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CHAPTER I

Introduction

In recent years, the need for controlling and coordinating institutions of higher education in the United States has become apparent (Glenny, 1964; Berdahl, 1971). The system for doing so in Ohio is similar to that in many other states. In fact, most state controlling and coordinating boards are similar in function and make-up to Ohio's. Thus, a study of Ohio's agency is useful for our understanding of similar agencies in other states. Like many other states, Ohio's state agency, the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) is a nine-member Board, appointed by the Governor, that legally has the responsibility to control and coordinate public institutions of higher education.

In addition to the initial powers given to the Regents by the legislation creating the Board in 1963, the OBR continues to gain power each time legislation is enacted for higher education which specifies that the legislation must be carried out "in accordance with the rules and regulations established by the Ohio Board of Regents."

Because of this phenomenon, the power and authority of the OBR has increased since its creation, raising many questions about the specific definitions of the operations and functions of the OBR.
Many individuals feel the OBR has too much power and authority. The OBR has been under fire from Governor James A. Rhodes who publicly stated when entering office in 1975 that he would like to take away most of its power or even disband the agency entirely. The legislature generally did not agree with the Governor. At the writing of this dissertation in 1976, Ohio has a Republican Governor and a Democratic Legislature. All public evidence to date suggests that this legislature will not diminish any of the OBR's power.

The questions, "what are the operations and functions of the OBR?" and "what might they be?" are timely and important. Although there has been a great deal of attention focused on these issues, there have not been careful analyses and there is little systematic research on controlling and coordinating boards. This research assumes that the general role of the OBR in higher education in Ohio, at present, is as a controlling and coordinating board, and seeks to identify specific operations and functions necessary and appropriate to that role.

The Problem

Many of the major problems facing a controlling and coordinating board may stem from misunderstandings between the various parties involved, as to what the operations and functions of the organization are and what they ought to be. These conflicts can exist at many levels. This study
identifies the operations and functions of the OBR as mandated by the legislature. The perceptions of what the operations and functions of the OBR are and ought to be by members of the Board and staff of the OBR are reported in the study. Also, areas of conflicting perceptions within and between the Board and its staff are identified. The implications of these conflicts are discussed.

Importance of the Study

The Ohio Board of Regents as mandated by the general assembly is a nine-member lay board with two ex officio members of the legislature, which hires a chancellor as the chief executive of a professional staff. The staff's responsibility is to bring to the attention of the Board those issues that must be dealt with by the Board. The staff is full-time and paid; the Board members, appointed by the Governor are not salaried. Each Board member is appointed for a nine-year term. Every three years, three members finish their terms and three new members are appointed by the Governor. This cyclical situation produces the necessity for adjustments in response to demands made by new members. For example, differing personality characteristics and views on policy must be taken into account. At the time of the study, the OBR was experiencing one of these cyclical situations; but one unique in the history of the Board to that time.
During the time of the study the OBR was undergoing a change. First, the OBR's chancellor, James A. (Dolph) Norton, appointed by the previous Democratic Governor, John J. Gilligan, had to deal with the then incumbent Republican Governor, James A. Rhodes. Second, three seats on the Board changed in October, 1975 and were replaced with Governor Rhodes' appointments. When the study began that month, there was speculation within the higher education community that Chancellor Norton would resign because of political factors. There was also speculation that the three new members would make things difficult for the chancellor. This did not happen. While this was a unique situation in the history of the OBR, boards of control and coordination are all subject to change in a similar cyclical manner to the OBR; thus the circumstances investigated here were common and rather typical (Williams, 1967; Berdahl, 1971).

The political factors made this study timely and interesting since the OBR was in a state of flux, trying to reach an equilibrium in dealing with the latest set of changes. Another factor making this study important was that higher education in society was undergoing a change; higher education was attempting to learn how to contend with zero-growth and retrenchment for the first time in several decades. Because of this, the Board was attempting to reckon with new problems and issues. In dealing with them, the OBR was viewed as adapting to its new environment; a continuous process in the life of an organization.
Definition of Terms

When used with a capital letter, the terms "Board," "OBR" and "Regents" will refer to the Ohio Board of Regents. "Coordinating Board" will refer to any state-wide agency for coordinating higher education (Berdahl, 1971). "Coordination" is the process of securing cooperative action in the areas of management, academic affairs, and interinstitutional action using a coordinating board (Berdahl, 1971). "Control" will be used as Lavendar (1965) did in his study of coordination "to refer to that phenomenon which, when exercised at a given level, results in specific and required behavior at a given subordinate level." Whenever the term Ohio Board of Regents is used, it will refer to the entire organization, including the nine-member board and its staff unless otherwise indicated. According to Hartnett (1971),

"Power refers to the ability of individuals or groups to control the policy-making processes....Influence seems to differ from power in that influence connotes informal procedures in contrast to formal ones, and persuasion as opposed to simply giving orders....Authority, on the other hand, refers to power vested in an office or role (that is 'authorized' or institutionally recognized power...) Authority, in other words, is limited and restricted. Power, on the other hand, knows no such limits."
For the purposes of this study, these definitions of power, authority and influence will be used.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is:

1. To describe the operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents as mandated by the legislature and created by the Board itself.

2. To classify the operations and functions of the OBR into categories.

3. To consider 1. and 2., above, with respect to their usefulness for studying controlling and coordinating boards.

Although the legal authority of the Regents and their staff is one and the same, the respective views of Board members and staff members may differ concerning the operations and functions of the entire organization. Assuming such a different perspective between groups might exist, the study tries:

4. To describe the perceptions of the Board members and staff members as to what the operations and functions of the OBR are and ought to be, and to obtain an indication of "how well" those activities are being performed.

5. To identify conflict areas within and between the OBR's Board and staff with respect to what the operations and functions of the OBR are as specified by legis-
lation. To identify conflict areas within and between the OBR's Board and staff with respect to what the operations and functions of the OBR ought to be as described by the members of the Regents and its staff. In investigating what "ought to be," according to the Regents members and their staff, two questions were asked. "What operations and functions should exist that do not?" and "What operations and functions exist that should not?"

6. To suggest possible future directions for the Ohio Board of Regents and to make recommendations based upon both interview data of Board and staff members and extensive observations of all public Board meetings.

Rationale for the Study

The growth of controlling and coordinating boards in the United States is a phenomenon that has affected higher education during the past two decades. As Perkins, (1972) states, "Higher education is in a state of transition. Under the pressures of increased numbers of students and rapidly rising costs, new organizations are being created that are changing the educational landscape. The traditional independence and autonomy of institutions is giving way to state or national coordinating bodies."

The control and coordination of higher education institutions on a state-wide basis has emerged as an issue with a variety of ramifications. In order to justify the increasingly enormous sums of taxpayer dollars that state
legislatures are spending for higher education, controlling and coordinating boards have been created by these legislatures to monitor and control the funds. The reasons used to establish such boards deal with the efficient use of public dollars. These boards control in order to hold institutions accountable to the taxpayer, and they coordinate to make sure that unnecessary duplications of efforts in higher education are not wasting public monies.

The problem arises when considering the work of such boards. Does the board control and coordinate as it should? Very seldom do states evaluate whether or not their agencies are performing effectively. The reason for this is simple; there are no systematically derived criteria for evaluation. This is partly because the operations and functions of agencies such as controlling and coordinating boards, though perhaps clearly defined by the Legislature, can be ill-defined in the minds of individuals (Corwin, 1974; Weick, 1976). Obviously, it is quite difficult to evaluate "how well" a specific activity is being performed, if that activity is not clearly identified. Further, perceptions of individuals vary tremendously as to what the goals and priorities for higher education are in society, making the task of developing criteria a very complex one (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972). In fact, the literature has been unable to define what controlling
and coordinating boards are supposed to do, although attempts have been made (Carnegie Commission, 1971; Perkins, 1972; Berdahl, 1975). This study contributes toward establishing a basis for evaluating the operations and functions of controlling and coordinating boards in the future. This dissertation is an attempt to utilize a proposed conceptual framework to study the operations and functions of controlling and coordinating boards and explore the perceptions of members of the board and staff of one such agency.

There is a dearth of literature concerning controlling and coordinating boards. The study of control and coordination in a systematic manner is not at a state where broad scale "theories" have been generated. Most of the literature has been written as historical memoirs or opinion pieces. There is a distinct lack of systematic observation or description in this area. The empirical literature consists predominantly of "national trend surveys" that tend to deal superficially with specific aspects of coordinating and controlling board operations and functions.

This study contributes to that empirical literature by describing the reality of one controlling and coordinating board, the Ohio Board of Regents, as an example of such boards nationally. This was done by describing its operations and functions in a systematic manner. These operations and functions were classified in order to
further study the perceptions of the Regents Board and staff members concerning them. By beginning to identify the kinds of variables that will ultimately be useful for theory building in this area in the future, this study may contribute to the systematic knowledge about controlling and coordinating boards and what they do.

There were many individuals whose opinions concerning the OBR would have been interesting to study. Those individuals include the Governor, state legislators, college and university presidents, and key political figures.

Although the boundary line defining who should participate could have been drawn in many places, the limitations of time, money and access helped determine where it was drawn. The specific questions addressed in this study concern specific operations and functions of the Board of Regents, which are not particularly well known to individuals outside of the OBR. For this reason only Board members and the chief decision-makers of the OBR staff were interviewed. They were the most knowledgable sources of information concerning the questions of this dissertation: those activities which they, themselves, engage in. The limitations of time and money also were factors considered.
Discussion of Operations and Functions

What are meant by the operations and functions of the OBR? It is important to understand what these are as they are perceived by those individuals who have the legal "authority" in the Weberian (1947) sense, to carry out the operations and activities of the Regents.

Although as Hartnett (1971) suggests, lay boards and their staffs have different roles, the legal authority for their activities is one and the same. The staff has the responsibility to present Board members with those issues that need attention. After the Board makes the policy decisions concerning the issues, the staff again assumes the responsibility for carrying them out.

Since the staff controls what information is given to the lay Board members, the question of who controls whom is important to ask. Discussing the issue, Hartnett (1971) writes:

"The questions, 'Who holds the power?' and 'How much power?' are too simplistic. No one group really 'holds' the power or even a certain portion of it. Power is situation dependent. The allocation of power in certain situations depends on which group can marshal support for its position. The person or group with authority (which is not synonymous with power) usually has a tactical advantage in jockeying for power, but authority alone is never sufficient in the face of substantial, relevant opposition. Even the question 'Who had the power in that specific situation?' often cannot be answered for a long time, for often the final settlement of a crisis or disagreement is not clear for many months.... It seems equally naive to ask 'Who should have the power?' Since situations vary...power is inevitably elusive."
For the purpose of this study, operations and functions have been defined as those formal and informal activities that are characteristic of the Board. These activities can further be defined as those behaviors that are engaged in by both Board and staff members, whether they are mandated by the legislature or not. Those activities that are mandated have been designated as "formal", and those that are not are "informal."

What type of behavior constitutes a formal or an informal activity? A formal activity is one that is undertaken by the Regents which has been mandated by the legislature, such as reporting annually to the Governor and the general assembly on the findings from its studies and the Master Plan for Higher Education for the state. Informal activities are unwritten and not mandated. For example, although the law states that the Board must provide information to both the legislative and executive branches of government concerning higher education, the informal lobbying that occurs over lunch between the chief executive and his friends on the Board would be considered an "informal" activity. Although "lobbying" is not an official function of the OBR, one of the formal activities does include representing higher education to the legis-
lature and the Governor. Most often, the Board's staff represents the interests of higher education in an advocacy role to the legislature, and when the staff works closely with the Board, specific Board members who are close to the Governor may "lobby" him on behalf of higher education. These lobbying or "advocacy" activities are formal.

