

In 1965 the Congress provided a program to help bring the resources of colleges and universities to bear on community problems on a state-by-state basis. This is known as Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It provides federal matching money to colleges and universities for community service programs to assist in the solution of community problems. This money is administered under a state plan developed in each state.

### Title I Plan in Iowa

The program in Iowa is administered under the general guidance of the State Extension Council of the State Board of Regents with the Dean of the Division of Extension and University Services of The University of Iowa designated as administrator for the program, which is known as the Iowa Community Services Program. There also is a seventeen-member State Advisory Council for the program.

Under the Iowa plan, colleges and universities may submit proposals for funding which deal with six general areas of community problems: Government and Community Affairs, Community Health Services, Community Education Services, Community Economic Development Services, Community Social Services, and Community Cultural and Recreational Services.

### Projects Authorized Under the State Plan

The state plan permits a wide variety of activities within each of these six categories. For example, the program areas authorized under the first category are as follows:

"Government and Community Affairs. Credit or noncredit courses, in-service training programs, conferences, institutes, and workshops designed to improve the skills, knowledge, understanding, and competence of local government officials and employees such as city managers, mayors, police officers, firemen, planning and zoning officials, urban renewal officials, housing and building code inspectors, water and sewer plant operators, parks and recreation personnel, and others."



## Accomplishments

An impressive number and variety of programs have been undertaken in Iowa. Including the projects which have been approved for the 1968-69 fiscal year, 129 have been or will be carried out over a four-year authorization period. There have been about 100 different programs, for twenty have been renewed at least once. Therefore, despite the fact that congressional appropriations are on a year-to-year basis and accordingly no grant is made by Title I officials for more than one year, some continuity of programming has been achieved by renewing programs.

Title I has stimulated many projects which would not have been attempted if federal grants had not been available, and under it some projects have been undertaken which suggest new approaches for dealing with community problems or are of likely long-range impact. Title I has brought persons in higher education more in touch with community problems than heretofore, and it has made community officials and leaders more aware of the resources of colleges and universities that are available to their communities.

## Analysis of Projects

Most of the programs are conferences, workshops, and short courses. Some conferences and workshops are held in a single location; others are regional meetings held at several locations.

Topics for projects vary widely. For example, seventeen projects have been devoted to community education training and service; fifteen to local government management and supervision; eleven to urban planning, community renewal, housing, and codes; five to law enforcement and fire protection.

(For more examples of projects, see page 46 of the full report.)

Although the projects more often than not are for public officials, they are not exclusively so. More than half of the projects involve audiences which are completely or partly from the private sector.

## Program Development

All of the projects involve program-development activities, but seven specific program development projects have been funded. They are: (1) Development of an Integrated Series of Police Short Courses, (2) School Building Planning Information Dissemination, (3) Identification and Articulation by Local Officials of Their Problems and Needs, (4) Development of the Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management, (5) Development and Implementation of Health Education Curricula and Teaching Materials for use in the Elementary and Junior High Schools, (6) Instruction of Public School Teachers to Teach Teachers' Aides, and (7) School-Agency Cooperation (a pilot program).



## Community and Program Problems

The intent of the services under Title I is stated in the law: (1) "To strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities," and (2) "To assist in the solution of community problems through community service programs." How these purposes are to be accomplished is left up to individual states.

Two questions which arise, then, are: (1) How can the major community problems in Iowa be identified, and (2) To which ones can college and university resources and capabilities be applied most effectively?

Title I authorities have held several statewide meetings with local government officials and other community leaders to receive ideas as to the problems of their communities. Major problem areas brought out by local officials include the following: (1) poor citizen understanding and interest in community problems; (2) need for models to develop intergovernmental agreements; (3) need for operational handbooks for various local government offices; (4) need for assistance in using consultants; (5) need for resources to encourage organizational experimentation, such as a pilot program to have an engineer or manager serve all the communities located in a single county or group of counties; (6) youth problems; (7) need for knowledge about data processing; and (8) need for additional in-service training.

Other problems which require consideration are as follows: (1) inadequate financial resources for city government; (2) run-down neighborhoods and de-

clining central business districts; (3) inadequate coordination of local agencies in handling community problems; (4) loss of population in counties, cities, and towns; (5) difficulties of adapting local government to rapid social changes and problems; and (6) loss of key personnel from local government services.

Title I authorities and the colleges and universities face a number of hard, crucial policy questions in determining the framework within which the Title I program will operate. They must determine the relative merits of programs dealing with localized community problems and those dealing with overall (statewide) problems. They must choose between short-range and long-range projects. They must decide whether to concentrate and coordinate efforts in a single year to a few areas of needs or to spread the benefits to diversified needs. They must find ways to provide sound problem identification and program planning at a time when "action-oriented" programs are being called for.