The activities explored in this dissertation were the formal operations and functions, only. Studying the formal activities was necessary before an understanding of the entire organization was possible (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1938; Taylor, 1911; Selznick, 1969). Thus, this study provides the foundations on which other investigations can be based.

In addition to the "formal" and "informal" distinctions made above, the operations and functions of the OBR could be classified into "originally mandated" and "additional expansion" categories. However, for the purpose of this study, the distinction between "originally mandated" and "additional expansion" operations and functions is not necessary. The importance attached to such a question is one of historical interest only. "Originally mandated" operations and functions are those that are
specified in House Bill 214 of the 105th General Assembly which created the Ohio Board of Regents. "Additional expansion" operations and functions are those activities that have been mandated since the original bill. The question in this study deals with the present operations and functions of the OBR, and the distinction between original and expanded activities is not significant for the purpose here. The question does not change the present nature of the activity unless it is amended out of the law at a later date.

Limitations of Study

This study is limited to the "formal" operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents. Excluded entirely from the study is a consideration of any informal activities the Board may engage in. The study limits itself to those six objectives identified as the purpose of the study:

1. To describe the operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents as mandated by the legislature and created by the Board itself.

2. To classify the operations and functions of the OBR into categories.

3. To consider 1. and 2., above, with respect to their usefulness for studying controlling and coordinating boards.
4. To describe the perceptions of the Board members and staff members as to what the operations and functions of the OBR are and ought to be, and to obtain an indication of "how well" those activities are being performed.

5. To identify conflict areas within and between the OBR's Board and staff with respect to what the operations and functions of the OBR are as specified by legislation. To identify conflict areas within and between the OBR's Board and staff with respect to what the operations and functions of the OBR ought to be as described by the members of the Regents and its staff. In investigating what "ought to be," according to the Regents members and their staff, two questions were asked of them: "What operations and functions exist that should not?" and "What operations and functions should exist that do not?"

6. To suggest possible future directions for the Ohio Board of Regents and to make recommendations based upon both interview data and observations.

Methods and Procedures

This dissertation identified the operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents as a controlling and coordinating board. What these operations and functions should be and what they were mandated to be were compared with one another. Conflict areas were identified. To explore
this, interviews were conducted with six of the present members of the Regents Board and four selected members of the staff. Three members of the Board and one additional member of the staff who were asked to participate, did not for a variety of reasons, the implications of which will be discussed later.

In addition to the interviews, the investigator attended every public monthly meeting of the Board beginning in October, 1975 and ending in May, 1976. During these meetings the investigator took extensive notes and compared the observations with at least one other individual who wished to remain anonymous. Each month, on the third Friday of the month, the Board met informally in the morning to discuss future topics of concern and then met again in the afternoon to conduct its formal meetings. Both morning and afternoon sessions were observed by the investigator. The extensive notes became part of the data base used in the study.

In order to study the questions posed above, information was obtained using the many primary sources in the Office of the OBR. These included the minutes of all meetings, the Regents publications, the Regents annual reports, and the five year master plans. Information was also obtained from the Ohio Revised Code and many newspaper articles.
The Board and staff of the OBR each represented a "group" as defined by Bobbitt, Breinholt, Doktor and McNaul (1974). Bobbitt, et. al. stated: A group is a collection of individuals among whom a set of interdependent relationships exists (that is, the individuals influence each other)." Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) defined a "psychological group" as members who share norms, beliefs, a set of values or an ideology. In many respects the Board and staff are "psychological groups." Though both groups share many norms, each group endorses some norms that the other does not endorse. The investigator determined where differences of opinion existed in each group on specific questions, such as whether there were differing opinions about how much power the OBR should have or how much autonomy the individual institutions should have.

Initially, the operations and functions of the OBR were identified as mandated by the legislature and created by the Board itself. A conceptual framework was developed to classify the operations and functions of the OBR into categories. The usefulness of this conceptual scheme for studying controlling and coordinating boards was explored. The interviews produced data which identified and described the perceptions of the Board members and staff members as to what the operations and functions of the OBR are and ought
to be, and "how well" those activities are being performed. The data also enabled the identification of conflict areas within and between the OBR's Board and staff with respect to what the operations and functions of the OBR are as specified by the legislature and what they ought to be as described by the members of the Regents Board and staff.

Outline of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter II is a discussion of the literature which deals with the concepts of control and coordination.

Chapter III is a brief history of higher education coordination in Ohio from the inception of the Inter-University Council in the 1930's to the creation of the Ohio Board of Regents in the 1960's to the present. The information in Chapter III should help to give the study a historical perspective.

Chapter IV describes the conceptual framework developed for the identification and categorization of the formal operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Chapter V discusses and details the methodology of the interview process used in the study and analyses the interview data by question.
Chapter VI contains the conclusions of the study and discusses those issues identified on pages 4-5 in the "Purposes of the Study." In this chapter, the investigator also suggests possible future directions for the Ohio Board of Regents.
CHAPTER II

Higher Education in Ohio Before 1963

Higher education coordination in Ohio had its beginning in 1939 when the Inter-University Council (IUC) was formed. This voluntary group consisted of the six state supported institutions of higher education in the state: (1) Ohio University, (2) Miami University, (3) The Ohio State University, (4) Bowling Green State University, (5) Kent State University, and (6) Central State College (Driver, 1970; Tucker, 1973; Millett, 1974).

At that time, Central State University did not exist as it does today. Central State evolved from a department at Wilberforce University, a private college. This department however, was receiving state appropriations, and therefore joined the other five state assisted institutions in creating the Inter-University Council. The recession in the thirties caused revenues to decrease at a time when enrollments were predicted to increase. Two institutions, Ohio State, and Miami University initiated a drive to bring together individuals from the state schools in order to identify and discuss proposed solutions to their common problems. (Driver, 1970).

Before the Inter-University Council was formed, each institution was on its own. Each one prepared and planned its own program and budget requests to the legislature. They would submit and lobby individually with-
out even considering other institutions. From 1939 until 1963, when the Ohio Board of Regents was established, the only form of higher education coordination in Ohio was the Inter-University Council. The individuals who represented the institutions on the IUC were the institutions' presidents. Tucker (1973) points out:

"An understanding of the modus operandi of the Council is essential since, in some respect, it is still employed by the IUC's successor, the OBR. Within a year after the IUC was formed, it assumed the responsibility of recommending to the Director of Finance how the anticipated appropriation for higher education should be divided among the institutions. Should the anticipated appropriation not materialize, each institution agreed to share the reduction at the same percentage rate as in the requests. If agreeing on a joint appropriations request became the cornerstone of the voluntary organization, then the sharing of reductions on the same basis was the keystone. Failure in 1960 to agree on either of these two points signaled the impending demise of the IUC."

Clearly, conflict plagued the IUC from its inception. There were no criteria to use in deciding which institution should get what share of the appropriations. Although, it was assumed without question that Ohio State University would get the majority of the appropriations due to its graduate and professional programs, the money available was fought after constantly. Every biennium, the university presidents would negotiate with each other, the Governor and the State Director of Finance, trying to get a larger appropriation for their institutions. According to Berdahl (1971),
"John Millett, himself a participant for many years in the Ohio voluntary group, has recently described its former budget deliberations as paralleling 'almost exactly' those of the Defense Department in the pre-McNamara days when the service chief's split up the defense appropriations on the basis of relatively fixed percentages of the total, and each branch went its own way."

In reality, however, the IUC minutes show that the participation of the Governor and the State Director of Finance, made the process of obtaining appropriations much more complicated than just having the university presidents decide among themselves how the appropriations would be split up. These appropriations were often in a state of flux and depended upon many political factors and often on the passing of specific legislation. A great deal of informal lobbying was done by the individual institutions. Some of this lobbying was done by the presidents, but more was done by the university's lobbyists and especially prominent university trustees, who could influence political decisions.

Tucker stresses the important character of the debates in the 1940's over whether or not two-year institutions should be financed by the state, predominantly because of the shortage of funds at the time, and because not only were the institutions competing with each other for state appropriations, but higher education, itself, was competing with other state agencies.
He states:

"This concern over competition for state tax dollars from other potential public institutions of higher education was a recurring theme in the minutes of the Council. This is understandable in light of the economic conditions in 1940; the universities continued opposition to junior or community colleges, however, reflected, among other things, the low level of public spending for higher education in Ohio. In the decades following World War II, whatever the needs for a rationally developed plan for the growth of higher education, the state universities attempted to pursue a course which would limit competition for educational monies and leave them in control of the system."

In addition to the development of the two-year institutional policy, the IUC also attempted to deal with the granting of Ph. D.'s. Until 1959, only Ohio State and Ohio University offered Ph. D. programs, but soon thereafter, the legislature gave Miami University, Kent State, and Bowling Green the same right.

Most institutions capitalized on it, thus producing an expansion of doctoral programs. Lack of coordination of two-year institutions and graduate education programs resulted from political realities inherent in the IUC's inability to agree or control those areas where there was no consensus as to what should be done. Tucker suggests that there was no control factor, and the only time the council was really effective was when it agreed, which was usually only on financial matters. Another criticism of the IUC was that it "lacked a mandate," according to Tucker.
He explains,

"It was not legally responsible for anything. When issues of importance for higher education were raised in the Council, if they did not receive general support they were dropped. In many respects, the Council was a forum where the several institutions kept each other more or less informed about their activities."

Nevertheless, some policies adopted by the voluntary coordinating board set precedents which developed into the present patterns of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Perhaps this might have been due to the fact that individuals in higher education were concerned about legislatively controlled "superboards", which would take various amounts of power, authority and autonomy away from the institutions, themselves. This fear made it seem worthwhile to coordinate voluntarily since a total lack of action might have hastened the process of legislative coordination. Glenny (1964) supports this view by stating,

"Without exception the well-known voluntary structures have arisen only after the state legislature orders or threatens to establish a single governing board or a coordinating agency with legal power. One of the main purposes is to ward off imminent threats of outside controls."

In the late fifties, however, there were a series of reports published that described the state of higher education in Ohio. In 1956, the Ohio College Association requested Governor C. William O'Neill to appoint a commission to study future plans for higher education in Ohio. In 1957, the Ohio Commission on Education Beyond the High
School was formed, and in 1958, its report was issued. Many of the members on the commission were also on the IUC, and so there was cooperation between the two. According to Driver (1970), the Commission,

"had developed a set of thirteen basic assumptions... these assumptions were basic in nature and mostly called attention to the expected substantial increases in enrollments and the resulting need for more facilities, more teachers, a more favorable geographic distribution of institutions and wider diversity of programs..."

The Interim Commission - OBR's Predecessor

The report (Commission, 1958) was a very broad philosophical statement and was not a specific plan for action. So the 103rd Ohio General Assembly established an Interim Commission on Education Beyond the High School to deal effectively with the educational issues. The law gave this Commission the following charge:

"1. Plan for the future welfare of higher education to the best traditions of the state of Ohio;

2. Direct its attention to the expansion and the excellence of education beyond the high school;

3. Cooperate with the state board of education to integrate secondary education with education beyond the high school and to establish closer ties between high schools and colleges;

4. Conduct studies of the need for and desirability of establishment of technical institutions, junior colleges, and university branches, the ways and means by which such institutions and two-year colleges should be organized, chartered, supervised, and financed, and the possible locations at which such institutions might be established;
5. Conduct studies of laws and policies governing admissions to state supported colleges and universities;

6. Conduct studies of the need for achievement and aptitude tests and of a state scholarship and loan program;

7. Conduct studies of the financial need of and possible state aid to municipal universities;

and 8. Conduct studies of the need for and desirability of educational television and of the legislative, administrative, and financial requirements of such educational television."

The Commission never published a final report. But it did submit to the legislature and the Governor mimeographed information concerning the problems of higher education. These informal reports did a great deal to bring to the public's attention the problems of higher education that the Ohio Board of Regents would ultimately have to reckon with. In fact, according to Driver,

"Dr. John D. Millett, who later became the first Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, has suggested that this coordinating board is really the successor to the Interim Commission since it was intended to cope with problems of coordination rather than cooperation."

The problems of coordination rather than cooperation were concerns of the institutions at the time. They viewed coordinating boards as a threat to their institutional autonomy because these "super-boards" were perceived to be controlling boards and were not just advisory. Thus, the possibility of losing an indeterminant amount of institutional autonomy was ever-present. The perceptions of the
higher education community were basically correct; the Ohio Board of Regents was being conceived as a controlling and coordinating board. Several individuals, however, were also disturbed because of confusion centering on whether the OBR would be a "governing" board for the state. (Millett, 1975). According to Millett, the distinction between a controlling board and a governing board is that in the former, each institution maintains its own board of trustees, and in the later, boards of trustees are abolished and the state's governing board acts as the board of trustees for each institution in the state. There is a difference in the amount of institutional autonomy. If the OBR had been conceived as a governing board, it would have acted as a board of trustees and would have been involved in the internal management of each public institution. This, of course, did not happen. The internal management of each public institution was preserved and thereby maintained its own board of trustees. Thus, the Ohio Board of Regents, by leaving internal management decisions to each board of trustees, allowed institutional autonomy to prevail. Indeed, the decision was made by the Ohio General Assembly.

During the late fifties and early sixties, there was a great fear that a "superboard", or state board
for higher education, would be formed and would take over
the responsibilities of the boards of trustees of the indi-
vidual institutions. In 1960, during a period of unrest
and problems, President Baker of Ohio University, who was
also the President of the IUC, wrote to the other Council
members saying:

"All of these divisive forces many of which come from
within the Council itself are appearing at a time
when there is much discussion of a central controlling
board for higher education in Ohio. If we cannot
agree on our budgets and support them loyally as
a group, the effectiveness of our system so
laboriously built up will decline rapidly."

The following year several efforts were made by
the IUC to forestall the coming of compulsory coordination,
that would create more two-year institutions, and erode
the power of the existing institutions. In Driver's
(1970) work, he interviewed Mr. William B. Coulter
who was the Executive Secretary of the IUC at that
time. These interviews give a great deal of insight
into the reasons why the IUC could not accom plish what
it would have had to in order to dispell the need for
a coordinating board. According to Driver, Mr. Coulter
"The universities were hung up on a very basic problem and I think it was a very real one and understandably. That was that Ohio had never demonstrated any really outstanding willingness to support higher education at the state level. And the universities had a very real fear that any move to set up a broader system of institutions or to undertake any kind of a new commitment was simply going to be a matter of spreading even farther the limited funds that the legislature had traditionally been willing to make available. And, I think they had a very good point. I think this probably, more than anything else was what caused them as a group to kind of drag their feet throughout this time. They hated to see the state take on this commitment when they did not feel that the state was doing adequately what it had already committed itself to do."

Because of many factors, Mr. Coulter realized that although the IUC had changed its constitution to give it more powers for coordination, it became clear that the kinds of tasks that needed to be done could not be done by the members of the IUC, who, as presidents of institutions did not have the time to devote to such laborious studies as were necessary to take action on the real issues.

According to Driver, Mr. Coulter recalled,

"The state obviously was beginning to clamor for much more thorough-going coordination of higher education. It seemed apparent to me that, unless the Council got moving awfully fast, it just could not be the vehicle. Because the state would not wait for it politically. I really think that probably was the last opportunity that I had to stimulate some real activity. Beyond that time we did some work in terms of interinstitutional studies and data exchange, particularly in a financial area, which, I think were very productive...I do not think there was ever a real threat after that moment that the Council was going to be the coordinating body in Ohio. I think it was inevitable then that the legislature would take it away from them, and the legislature did, of course."
Establishment of OBR

The Ohio Board of Regents was established in the political environment of the early 1960's. In November of 1962, James A. Rhodes was elected Governor of Ohio. One of his campaign promises was the establishment of a Board of Regents to tackle the problems of higher education in Ohio. After his election, the political decision was made, especially since other states had been moving toward statutory coordination in this period. The trend was set, nationally, (as of 1962, twenty-eight states had state-wide coordinating boards) but the decisions to do so were not always as rational as promised. (Driver, 1970). Many shared Henderson's (1966) view,

"The band-wagon mood about compulsory planning and coordination causes noncritical observers to assume that a state board will always provide itself with reliable data, will always make wise decisions, will refrain from enlarging its power, and will continue to be noble and professional in its actions after the initial period of missionary zeal has passed. The New York experience negates these assumptions; it shows how a long-standing board can fail to keep alert to the public interest, and also how a power-conscious government can suck such institutions of higher education into its vortex."

After several attempts to amend H.B. 214 creating the Ohio Board of Regents were unsuccessful, it passed easily in both houses of the 105th Ohio General Assembly. The Board would consist of nine public members appointed
by the Governor with Senate confirmation and the chair-
men of the Senate and the House Education Committees to
act as ex officio members without a vote. The Board
would have specific advisory, study-making and policy-
making responsibilities. Governor Rhodes signed the
bill into law on June 21, 1963, to become effective
September 20, 1963. As Driver put it, "For voluntary
coordination in Ohio, it was the end of the road."
During this study, several individuals reminded the
investigator of the fact that the OBR was created in
an atmosphere of violent disagreement about the nature
of controlling and coordinating boards especially
among the institutions and their presidents. These disagree-
ments affected the development of the OBR.

The Choosing of John Millett

The events that occurred immediately after September
20, 1963 are described by John Millett (1974):

"Governor Rhodes promptly appointed nine members
of the Board of Regents and called them together in
his office for their first meeting on September 23rd.
All nine were prominent citizens; including Representa-
tive Oyster who resigned his position as a member
of the General Assembly. He was selected as the first
chairman. The Board began to function with a temporary
staff. It took two major actions. The Board began to
look for consultants to help the Board to prepare
a master plan, and in January, 1964, selected the
Academy for Educational Development, an offshoot of
the Ford Foundation, to undertake this task. Secondly,
under the leadership of a special committee chaired by John Marshall Briley of Toledo, the Board began a search for a director...at a meeting of the Inter-University Council I learned the news that the Board of Regents had decided upon the title of chancellor for its executive officer...In February, 1964, I was asked to meet in Columbus with four members of the Board of Regents; the Chairman, Mr. Briley, and the two members of Mr. Briley's selection committee. They informed me that they wished to offer me the appointment as director and chancellor of the Board, with the commitment of the Governor that the law would be changed in 1964 to provide the title of chancellor."

It was. And on June 30, 1964, John D. Millett resigned as President of Miami University. On July 1, 1964, he became Director and Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

The State of Higher Education in 1963

Millett (1974) discusses the state of higher education when the Ohio Board of Regents began to operate in September, 1963. He says,

"First of all, the time was at hand when substantial enrollment increases were expected; the time for analysis and discussion were past and the time for action had arrived. Second, the State of Ohio now had an activist Governor and a legislature disposed to cooperate with him. Third, the State of Ohio now had a state board of higher education that was a permanent agency of state government and that had the capacity to act with or without the unanimous approval of the six state universities. And in the fourth place, the Board of Regents was preparing to move forward rapidly as a planning agency."
The major issues identified by Millett during his tenure are hinted at above. He discusses them as (1) enrollment, (2) program expansion, (3) medical education, (4) the impact upon private higher education and, (5) budgeting. Tucker (1973) looks at the Millett years from political, educational and financial perspectives. These are basically the same issues that are being dealt with by the Regents today.

Millett's View of Planning

Because John Millett was the first chancellor of the OBR, he had the opportunity to develop the Regents and influence the manner in which it evolved. One of the most striking examples of how Millett influenced the development of the Board can be studied by noting how he viewed the concept of planning. He states,

I think of planning as preparation for action. To me, the important aspect of planning in any enterprise is the action that results from the process. I want to emphasize the word 'action.' I differentiate planning as a process from such other activities as research or the formulation of concepts of knowledge.... Planning may, and indeed I think should, make use of research and knowledge. Yet, planning is a different process, a process for undertaking governmental or other activity....Because planning is preparation for action, it must be practical. In other words, planning means preparing to do something that can be accomplished. As I understand the meaning of this word, "practical", it involves at least three character-
istics; the work to be done must be socially accept-
able, the work must be technologically possible
(in other words, there is a work process available
to produce the desired output), and the work must
be financially feasible."

The Issues - Growth in 1963

In 1963, when the Board of Regents was formed, a
rapid growth of higher education enrollment in Ohio
was predicted for the mid-sixties. Indeed, enrollments
did increase. Ohio's public institutions of higher
education had enrollments that rose from 73,000 students
in 1955 to 96,000 in 1960, to 174,000 in 1965, and
280,000 in 1970. Enrollments in private institutions
also increased during this period, but not nearly as
much.

Open Access

One of the goals of the first chancellor was to
make "open access" to higher education a reality in
Ohio. Millett interpreted Ohio's 1913 law providing
open access to public higher education as accomodating
any high school graduate who wants to attend a public
college or university literally, an interpretation
which is still used by the Board. In order to make open
access a reality the OBR adopted a policy to locate a
two-year campus within thirty miles of every person in the state and to locate a four-year campus in all eight major urban areas of the state.

**Acquisition of New 4-Year Institutions**

By 1967, Ohio had six new state institutions in order to achieve the goal. In 1967 the municipal institutions in Akron and Toledo became state universities. Fenn College, a private institution in Cleveland became Cleveland State University. The University of Cincinnati began to acquire state revenues. Wright State University in Dayton grew out of a branch program in the area. And, Youngstown State University was created from a private institution.

**Creation of 2-Year Institutions**

During the same period of time, university branch campuses, community colleges, and technical colleges were being built. By 1972 there were four community colleges, twenty-four branch campuses and eighteen technical colleges. The General Assembly had authorized all three types of institutions without a rationale or plan as to what type of two-year institution or system would best suit the needs of the people of the State of Ohio. The interview data of this dissertation supports
the view that this non-system plagues the OBR to this day. Millett's concept of the role of the Board in this area, which has survived to date, is to "prevent a duplication of facilities offering the same instructional programs in the same service area." In the sixties, enrollment needs were by and large met. By 1972, enrollment leveled off. The major problem that access has created is a problem of what kind of instructional programs are appropriate to a 'mass' enrollment.