## Suggestions

Part II of the report proposes renewed effort in identifying community problems and cataloguing the higher educational resources that can be brought to bear on them, in promoting greater rapport between community leaders and academic personnel, in identifying one to three major problems to be given priority, and in finding ways to fund long-term substantial projects.

(See page 55 of the full report for a list of suggestions.)

The report also proposes that priority in government and community affairs projects be given to programs (1) to help local leaders achieve better public understanding of local government services and problems, (2) to take leadership training into communities, (3) to provide managerial and supervisory training for local government officials and employees on a continuing basis, (4) to take academic personnel into the cities to meet with community leaders, and (5) to deal significantly with the government problems of the small community which lacks trained officials and employees.



# **Part 3**

---

## **Progress Report: Development of Iowa Plan for In-Service Education in Local Government Management**



## Progress Report:

Development of Iowa Plan for

In-Service Education in

Local Government Management

**Introduction**

In the spring of 1967 the Institute of Public Affairs submitted a proposal to Title I officials for a substantial grant to finance the development of an in-service education program in local government management for city and county personnel in Iowa. The Institute outlined a three-phase planning program which in its view should precede the inauguration of the program:

**Phase 1.**

An assessment of the educational and experience levels of managerial and supervisory employees in local government and an inventory of relevant training programs now available to these persons.

**Phase 2.**

Formulation of a curriculum and a plan of action for offering and teaching the courses under the program (to involve choosing courses and methods of offering them, developing materials, recruiting instructors, and determining administrative and financial policies).

**Phase 3.**

Spurring interest and support for the program among local government officials and personnel, educators, and professional groups.

---

Instead of funding this project in its entirety, Title I officials made a grant to the Institute: (a) to begin the Local Government Management Training project, primarily for Phase 1, and (b) to survey training needs and resources for all local government personnel in Iowa and

to make suggestions regarding meeting these needs, particularly regarding the coordination of programs and the use of Title I money for local government training. A survey was made, and the three-part report was written as a result of it. Part III is a progress report on the surveys and the field work done to begin development of the Local Government Management Training program.

**Survey of Managerial and Supervisory Personnel**

For background information to use in making decisions about the development of the in-service training program in government management, a survey was made of city and county personnel, most of whom are in managerial and supervisory positions. It sought three types of information: (1) their educational and experience levels, (2) their views concerning training they need, and (3) types of managerial and supervisory training now available to them.

Responses came from 1,594 persons, 1,151 in city positions and 443 in county positions, representing practically every one of the large cities and two-thirds of the twenty-one large counties. It is estimated that nearly one-half of the persons in managerial and supervisory positions in all municipal and county governments in the state answered the questionnaire. There are an estimated 3,500 to 3,900 persons in these positions, counting members of county boards of supervisors and police and fire department command officers beneath the rank of captain (that is, lieutenants and sergeants). Without these two classes of positions, there are an estimated 2,900 to 3,300 in managerial and supervisory positions.

(For details about persons answering the questionnaire, see pages 61-62 and Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix B of the full report.)



## Personal Background and Experience

Questions were asked to obtain the age, education, and work experience of the persons who responded.

(For details see pages 63-66 of the full report.)

**Age.** City and county officials who responded to the questionnaire appear to be relatively young, considering the responsible positions they hold. In city government, only about 15 per cent of the respondents were more than 55 years old. The percentage is higher in counties (about one-third of the total), but even here, two-thirds of the respondents are more than ten years away from the normal retirement age of 65.

The relative "youngness" of these officials indicates that a great many, far more than a majority, are still at an age where they would be interested in in-service training.

**Education.** Answers about formal schooling show that:

—one out of six (279) are college graduates (have four or more years of college)

—another one out of six (258) have some college education

—another one out of six (282) have not completed high school

—the remainder (739) have a high school diploma but did not attend college.

**Work Experience.** City and county officials were asked for whom they

worked immediately before they came to their present jobs. More than 1,100 of the 1,600 replied that they worked for private business. A relatively smaller portion said they worked for a government (another municipal or county government, a state or federal government, a school system) as their immediate previous employment.

As might be expected, those officials in responsible positions have rather long tenure. About 60 per cent of them have worked with their city or county for more than ten years, and the tenure is longer in cities than in counties.

More than one-third of the city officials and about one-fourth of the county officials have been in their present positions for less than three years. On the other hand, two out of five of the city officials and about three of five of the county officials have been in their present positions from five to fifteen years.