New Program Developments

During the period between 1968 and 1972, there were three major areas that required new program developments; technical education, doctoral degree education, and medical education. By a new degree program, the Regents defined their criteria as an entirely new curriculum, leading to a degree in an area where such a program had not existed before in public higher education in the state. The technical education problems dealt with its expansion in the state. Doctoral education problems were concerned with the restriction of such programs. Medical education problems dealt with the uncertainty of expansion in terms of the quantity and type necessary for the state, and the extraordinary problems of medical education costs.
Millett's concept of how the OBR exercised its authority in the area of program approval formed the basis for the Board's interpretation of its activities concerning the approval of new degree programs to date. According to Millett,

"the approval of new degree programs was essentially threefold: (1) was there a reasonably evident need for the program; (2) would the program be an unnecessary or expensive duplication of an existing program offered by another public college or university; and (3) would the program have the necessary financial support, either from an adjustment in current resources or from the reasonable prospect of increased appropriations in the next biennium."

Quality control was left up to accrediting agencies, and all Board approval was conditional upon the obtaining of accreditation.

Technical Education and Doctoral Programs

The 1971 Master Plan exemplifies the Board's decisions concerning both technical education and doctoral programs at the time. Technical education programs were expanded and developed considerably and grew into a vital portion of the higher education community during this period. Doctoral programs were restricted and not allowed to expand in the manner that most presidents of institutions would have liked. According to Millett, it appeared to many presidents that the way to make their institutions more prestigious and obtain more funds was to develop
doctoral programs. Nevertheless, the Regents, in 1972, established a policy statement that was agreed to by all the state universities that named Ohio State and Cincinnati to be

"recognized as the leading research universities offering an extensive scope of doctoral degree programs, with a heavy emphasis upon research competence. Bowling Green State University, Kent State University, Miami University and Ohio University were expected to emphasize the education of graduate students primarily for careers as undergraduate instructors in four year colleges. The public universities in major urban areas were asked to concentrate their development of doctoral programs in professional fields for persons already employed in their area and desiring improved professional competence."

Between 1964 and 1972, forty new doctoral degree programs were created, but by 1973 new doctoral degree programs were seldom approved.

Medical Education

The problems of medical education were complex and difficult to deal with. Ohio desperately needed doctors and so the Ohio General Assembly passed a bill creating the Medical College of Ohio at Toledo in December, 1964. To build this college was an effort that was wrought with conflicting philosophies of medical education between the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents and the medical
profession. The conflict was clearly won by the medical profession, thus creating a great deal of frustration for the Regents and its Chancellor during this period. The Medical College of Toledo was built according to the way the medical educators wanted it; as a health science center that combines research, internships, residency training, patient care, education in all areas of the health professions, and medical education. Millett describes this center as a place "where the emphasis is upon the expansion of knowledge in the health sciences rather than upon the education of doctors." The Board of Regents wanted to create this medical college using existing facilities in Toledo, but without the "health science center" approach, the medical educators would not approve of it.

The problems of medical education and the shortage of doctors in Ohio were not resolved in 1972, and are still not resolved today because of their complexity. For example, one real problem in medical education is its enormous cost, though the Legislature has thus far been willing to bear it. Another problem is the misconception that the total number of doctors educated is insufficient for society's needs, when in reality the "shortage of doc-
tors" phenomenon in this country may be a function of poor distribution within specialties, i.e. too many surgeons and not enough family practitioners; and poor distribution across geographical areas, i.e. too many in the suburbs of large cities and not enough in the inner city or rural areas.

The financial policies for higher education that the Board of Regents adopted during the Millett years remain to date. Though most of these policies were mandated by law, the OBR's interpretations of them as they were formally developed into the Rules and Regulations of the Board are still intact.

Millett's Resignation, Norton's Appointment

The Ohio Board of Regents was created at a time when there was a Republican Governor, a Republican Legislature and the first Chancellor of the OBR was a friend of Governor James A. Rhodes. Millett's own technique of working with the Governor and the General Assembly ceased to be effective when in November of 1970, John J. Gilligan, a Democrat, was elected Governor of Ohio. He took office in January of 1971. Although the General Assembly remained in the control of the Republicans, the first Chancellor's
problems began. As he put it, (Millett, 1974)

"...I found that my influence depended in large
part upon my relationship to the Governor. Governor
Rhodes and I became friends; I came to like and to
respect him. I think he liked me. I did not and could
not have the same relationship to Governor Gilligan
after January, 1971."

In September, 1971, John Millett announced his re-
tirement from the Board of Regents and on July 1, 1972,
William Coulter, the present Vice-Chancellor for Adminis-
tration became the Acting Chancellor. In the fall of 1972,
the first appointments from Governor John J. Gilligan came
to the OBR, and in the spring of 1973, James A. (Dolph)
Norton was announced to become the second Chancellor of
the Ohio Board of Regents. He officially began in July,

Norton's Responsibilities
As soon as Dr. Norton became Chancellor and came
to the Ohio Board of Regents, he convened the Citizens
Task Force on Higher Education for the State of Ohio. Its
charge was outlined in Amended Substitute House Bill No.
86, the 1973-75 Biennial Appropriations Act, which dis-
cussed pressing public policy issues confronting higher
education in Ohio. In May, 1974, the Task Force made its
report on a variety of issues in higher education, with
specific recommendations.
In November, 1974, John Gilligan lost the Gubernatorial election to James A. Rhodes and the Ohio Board of Regents found itself with a new Chancellor appointed by a former Governor of an opposite political party, a Republican Governor, and a Democratic legislature. In October 1975, when this study began, James A. Rhodes appointed three new members of the Board.

Philosophies of Dr. Norton

The philosophies of Dr. Norton and Dr. Millett toward higher education issues were similar, but the manner in which Dr. Millett assumed the Chancellorship was quite different to that of Dr. Norton, although these differences were probably more due to their personality differences than any other factor.

Dr. Norton's philosophies are perhaps best expressed in the forthcoming 1976 Master Plan for Higher Education, just as Dr. Millett's philosophies pervaded the Master Plan of 1971. But, Norton's concept of planning is interesting to note. Three weeks before his official duties began at the OBR, Dr. Norton gave the Commencement Address at Kent State University in which he said,
"The planning process, for a system as large and complex as post-secondary education in Ohio, is quite intricate. It involves far more persons and activities than we sometimes recognize. It begins with an awareness of widely diverse needs and a recognition of complex goals for the system and of the system. To plan demands that we try to clarify the needs and goals, to put some things in first place and others in lesser rank, to establish standards that let us measure our accomplishment. As we plan, we analyse the situation within which our institutions work and how they work, we assess and create resources. Some alternatives will stand out; others must be invented, and there is the difficult process of choosing among them; making decisions, and encouraging their implementation; and at all times monitoring and evaluating what is going on. It is a process in which continuing feedback serves to correct and stimulate decisions affecting the long-term future. Planning utilizes the pragmatism of trial and error just as does science."

The social and political climate of Dr. Millett's tenure was far different than that of Dr. Norton. Although the major economic, political and educational issues by and large were the same, the problems of 1976 are set in an environment of retrenchment rather than growth. There are a few exceptions, but higher education is no longer expanding and is being forced to set its priorities carefully because of limited resources.
CHAPTER III

Identification, Description and Classification of the Operations and Functions of the Ohio Board of Regents at Present

The investigator developed a classification system for the operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents in order to gain a better understanding of the organization's formal activities. There are three kinds of operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents identified; those that have been mandated by the legislature, those that have been adopted formally by the Board to carry out legislative acts, and those "informal" activities which are not being dealt with in this study. Developing meaningful categories for these operations and functions was a difficult task because of the complex nature of the activities. Before a categorization could be developed, however, the investigator had to compile a list of all formal activities of the Board, since no such compilation existed. The process used to develop it consisted of reading as many documents as possible to ascertain what the OBR was mandated to do. Using predominantly the OBR's internal working papers, the Ohio Revised Code and the Ohio Board of Regents Rules, fifty-four operations and functions were identified. They are numbered.
"The Ohio Board of Regents shall:

1. Make studies of state policy in the field of higher education and formulate a master plan for higher education for the state, considering the needs of the people, the needs of the state, and the role of individual public and private institutions within the state in fulfilling these needs.

2. Report annually to the governor and the general assembly on the findings from its studies and the master plan for higher education for the state.

3. Approve or disapprove the establishment of new branches or academic centers of state colleges and universities.

4. Approve or disapprove the establishment of state technical institutes or any other state institution of higher education.

5. Recommend (to all state supported institutions of higher education) the nature of the programs, undergraduate, graduate, professional, state financed research, and public services which should be offered by the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education in order to utilize to the best advantage their facilities and personnel.

6. Recommend to the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education programs which could be eliminated because they constitute unnecessary duplication, or for other good and sufficient cause.

7. Recommend to the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education programs which should be added to their present programs.

8. Conduct studies for the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education to assist them in making the best and most efficient use of their existing facilities and personnel.
9. Make recommendations to the governor and general assembly concerning the development of state financed capital plans for higher education; the establishment of new state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education; and the establishment of new programs at the existing state colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education.

10. Review the appropriation requests of the public community colleges and the state colleges and universities and submit to the department of finance and to the chairmen of the finance committees of the house of representatives and of the senate its recommendations in regard to the biennial higher education appropriation for the state, including appropriations for the individual state colleges and universities and public community colleges. The board shall work in close cooperation with the director of finance in this respect and in all other matters concerning the expenditure of appropriated funds by state colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education.

11. Seek the cooperation and advice of the officers and trustees of both public and private colleges, universities and other institutions of higher education in the state in performing its duties and making its plans, studies, and recommendations.

12. Appoint advisory committees consisting of persons associated with public or private secondary schools, members of the state board of education, or personnel of the state department of education.

13. Appoint advisory committees consisting of colleges and university personnel, or other persons knowledgeable in the field of higher education, or both, in order to obtain their advice and assistance in defining and suggesting solutions for the problems and needs of higher education in this state.

14. Approve or disapprove all new degrees and new degree programs at all state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education.
15. Adopt such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

16. The Ohio Board of Regents shall approve or disapprove proposed official plans of community college districts.

17. The Ohio Board of Regents shall prepare a state plan and do all other things necessary for participation in federal acts relative to the construction of higher education academic facilities.

18. Private institutions of higher education with less than $12,500,000 endowment may use eminent domain in acquiring land approval of the Ohio Board of Regents.

19. The Board may enter into agreements with non-public schools of medicine and dentistry to receive state support.

20. Each school or college of medicine supported in whole or in part by the state shall create a curriculum for and maintain a department of family practice, the purpose of which shall be to acquaint undergraduates with and to train postgraduate physicians for the practice of family medicine. The minimum requirements for the department shall include courses of study in family care, including clinical experience, a program of preceptorship and a program of family practice residencies in university or other hospital settings. Funds appropriated by the general assembly in support of family practice programs shall not be disbursed until the Ohio Board of Regents has certified that the intent and requirements are being met.

21. The Ohio Board of Regents shall establish and administer an instructional grants program for full-time undergraduate students in an Ohio institution of higher education which is state assisted or which has received a certificate of authorization from the board.
22. Subject to the provisions of the applicable appropriation measure, appropriations made to state supported and state assisted institutions of higher education and to the Ohio Board of Regents for the purposes of this division shall be transferred by the treasurer of state at the times and in the amounts necessary to meet all payments required to be made by such institutions and by the Ohio Board of Regents to the Ohio public facilities commission pursuant to leases or agreements made by them with such commission.

23. All public post high school technical education programs shall be operated by technical colleges, community colleges, universities, or their branches, state colleges, state-affiliated universities and state universities subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the Ohio Board of Regents.

24. If the board of trustees of a state university fails to undertake appropriate action to establish a university branch campus within one year from the enactment of a capital improvement appropriation for the development of such university branch facility, the Ohio Board of Regents may act as it deems necessary in place of the board of trustees.

25. Capital improvement laws have provided that capital improvement funds be released by the State Controlling Board only upon the recommendation of the Board of Regents.

26. Certain fees pledged to pay off bonds and notes can only be increased with the Board approval.

27. The Board has been authorized to define a full-time equivalent student for subsidy purposes.

28. The Board has been designated as the state agency to handle phases of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

29. The Board is authorized to set up rules for disbursement of Developmental Instructional funds.

30. The Board must approve printed material contracts to any out-of-state vendor hired by an institution of higher education. The out-of-state contract must be denied if an in-state vendor can meet all conditions of such contracts except price.
31. The Board may prescribe forms for reporting institutional out-of-state travel.

32. The Board has the authority to disburse monies for payment to private institutions of higher education for educational services provided to the state if approved by the Board.

33. The Board shall promulgate rules and regulations prescribing an operating manual for state institutions with respect to various areas of management.

There are fourteen major rules that have been created by the Board of Regents to carry out the laws established by the Ohio General Assembly. Rules 34-41 are all part of the first OBR regulation. Although these rules may not appear as significant as those operations and functions mandated in the law, they must initially be treated equally, since they have the force of law, and are equal under the law.

34. The Ohio Board of Regents organizes for the conduct of business yearly by electing from its membership a chairman, vice-chairman, and by electing a secretary who may or may not be a member of the Board.

35. The Board of Regents shall appoint a Chancellor as its chief executive officer. The Chancellor shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The duties of the Chancellor shall be prescribed by resolution of the Board. The Chancellor shall appoint members of the administrative staff, with the approval of the Board or under authority delegated by the Board.

36. Regular meetings of the Board of Regents shall be held on the third Friday of each month, except as the Board may otherwise determine from time to time.

37. The Board shall keep an official set of minutes of all official business transacted by the Board.
38. The Board may authorize such standing or special committees as it may deem desirable from time to time. The Chairman shall designate the members of such committees.

39. The Board may authorize the appointment of advisory committees from time to time. Such advisory committees will normally report to the Board through the Chancellor.

40. The Board shall transmit an annual report at or near the conclusion of each fiscal year to the Governor and to the General Assembly. The Board shall also publish a Master Plan as required by law to be prepared by it, and may publish such other studies or reports from time to time as it may deem desirable. All published reports shall be made available to the Governor and the General Assembly and to the general public.

41. All internal budgetary decisions (to operate the Board and its staff) are established by the Board.

42. The Ohio Board of Regents defines "Full-Time Equivalent Student," at all levels; establishes criteria for determination of enrollment; defines Ohio residency; establishes rules for enrollment records and reports; calculate the appropriate subsidy payments to each institution upon the basis of the enrollment reports submitted by each institution; designates resident credit centers; and establishes enrollment limitations.

43. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the release of funds from appropriations for capital improvements.

44. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the approval of associate degree programs.

45. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the consideration of new degrees and new degree programs other than doctoral degrees and associate degrees.
The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the procedures to be followed in giving public notice of rule-adoption hearings under the Administrative Procedure Act which states, "Each agency shall adopt a rule setting forth in detail the method which such agency shall follow in giving public notice as to the adoption, amendment, or rescission of rules."

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the consideration of new doctoral degree programs.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for issuance of certificates of authorization to monitor academic standards of institutions of higher education in Ohio.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules and regulations governing the Ohio Instructional Grants Program.

The Ohio Board of Regents defines "Ohio Student Residency" for state subsidy and tuition surcharge purposes.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules and regulations concerning the release of appropriations for contracts for services.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules of compliance for the development of family practice departments and guidelines for distribution in each school or college of medicine.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules of compliance for the development of the Fifth Pathway Medical School Program.

The Ohio Board of Regents establishes rules and procedures in accordance with the "Sunshine" law so that any person may determine the time and place of all regularly scheduled meetings and the time, place, and purpose of all special meetings.

In determining a classification system for these activities, the investigator derived a set of
categories using constructs explored in several other studies (Tucker, 1973; Berdahl, 1971), which all generally discussed economic, political and educational operations and functions of controlling and coordinating boards. This investigator found that all of the formal operations and functions of the OBR can be classified under these three categories. There are several sub-categories, however, representing the various aspects of each major category or dimension.

The three major categories are "Political Operations," "Economic Operations," and "Educational Operations". The subcategories under "political operations" are 1) legal, 2) internal organization, 3) external political, 4) administrative regulation. The sub-categories under "economic operations" are 1) capital funds and 2) general operating funds. The sub-categories under "educational operations" are 1) policy-making and planning, 2) establishment or approval of educational programs, 3) establishment or approval of educational facilities and 4) establishment of procedures for approval of funds in support of educational programs or facilities. (See Figure 1).

Any operation and function concerning money would be classified as "economic". This category has been divided into two sub-categories; "Capital Funds" and "Total General Operating Funds". "Capital Funds" deal with construction and major physical plant alter-
This sub-category incorporates all those activities that deal in any way with the construction, major maintenance, renovation or acquisition of any physical facility. "Operating Funds" are all others that deal with operations. These funds are used for expenditures which include salaries and wages, personnel benefits, supplies, equipment, or grants.

**Political**
1. Legal  
2. Internal Organization  
3. External Political  
4. Administrative Regulation

**Economic**
1. Capital Funds  
2. General Operating Funds

**Educational**
1. Policy-Making and Planning  
2. Establishment or Approval of Educational Programs  
3. Establishment or Approval of Educational Facilities  
4. Establishment of Procedures for Approval of Funds in Support of Educational Programs or Facilities

*FIGURE 1*
The "Political" category has been divided into four sub-categories: legal, administrative regulation, internal organization, and external political. "Legal" operations and functions are those that have been mandated directly and specifically by the Legislature. Operations and functions numbered 1 through 33, directly quoted from the Ohio Revised Code are automatically included. In addition, several rules of the Board are established directly from legislative acts, which further specify and clarify them. It may appear that these are duplicated, but the law is general and less specific than the rule generated by the Board to carry out the law itself.

"Administrative Regulation" operations and functions are those rules and regulations established by the Board for controlling action by public institutions of higher education whether they directly or indirectly stem from mandated legislation. "Internal Organization" operations and functions are those activities that concern the internal administration and organization of the Board and its staff.

"External Political" operations and functions are those activities that require the interaction of the Board with outside individuals or agencies such as other state agencies: e.g. the General Assembly, the Governor, the Office of Budget and Management, or
institutions of higher education, whether public or private. "Miscellaneous" operations and functions are those activities that do not fit under any of the other categories specified. Although this investigator was able to classify each operation and function into at least one of the categories, the miscellaneous category had to be established in order to provide an option for any one who feels that none of the categories apply, since the members of the OER were invited to classify their operations and functions into the conceptual scheme.

Operations and functions that pertain to "Educational" matters have been divided into four sub-categories, 1) "Establishment and/or approval of educational programs, 2) facilities, 3) or monies," and 4) "Policy-making and planning." These sub-categories are self explanatory.

Because almost all educational decisions have some financial consequences, the operations and functions in this category are often classified under the Economic category as well. For example, "educational" rules that govern how money is spent could be classified both ways.

Since numbers have been assigned to each operation and function, each one can easily be put into the table below. The same item can appear under more than one major category, and can appear under more than one
## Political

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Internal Organization</th>
<th>External Political</th>
<th>Administrative Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 33 from The Ohio Revised Code</td>
<td>15, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 54</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 40, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54</td>
<td>34 - 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Economic

### Capital Funds

| 8, 17, 18, 9, 25, 26, 28, 43 |

### General Operating Funds

| 10, 19, 21, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 42, 49, 51, 52 |

## Educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment or approval of educational programs</th>
<th>facilities</th>
<th>procedures*</th>
<th>policy-making and planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9, 14, 20, 23, 29, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 53</td>
<td>3, 4, 9, 25</td>
<td>10, 19, 20, 21, 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 25, 27, 28, 29, 9, 10, 11, 16, 32, 42, 49, 50, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* for approval of funds in support of educational programs or facilities

FIGURE 2
sub-category because each operation and function can have political, economic, and educational characteristics, or combinations, thereof. The three major categories represent different dimensions, and the sub-categories represent different aspects of the same dimension. In other words, each category and sub-category identifies a distinct aspect of the Board's activities. Each action of the Board, however, has several facets, each of which may "fit" into a different sub-category because it can be seen as fulfilling more than one purpose.

In addition to classifying the formal operations and functions in the above categories, each one can also be classified as either a "coordinating" activity, or a "controlling" activity or both. As in the categories above, the individuals were given an option to classify each activity as being neither "coordinating" nor "controlling."

**ACTIVITIES OF THE OBR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>COORDINATION</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54,</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 40.</td>
<td>3, 4, 10, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53.</td>
<td>52, 53.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3**
Although this dissertation did not attempt to measure "how much" control or coordination exists, it may ultimately be possible to represent classifications by a three-dimensional graph with control on the x-axis, the seven categories above on the y-axis, and coordination on the z-axis as in Figure 4.

If measurements of control and coordination can eventually be derived for use as a research tool, points on a graph can be plotted showing where each category "fits" into the cube. Each category (the y value), although fixed, can be assigned an x and z value, plotting the point \((x, y, z)\) to show 1) where each category exists in relation to "how much control and coordination" it carries with it, and 2) how each category relates to each other category.

This study did not attempt to measure control or coordination but has identified each operation as being either one or the other or having elements of
both. The study can be conceptualized as two 3-dimensional cubes being compared with each other. One 3-dimensional cube, representing the formal operations and functions of the OBR remains constant (the independent variable) while the other, representing the individuals' perceptions of what the operations and functions are changes (the dependent variable). Schematically, the two 3-dimensional graphs would look like this.

Because there were no measurements of control and coordination, but only a designation of yes, no or both, the kinds of points that could have been plotted for this dissertation would have been on one of the three axes or on the $x = z$ axis.
CHAPTER IV
Methodology and Analysis of Data
The Pilot Study

After the objectives of the dissertation were specified and the focus of the study decided upon, the investigator had to develop:

1. a list of all formal operations and functions of the OBR;
2. a classification scheme for the formal operations and functions of the OBR; and
3. a set of interview questions which would obtain the information necessary to the objectives of the study.

One and two were developed in Chapter III. The following list of interview questions was developed. The questions attempted to solicit the information necessary to meet the objectives of the study.

Did you have a chance to look at the materials I sent you? (Appendix I-II).
if yes

2a. Are there any formal activities of the OBR that I have left off the list?
for both yes and no answers on 1.

2b. Generally speaking, what activities does the OBR engage in?

3. What formal activities does the OBR engage in that it should not?

4. What formal activities should the OBR engage in that it does not?
5. Do the performances of any formal activities that the OBR engages in need to be improved?