The fact that persons come with business experience into government much more often than with government experience raises the question as to what experience and training they received in business that is applicable to government. Persons in these positions have considerable tenure in their governmental units, however, and probably have considerable knowledge about the operation of them. They also have considerable experience in the positions they now hold. A considerable number, however, have been in their current capacity for less than three years, indicating probably a fair degree of up-

ward mobility (promotion) and need for in-service training to handle additional responsibilities.



### **Willingness for Additional Training**

Nearly 70 per cent would be willing to enroll in training or continuing education courses if offered at night at a nearby college or community college. Nearly 60 per cent would be willing to enroll in noncredit courses offered by the state universities.

Forty-seven per cent would be willing to take a series of courses, two per year for three years, leading to a certificate (nondegree program) in government management.

A larger proportion of city officials than county officials expressed a willingness to participate in such courses.

### **Kinds of Courses Preferred**

Each respondent was asked to check his five top preferences of fourteen courses proposed in the questionnaire.

The five courses of most interest were: human relations and psychology, supervisory practices in public management, personnel administration, governmental public relations and communications, and management planning.

Not far behind in preference were three courses: public speaking and writing, general public administration, and public law.

### **Abilities Required for Position**

City officials said the abilities or skills most important for their positions are: (1) supervisory skills and (2) technical skills for work in their department, in that order. County officials chose the same two but placed them in reverse order of importance.



## Managerial and Supervisory Training Now Available

Opportunities for local government officials to obtain managerial and supervisory training from Iowa agencies are spotty. Some training courses are offered by agencies outside the state, but generally they are not readily available.

(A listing of these programs is included in Appendix A of the full report.)

Within the state, the three state universities and Drake University primarily have provided a variety of programs for this kind of in-service training, but there is little continuity to the programs and a minimum of coordination of them.

Training usually is offered in short courses and correspondence courses, mostly for city department heads and dealing with management techniques. Discussions with key persons in local government and state associations frequently brought forth the comment that the top officials in local government, through conferences, meetings, and their previous experience, have ample opportunity to gain a perspective of governmental and management affairs, and it is the middle managers and first-line supervisors who need training help. They have little or no opportunity to gain a perspective of government and management affairs.

Apparently in Iowa there are few senior executive-type courses or seminars available to top local officials: mayors, county supervisors, city managers, and department heads of larger cities and counties. Such training would include sessions in leadership, decision making, and utilization of modern management systems and techniques.

## Major Conclusions From Surveys

1. Additional in-service training in management and supervision is needed. Existing programs are spotty; they are uncoordinated, single courses for the most part, and often not readily available.
2. This training is needed (a) to upgrade management skills and broaden the understandings of middle management, and (b) to provide supervisory skills and human and public relations training for first-line supervisors and persons likely to be promoted to such positions. Senior executive type management training also apparently is needed, although not on as large a scale.
3. Local government personnel who responded to the questionnaire (about one-half of the more than 3,000 in these positions) indicated considerable interest in additional in-service training for themselves. They prefer courses close to home on a short-term basis, but nearly one-half of them expressed a willingness to take a series of courses over a period of years. A large majority who are interested would pay part of the cost of the course if this were necessary.
4. Education and experience levels, although widely varied for the group as a whole, are fairly high for many. A large majority have had some continuing education, although one-half not in the last three years and about one-fourth not during the last dozen years.
5. Courses related to handling personnel (human relations, personnel administration, and supervisory practices), handling public relations aspects of their jobs (including public speaking and writing), and handling management planning are of most interest to these persons, but there was significant interest shown in eleven of the fourteen courses proposed in the survey.



### Plans for Development of the Program

The Institute of Public Affairs, with the cooperation of other educational agencies and associations of local government officials in Iowa, is developing plans during the 1968-69 fiscal year for a program of in-service education in local government management. The development of this program is being financed in part by a grant from the federal government under Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964. Two committees, one of local public officials and one of educators, are assisting with the planning and development of a curriculum of continuing education.

In addition to working with the committees, the Institute staff is continually discussing the program with other key persons in government and education, seeking their aid in developing a coordinated program and their interest and support for it.

---

Plans are not complete, but the program will likely include:

- a series of courses from which local government personnel could choose the ones best suited to their individual needs
- noncredit courses, offered at a number of attendance centers throughout the state
- courses geared to needs of managerial and supervisory personnel, but open to other local personnel
- instruction by both regular school faculty and other well-qualified persons with backgrounds and accomplishments in the public service
- courses offered on a continuing basis
- recognition by educational institutions for completion of a series of courses, and probably for completion of individual courses.

It is anticipated that this series of courses will be started on a pilot basis in September, 1969.







STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA



3 1723 02101 7850