6. What are the three most successful formal activities of the OBR?

7. What are the three most pressing problems facing the OBR?

8. What is the role of the OBR in higher education in Ohio?

9. What are the respective roles of the nine-member Board as opposed to its staff?

10. How do you view the role of the OBR with respect to the Legislature and the Governor? What are their relationships?

When all three were developed, the investigator asked two members of the OBR staff who would not be participating in the investigation to participate in a pilot study. They agreed. Each one was given the same packet that was sent to those participating. Interviews were conducted, and the process of classifying the fifty-four operations and functions of the OBR was included. Filling out the form took twenty minutes for one individual and thirty minutes for the other. One interview lasted one hour; the other lasted one hour and fifteen minutes.
The Observation Process

In addition to interview data, the investigator attended every public monthly meeting of the Board beginning in October, 1975. During these meetings the investigator took extensive notes and compared the observations with at least one other individual who attended all the meetings but wished to remain anonymous. Each month, on the third Friday of the month, the Board met informally in the morning to discuss future topics of concern and then met again in the afternoon to conduct its formal meetings. Both morning and afternoon sessions were observed by the investigator producing extensive amounts of data, which were used in the study.

The Study

After the pilot study was completed, all nine members of the Board, the Chancellor, and the four Vice-Chancellors were asked to participate in the study. Each one was sent a letter explaining that an interview would be required if they participated. Each individual was also asked to classify the operations and functions of the OER into the conceptual framework developed in the study. All of these materials were sent in one packet (see appendices I - II). The two ex officio members of the Board, the Chairmen of the
Ohio House and Senate Education Committees were not asked to participate since their schedules seldom permitted them to attend meetings of the Board.

Participating

Of the fourteen individuals who were asked to participate in the study, ten were able to do so; three members of the Board and one member of the staff did not. Only one member of the Board, who was ill, would not participate, the other two individuals were not in the state. One member of the staff was also ill during the period that formal interviews were held. Therefore, the data do not express the views of an entire "population" as hoped for.

The study's methodology had many limitations. Social science research "in the field" can produce many dilemmas in which trade-offs must be made. Using interview data had its disadvantages but the kinds of information obtained would never have been possible without extensive interviews. Although the population chosen was done so because it appeared to be the best one available to answer the questions of the dissertation, the political realities of doing research in this area necessitated a tolerance for ambivalence and research hazards such as sampling error and bias. This investigator
attempted to account for possible bias by considering certain characteristics of the individuals who did not participate as will be discussed below. The problems of working with a small group of individuals became apparent when anonymity was promised. Since the number of people in the entire group was so small, the analyses of individuals' characteristics had to be carefully done to avoid their identifications becoming immediately obvious.

The Sampling Bias

Four individuals did not participate in the study. From the extensive observations, the investigator was familiar with each individual who did not participate and had a fairly accurate impression of each individual's overt behavior in public Board meetings. The two Board members who did not participate had similar public behavior patterns. They seldom raised questions, seldom objected and during this study, always went along with the Board's decisions. They were both considerably older than the average age of Board members, and were both appointed by the same governor. After observing the individuals for so many months, the investigator would not have anticipated any reason to believe that these individuals would have felt differently about the issues and the operations and functions than others who participated.
The third Board member, who was ill, although very outspoken, shared many characteristics of the other two; the individual was older than the average Board member, and was appointed by the same governor. Unlike the other two people, this Board member asked many questions and had on occasion openly disagreed with both Board and staff members. Nevertheless, the investigator's observations indicated that this person perceived the formal operations and functions of the OBR similarly to others.

The staff member who did not participate became ill shortly before the investigator began to collect data. This individual had been very helpful during the time of the study, and the investigator was able to ascertain this person's beliefs and understandings concerning a variety of issues in higher education. The investigator's observations indicated that this individual perceived the formal operations and functions of the OBR in a similar fashion to the other staff members. Since any one individual was a substantial proportion of the whole board or staff, it was important to ascertain that those who did not participate were not significantly different from those who did.
The Interviews

Calls were made and appointments were set up with all ten individuals. The interview settings were varied. Twice, the interviews were conducted over lunch; one was in a restaurant, one in the investigator's home. One interview took place in the library of the OBR, one took place in the investigator's office at The Ohio State University, and all of the others took place in the offices of the individuals throughout the state. The interviews ranged from fifty minutes to two hours and forty minutes. Most of the questions could easily have been covered in less than one hour, however, some individuals volunteered enormous amounts of information and opinion.

It must be noted, here, that the investigator began to study the OBR in September of 1975. The interviews were conducted in April and May of 1976. By that time, all of those individuals asked to participate knew the investigator and were aware that the study was to be a Ph. D. dissertation. Although no one knew what aspect of the OBR was being studied, there was a general understanding as to what the investigator was doing at the offices of the OBR so often and at all public meetings.

Before any questions were asked, the investigator told each individual that the final focus of the study was the "formal" activities or the formal oper-
ations and functions of the OBR. "Formal activity" was then defined as one that is mandated by the state legislature, the Federal Government, or created by the Board in its rules. The questions were then asked.

Some of the questions obviously attempted to solicit specific information while others were more general. As evident in appendix III, each interview produced a great deal of data, and it was anticipated that many questions could yield ambiguous replies. They did. Many of the individuals knew that most questions could be interpreted liberally and responses were diverse. Unfortunately, recording devises were not acceptable due to the nature of the conversations. Each individual was assured that all conversations would be kept strictly confidential and that anonymity would be maintained. Therefore no names are attached to the aggregate data reported in the next chapter. Each individual was simply randomly assigned a number, one through four, for the staff, and one through six, for the Board thus producing Staff members one through four and Board members one through six. Also, any comments that were told to the investigator "strictly off the record" are not reported anywhere in the dissertation although these responses obviously helped the investigator to gain insights into the issues facing the OBR.

Each individual was also asked, "How do you view your role on the Board (or its staff)?" The results
of this question were very personal for most individuals and helped the investigator to understand how the members saw themselves in relation to each other. However, the results could not be reported due to the personal nature of the answers.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of data has been done by question. Raw data may be examined in Appendix III. In each question the responses were reported and comparisons within groups and between groups were made. Issues raised were discussed in depth.

Question 1

Did you have a chance to look at the materials I sent you?

insert Matrix 1

Question one was the most disappointing portion of the study. It became apparent immediately that the packet would take too much time to complete and appeared so overwhelming that the individuals would not do it. Half of the individuals glanced at it and a few began to work through it though never finished it. The other half did not look at it at all. See packet, appendix I-II.

Although the pilot study showed that the charts could be filled in without much effort if the investigator helped, it was decided that the most useful information in the time available would be obtained with interview questions, only.
Matrix 1

Responses to Question 1

Did you have a chance to look at the materials I sent you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2**

2a. Are there any formal activities of the OBR that I have left off the list?

2b. Generally speaking, what activities does the OBR engage in?

(insert Matrix 2)

First of all, it must be noted that only S1 had sufficiently looked at the materials to answer question 2a. All of the others answered 2b, only, although S1 answered 2b as well. As far as question 2a was concerned, the individual did not believe that any formal activities had been left off, though there was some concern that perhaps some specific pieces of Federal legislation might have been.

Those individuals who had looked at and read through the list of formal operations and functions generated by the investigator felt that the list was complete. After a check for the pieces of Federal legislation, it was found that they, too, had been included. Part of the process of developing the list consisted of asking a member of the OBR's staff and two other knowledgeable individuals who did not participate in the study, to check the list for completeness. Those individuals felt the list was all-inclusive, at that time.
Matrix 2
Responses to Question 2

Generally speaking, what activities does the OBR engage in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBR is controlling agency for higher education by statutory authority</th>
<th>coordinating agency for higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibilities Prescribed By Statute

Question 2b was purposely meant to be general in order to allow the individuals being interviewed to be as free as possible in their interpretation. By and large, on this question, there was no conflict identified either between groups or within them. The responsibilities of the Board were described as being prescribed by statute by all of those interviewed. Most described their operations and functions as coordinating or controlling a variety of areas such as budgeting, program approval, access, planning, capital improvement, quality, communications and a forum for debating higher education issues.

Representing Higher Education

Both members of the Board and the staff stressed that the OBR represents higher education to the government (it is a government agency) and the government to higher education. One of the most interesting aspects of this question was that three members of the Board stressed the importance of institutional autonomy and no staff members did although all ten individuals mentioned its importance sometime during the interview. Historically, this was the biggest issue that caused conflict.
Question 2

What formal activities does the OBR engage in that it should not?

Three individuals initially suggested that there were no formal activities that the OBR engaged in that it should not engage in because formal activities are mandated. Nevertheless, there were a variety of activities mentioned.

Capital Improvement Process

The ones mentioned most often (five times) were the activities that define the process of capital improvement and construction. Three individuals mentioned nothing else. Some individuals, both Board and staff members, did not object to the planning stages of the capital improvement process, but did object to the implementing stages. Individuals in the larger, more established institutions often think the 54 steps that the OBR has created for all institutions in the approval process is inappropriate for them.

It is understandable that small institutions which have not established relationships with architects and planners and do not have the staff to carry out such tasks require guidance. The larger institutions have these established relationships and staffs.
Matrix 2

Responses to Question 3

What formal activities does the OBR engage in that it should not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none, but</th>
<th>capital improvement process</th>
<th>OIG</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To them, the long involved process is a nuisance and an unnecessary duplication of effort. Much of the stress between the OBR and the state's institutions is a direct result of this process. As one vice-chancellor explained, it can take years to build good will between an institution and the Board, and it can easily be spent in an afternoon. This process causes much institutional upset. The answers of both Board and staff members reflect the OBR's awareness of this problem.

Ohio Instructional Grant Program

Several other issues were raised. Two individuals mentioned the administrative problems of the Ohio Instructional Grants (OIG) program. Both cited the inconvenience associated with the growing problems of the OIG and the enormous amounts of paper work which require extra staff.

The Ohio General Assembly enacted legislation creating the Ohio Instructional Grant Program (OIG), which is an instructional grant program for full-time undergraduate students enrolled in any Ohio institution of higher education. The General Assembly gave the Ohio Board of Regents the responsibility of administering
the program and establishing the rules for the program. The General Assembly funds the program every biennium and has established priority systems for eligible students, which the OBR carries out. During this biennium, the OIG was underfunded creating many problems for the OBR and for many students in Ohio.

Campus Disruptions

One Board member mentioned the responsibility of dealing with campus disturbances, which was a pressing issue in the late sixties and early seventies.

Federal Responsibilities

Another Board member stated that the Federal responsibilities that are mandated via the Governor were activities that should not be engaged in, and that fee limits should not be determined by the OBR, but should be determined by the Legislature.

Recommending and Eliminating Programs

Board member two stated that the formal activity of recommending new degree programs and the eliminating of others might more appropriately be done by institutions themselves. This issue deals with the problem of
manpower needs and the jobs available in society. This was also raised by staff member four, who believed that the hows and whys of planning for the future were appropriate activities for the Board, but should not have to be undertaken by the Board, alone, and could use the help of other state agencies including institutions of higher education, themselves. Staff member four believed that there were no simple solutions to the manpower problem, but that much work needed to be done in the area.

"Bailing Out" of Ohio University

Finally, one staff member mentioned the formal activity given the OER recently to monitor and oversee the "bailing out" and re-organization of the management process at one of Ohio's institutions of higher education, Ohio University. This occurred because the school could not pay off its bonds on several empty dormitories. The empty dormitories were a symptom of the university's drastic drop in enrollment. Several individuals interviewed also indicated that there was some mis-management. Although the Ohio General Assembly
appropriated the funds necessary for the "bail out", it gave the responsibility for overseeing and monitoring the disbursement of funds to the OBR. Many individuals believed that this kind of activity would be an encroachment upon the autonomy of an institution, and could ultimately lead to the loss of institutional autonomy if crises or extenuating circumstances in the future prompted such action by the Legislature.

**Question 4**

What formal activities should the OBR engage in that it does not?

insert Matrix 4

Need for More Power

Several issues were raised in question four. Initially, it must be noted that three Board members and one staff member explicitly stated that they needed more force in their actions, more power. Staff member three stated that the OBR has to be more powerful and more decisive. Board members one, two and four all felt the need for more power. Board member one thought that the OBR needed more responsibility for overall enforcement of the Master Plan because so many of the OBR's formal activities were advisory. Board member one also indicated a concern that the Legislature
Matrix 4
Responses to Question 4
What formal activities should the OBR engage in that it does not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more power</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs and the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elimination of poor programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraging cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure of higher education to deal with problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
could over-ride the Board and make poor educational decisions for political reasons. For example, the setting up of branch campuses and the creation of medical schools were political decisions. Institutions of higher education could be created by the legislature regardless of the Board's decisions. Board member two thought that the Master Plan ought to be more definitive.

Financial Concerns

Board member four wanted to get into and control the finances of individual institutions of at least the percentage of the budget provided by the state (about one half at Ohio State, for example). Board members three and four did not agree on the point above. Board member three wanted to rely on the institutions themselves to determine their own budgets and keep the Board outside of the process, while clearly Board member four wanted the Board to have more control of the institutions' funding mechanisms.

Jobs and the Training Market

Board member three, however, hinted at the problem of the relationship between jobs and the training market that was first discussed in the last question by staff member four, who believed the OBR should not be trying to solve the problem alone. Board member three agreed that there was a need to deal more with this issue.
Elimination of Poor Programs

Several individuals mentioned the task of eliminating poor programs that were obsolete or unnecessary. Those who stressed this were staff member one and Board members three, four and five. The OBR already had this authority, but it was not being used. This was the issue that Board member two raised in question three that might have been more appropriately handled by the institutions, themselves rather than by the Regents. This might be because of the mechanical problems and staff required for evaluation of this type, which is costly.

Some individuals felt that the elimination of obsolete programs was unnecessary, since if a program is no longer of any use, students would not enroll in it. Because of the enrollment-dependent funding model in the state, if individuals no longer enrolled in programs, the programs were not funded and formal "elimination" would become a moot activity.

Encouraging Cooperation

Two individuals, staff member one and Board member six, discussed the necessity of encouraging institutions to work together on common problems, such as the energy conservation program which the OBR has recently been
very successful in achieving for the state. Board member six believed that the OBR should act as a catalyst to solve such problems in the areas of medicine and economic research and development by sharing the state's expertise and utilizing the state's total brain power, as with this energy issue.

Donald D. Glower, Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The Ohio State University shared with the Chancellor the success that Ohio State had had with its energy conservation program. Begun in 1973, the program had helped to reduce energy consumption on the Ohio State campus significantly, saving the university close to $1.5 million (OSU Report, 1975). The Ohio State program was used as a model for other state institutions of higher education with the cooperation of Dr. Glower and the Chancellor. Communication channels were opened and other institutions were able to benefit from the knowledge acquired at Ohio State. This ongoing program produced extensive reporting of a variety of energy research proposals and ideas, benefitting everyone in the state.
Improving Communication

Board member six also agreed with staff member two that channels of communication within the state should be improved. These channels would extend from higher education out into the community, and internally between all institutions of higher education and the Board of Regents. Staff member two stressed, here, that the members of the higher education community had to learn to talk to, not at, each other.

Access

There were two unique ideas that Board member one suggested as activities of the OBR.

First, Board member one felt that there should be overall recruiting and counseling of students at the state level to help students decide which colleges and universities would be most appropriate for their needs and wants. Board member one felt that this would help both private and public institutions in the state, and that the competition between institutions might cease. Board member one also believed that to improve access, the Board needed to encourage the establishment of day-care centers and Ohio Instructional Grants for part-time students. The problems of access, however,
are complex and difficult to deal with. Often, access can only be achieved if sufficient funding is available from the Ohio General Assembly. At the May, 1976 meeting of the Board, Senator M. Morris Jackson, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, stated that in the next biennium there would be no increased funding for higher education in Ohio. At the same meeting, the Chancellor twice stated that the abolishment of open admissions might have to become a reality if not enough funds were appropriated to maintain the quality of education in the state. Most argued that the education of increased numbers of students without increased funding would lead to a decrease in quality.

Board member two felt that there should be more of a "system" of higher education in the state. For example, Board member two suggested a system of general colleges that could take students who were not ready for Ohio's major colleges and universities. Board member two stressed that institutions, like Ohio State University should stress graduate and professional education, and only take the upper percentages of high school graduating classes. Remedial classes should only be taught in two-year institutions. (At present, Ohio State teaches remedial classes). Staff member four dealt
with two specific issues. First, staff member four proposed that some degree of control be exercised in the private sector of higher education in the state. Staff member four felt this was imperative if state-wide control was to be meaningful. Staff member three mentioned this problem elsewhere. For example, if a public institution finds there is a demand for a particular program in its area, but the OBR denies them the program because there is a similar one close by, a private institution can offer the program since it is not under any obligation to the OBR. Thus, there really is no total state-wide control.

Failure of Higher Education to deal with Problems

The second issue staff member four discussed concerns a point made before. Although two different specific problems were discussed, the monitoring of a financially troubled institution, and the failure of medical schools to produce sufficient family practitioners, the general concept was the same. In the former problem, the legislature stepped in because of the failure of an institution to manage itself, thus producing a loss of some institutional autonomy. In the latter problem, the legislature mandated an academic
program creating departments of family practice in all state-supported medical schools because of the failure of medical schools to deal with society's needs for family physicians. This action also produced a loss of institutional autonomy to some degree. If institutions do not deal with pressing problems, the Legislature is forced to. Every time this occurs, the institutions lose some autonomy.

**Question 5**

**Do the performances of any formal activities that the OBR engages in need to be improved?**

*insert Matrix 5*

**Need to Improve Communications**

The responses to question 5 were many and varied. The single item mentioned more than any other was the need to develop better communication networks in a variety of areas. Staff member two felt that the OBR should set an example and take a leadership role in programs that would demonstrate the benefits of increased constructive communication between all elements in Ohio's system of higher education. For example, the Task Force on Higher Education's project had been a successful endeavor in this area and could be used as a model. Staff member three
Matrix 5

Responses to Question 5

Do the performances of any formal activities that the OBR engages in need to be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>need to improve communications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program approval process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ohio instructional grants program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved long-range planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggested that various public relations programs were inadequate and misguided, such as television advertisements for Ohio Instructional Grant monies, when there were no monies available. Instead, staff member three felt the communication effort should be in the Legislature, attempting to educate legislators to the need for more funds in this area. Staff member four stressed the need to improve the reporting system. Board member two suggested the need to better communicate the priorities of higher education and the need to better communicate with the private sector of higher education in the state. The problems of inaccurate and inadequate cost information within the state's system was expressed by Board members three and four. All levels of communication needed improvement according to Board member six, who cited three special areas; the relationship between institutions, the Board and the Legislature; the relationship between the Board and the Federal Government; and the relationship between the people of the state of Ohio and the Board.
The Program Approval Process

The program approval process was mentioned as a problem area that needed improvement by several individuals. Specifically, staff member three commented that although the fiscal implications were always considered in program approval, the Board was unequal in its treatment of different institutions. For example, staff member three believes the Board gave more established schools less pressure in program approval. Staff member four also was concerned about the fiscal implications of program approval. Board members three, four and five all stated that the program approval process needed help.

The program approval process consisted of several steps that an institution would have to take for program approval. Initially the institution would have to follow several steps in order to get permission by the OBR just to write a program for consideration. If that permission was granted, then the institution could proceed by answering a second set of questions and providing specific kinds of information to the OBR. This extensive process was long. Board members appeared to have difficulty with this process because both sets of procedures were already completed by the time they would be asked to vote approval. Only staff members would have interaction with the process
to that point. Although the staff only brought to the Board those programs that they were recommending for approval, the Board usually felt that it had insufficient information to make the decision. The question of "how much" information the staff should provide the Board in order for the Board to make an intelligent decision on any issue remained a dilemma.

Funding Problems

Two individuals, staff member three and Board member three felt that the OBR meddled too much in institutional affairs; especially in the areas of financial management. A variety of budgetary problems were mentioned by several individuals. The issue of funding programs such as continuing education and life-long learning was raised by Board members one and five.

The funding models in the state did not include programs such as life-long learning or continuing education. The 1976 Master Plan supported the encouragement of these programs and stressed their importance to the state. If the funding patterns could accommodate these programs, a decision which must come from the General Assembly, then the problems might be resolved. The OBR
has been dealing with the policy issue of whether or not to recommend to the General Assembly that the state should fund such programs.

Ohio Instructional Grants Program

The Ohio Instructional Grants program needed improvement according to Board members five and two, who cited the problems in its administration and implementation. One individual, Board member two, suggests that in addition to the OIG, a loan program and a work-study program be established.

Improved Long-Range Planning

Finally, the areas of improved long-range planning and the increased use of educational television were mentioned by Board members one and two, respectively.

Question 6

What are the three most successful activities of the OBR?

insert Matrix 6

Budget Formulas

This question elicited a variety of responses. The budget formula for higher education and the manner in
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Responses to Question 6

What are the three most successful activities of the OBR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>budget formulas and funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program approval process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the planning process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer data-base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation efforts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which the OBR interpreted the needs of higher education to the Legislature were the activities mentioned most often. In fact, these items were mentioned by every member of the staff and four of the six board members. Most felt the formulas had evolved into sensitive measurements of institutional needs while maintaining the institutional autonomy. Also, the formulas maintained equal treatment of all state supported institutions by the program.

Program Approval Process

Several individuals mentioned the fact that the OBR had been effective in its program approval process; staff members three and four and Board members two and four.

The Planning Process

The planning process involved with the Master Plan was praised by staff member one who felt that the OBR even encouraged criticism and feedback in this process by sending out drafts to all institutions and requesting it from them. Staff member one also stated that the general themes of previous Master Plans had prevailed. Board members three and six concurred with this belief.
Three members of the Board felt that the OBR successfully developed the two-year institutions and medical complex systems in the state; Board members three, five and six. Two individuals, Board member five and staff member four indicated that despite the delays and the political pressures involved, the Board had been successful in the handling of capital improvements.

Computer Data-Base

One individual, staff member two, felt that the formal informational system of the Board that generated data for the Board with the aid of computers and other technologies was well executed and would become even better.

Cooperation Efforts

Another individual, Board member two, felt the coordinating effort involved in the energy program was so successful that it should act as a model for solving other problems in the state. Board member two also felt the OIG program was well done.

Board member one and staff member three suggested that the OBR was successful in serving as a vehicle through which people could talk to one another and get personally
involved. Board member one felt that the Board had a general understanding of the problems of higher education and the diversities within the different kinds of institutions which helped them deal with each institution's unique problems. As additional examples of how the OBR could act as a forum to get individuals together, Board member one cited the work of the Citizens Task Force on Higher Education in 1974 and the committee structure of the Board, which encouraged Board members themselves to become involved in the issues.

**Question 7**

What are the three most pressing problems facing the OBR?

Insert Matrix 7

**Financial Problems**

Most issues raised related to financial problems. The entire philosophical question, who should finance higher education, the student or society? is still a policy problem as pointed out by staff member one. Staff member two and Board members two, five and six were concerned about the budget for the next biennium along with
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Responses to Question 7

What are the three most pressing problems facing the OBR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>financial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ohio university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal crisis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all of the priority setting of expenditures that need to be done. Board member one felt that there was not adequate funding for the Board's staff for creative research. This belief was similar to that of staff member four, who desired to see the Legislature establish categorical funds to do specific things that were creative to help solve problems. These flexible monies would be used to move in new directions and could not be used for existing programs.

Funding Private Institutions

Keeping independent colleges and universities afloat without violating public law concerns Board member six. The value of private institutions in society and whether or not public monies should be used to sustain these private endeavors were issues that faced the state of Ohio and required further consideration by the OBR.

There was no doubt that public monies could support private institutions. An example of how state monies could be legally used to subsidize private institutions was the Ohio Instructional Grants program, open to all Ohio residents who qualify. A student attending a private institution could receive up to $1,500 per year, but
a student attending a public institution could only receive up to $600 per year, a substantial difference of $900 and a difference favoring students attending private institutions.

Ohio University Fiscal Crisis

Several individuals suggested the importance of the financial crisis facing Ohio University at the present time. Staff members two and four and Board members three, four and five all concurred that the OBR must help maintain the economic well-being of institutions, help them make good management decisions themselves and help them keep their costs realistic. The implications for failure were discussed above (question three).

Planning Problems

Problems in the area of planning in general and the Master Plan specifically were cited. Staff member one explained that the planning process was more complicated than in the past, that new parameters existed and that a new era of instability and decline, as opposed to growth, created further problems. The issues concerning the problems of the future were stated by staff member four and Board members four, five and six. Problems in predicting manpower needs and the development of medical centers were pointed out by Board members three and five.
and staff member four.

In planning for the future, several issues were raised. The problems of how to define or measure "quality" education were suggested by Board members two and six.

Communication Difficulties

Communication networks were also an issue. Problems in public understanding of the OBR and its internal channels were discussed by several individuals. Evidence of internal communication difficulties was provided by three staff members who cited the relationship between the staff and Board members as a pressing problem. Staff member three felt there were many concerns in this delicate area, including getting the Board to have "faith" in the staff.

Access

Finally, Board member two felt that the issue of access was still unresolved and needed a more regional approach, stressing the need for a system to be developed.

Question 8

What is the role of the OBR in higher education in Ohio?

insert Matrix 8
**Matrix 8**

Responses to Question 8

What is the role of the OBR in higher education in Ohio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>defined by legislature</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination and control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal responsibility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgetary process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preserving institutional autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defined by Legislature

Individuals stated that the role of the OBR was defined by the Legislature's mandates. However, different mandates were stressed by different individuals.

Coordination and Control

Broad coordination and control activities are stressed by staff member one and Board members three and six directly. Staff member two stressed coordination of all elements in the system.

Societal Responsibility

Staff members three and four and Board members two and four stressed the societal responsibility of the Board, representing the people and being accountable to them. Board member one stressed the budgetary and planning process activities and Board member five stressed the importance of preserving institutional autonomy.

Question 9

What are the respective roles of the nine-member Board as opposed to its staff?

Board Responsible to People, Staff Responsible to Board

Individuals responded similarly on this question. Both Board and staff members agreed that the Board itself
Matrix 2

Responses to Question 9

What are the respective roles of the nine-member Board as opposed to its staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>board responsible to people (policy-makers)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff responsibility to board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who controls whom?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal responsibility the same</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had the legal responsibility to the people, and appointed a chancellor who had a responsibility to the Board. The interpretations varied little. Most suggested that the staff brought to the attention of the Board, those issues that needed to be dealt with. In this process, the staff presented the Board with issues that were clearly explicated so that, as staff member two said, these issues could be settled by citizens." Then, as many stressed, after the Board's process of decision-making and policy-making, the staff again assumed the responsibility of carrying out those decisions.

Legal Responsibility the Same

All those interviewed agreed that although there was a distinction between the role of a Board member and a staff member, the legal authority of the Ohio Board of Regents was one and the same.

Who Controls Whom?

Individuals were concerned with the question: Who really controlled the decision making process? Board member five stated there was a delicate balance of who ran whom. As suggested by many, the staff ran the day-to-day operation. They were full-time professionals. They engaged in research, sifted facts, analysed trends
and needs, recommended priorities and problems. The staff controlled the flow of most information. Although no staff member had a vote, the staff recommended appropriate action. Staff member three suggested that the Board should take the staff recommendations without the resistance that presently existed. Board member five suggested that the Board look to the staff as "expert," yet as Board member four noted, the Board accepted the ultimate responsibility for its actions.

Question 10

How do you view the role of the OBR with respect to the legislature and the Governor?

insert Matrix 10

Provider of Information

Most individuals felt that the most prominent role the OBR played with respect to the Legislature and the Governor was one of an impartial provider of information concerning higher education. This was specifically stated by staff members two and four and Board members one, two, four and five. The impartiality of the information provided to both the Legislature and the Governor were stressed by staff members two and four and Board member six.
Matrix 10

Responses to Question 10

How do you view the role of the CBR with respect to the legislature and the governor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provider of information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor's responsibility as chief executive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support of the governor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buffer function</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Governor's responsibility for higher education was primarily as the Chief Executive as pointed out by staff member two and Board members three and four. These responsibilities included the appointment of individuals to boards of trustees of institutions of higher education and to the Regents, and the budget for higher education. Staff member two strongly stressed the need to be in constant communication with the Governor so as to never embarrass him.

Support of the Governor

The necessity for support from the governor was stressed by three Board members and staff member three. Board member one felt that the governor should be promoting the same policies as the OBR.

Buffer Function of the Board

Both Board members three and six stress the delicate buffer function of the Board in its relation to the governor, the Legislature and the rest of the state. Staff member three's concern was that the OBR needed the support of the Governor in order to be effective, but he feared that that support did not exist at present.
Synthesis of Analysis of Data

Little Conflict

Overall, there were many trends observed in the data. There was little conflict among the individuals' perceptions concerning the formal operations and functions of the OBR, either within or between groups. All individuals had a fairly accurate understanding of the mandated activities that were the responsibilities of the Board. The perceptions of the roles played by Board and staff members were relatively consistent as well. Although both Board and staff members often felt they needed more power relative to each other or to the legislature, the individuals' perceptions of the governor's official role and that of the general assembly were quite similar.

Problems of Dealing with Complex Issues

Very often, individuals cited problem areas or issues that they felt uncomfortable about without citing specifically what was wrong. This was probably due to the enormous complexity of many of these issues. These complex issues concerned many individuals. Though they brought these up in the interviews, no solutions were suggested. For example, the problem of funding life-long learning programs and continuing education programs was so complicated
that the Regents never came to a policy decision. The 1976 Master Plan chapter on Life-Long Learning discussed it in depth, citing its importance for society, but saying nothing about its funding.

There were few differences of opinion concerning the issues facing higher education in the state. Most differences of opinion centered on who should have power over whom, in the relationship among the OBR, the Governor, and the General Assembly.
CHAPTER V
Conclusion

On pages 6-7, the purpose of the study was outlined as having six objectives. Objective 1, describing the operations and functions of the Ohio Board of Regents was completed in Chapter III with the identification of 514 operations and functions of the OBR from the Ohio Revised Code and the Ohio Board of Regents Rules. Formal activities were defined as those that were mandated by the Legislature, the Federal Government or the Board, itself to carry out a law. Federal legislation became the responsibility of the OBR through mandates by the Governor, which are then incorporated into the Rules of the Board.

To develop a classification system for the formal activities identified in objective 1, the investigator derived a category system using constructs explored in several other studies (Tucker, 1973; Berdahl, 1971; and Folger, 1975), which all generally discuss economic, political, and educational operations and functions of controlling and coordinating boards. The investigator found that all of the formal activities of the OBR could be classified using the new scheme and did
so in Chapter III to complete objective two.

Systematically studying the formal operations and functions of the OBR was essential before an understanding of the entire organization was possible. Although the process of describing and categorizing the operations and functions was useful for the investigator, it was not found to be an easy procedure for others to engage in. It was slightly too complicated, took too much time to complete, and the individuals were overwhelmed by the task.

Objectives four and five were completed in Chapter IV. The ten questions were answered and a variety of issues were raised and discussed. The aspect of objective five that dealt with identifying conflict areas was discussed.

Conflict Areas

There were only a few conflict areas identified on any question, either within groups or between them. That was not to say that there were no conflict areas between individuals. Conflicts existed but they were not directly concerned with the formal activities of the Board. Most of the conflicts were interpersonal, such as the problems identified by the staff of getting along with Board members and staff members working effectively with each other. There was one notable
exception. The conflict mentioned in question nine was really a different perception of who should have control. Although no one misunderstood the nature of who had ultimate authority, the attitude of staff member three that the Board should accept the recommendations of the staff, trust the staff and have more confidence in the staff indicated that friction existed between the Board and the staff, but was interpersonal in nature and did not concern "formal" activities of the Board.

Recommendations

There were several issues that were raised in this study that require further discussion and recommendation. Although the problems that plague higher education in this country are the same problems which had to be dealt with by the OBR, there were also organizational problems that beset the OBR. Based upon the interview data and the observations of the investigator, five recommendations were made.

1. The Ohio Board of Regents should establish a much more intensive communications program from the higher education community to the people of the State and internally within the higher education community and within the Board.
Communication Problems

Communication problems are ever-present in all organizations, including institutions of higher education (Lavender, 1965; Berdahl, 1975). Communication networks between the higher education community and the people of the state must be re-examined. A public relations effort might be appropriate to educate the people to the needs of higher education in the state and the role of the OBR. For example, public relations efforts to educate the citizens of Ohio concerning the Ohio Instructional Grants program must be as accurate and timely as possible. A statewide program to develop and administer a public information system has been considered. If done properly, the OBR could provide leadership in this area. The program would establish communications between the OBR staff and public information personnel at colleges and universities. Development of this statewide effort to disseminate information on higher education by contacting the news media, special interest groups and the general public would help to alleviate some of the problems in this area.

Inter-Institutional Communications

Within the higher education community, itself, and between the Board and the higher education community,
there are not enough lines of communication. One of the
detrimental aspects of autonomy concerns the tendency for
institutions to ignore each other unless forced to interact
(Perkins, 1972. The Board of Regents could do more to
provide the opportunity for individuals within the
higher education community to interact. The recent
effort with the 1976 Master Plan was an example of
the kind of worthwhile endeavor possible within the
system. Here, the Regents requested feedback on the
Master Plan drafts thus encouraging the flow of informa-
tion between institutions of higher education and the
Regents. Also, the energy coordination effort as
described in the preceding chapter, could be used as
a model to deal with other pressing problems in the
state. The Chancellor's use of advisory committees
should be continued and augmented and the Board's
standing committees should encourage as much interaction
with the public as possible. Although the problems of
dealing with the public are substantial (Hartnett, 1971),
the public's view should be sought.

**Internal Board Communications**

Communication problems within the Board, between
some Board and staff members and between staff members
should be investigated. The continued lack of communi-
cation in this area can be only detrimental to the
work of the OBR and must be dealt with firmly. The public displays of inconsistency and open criticism observed by the investigator and alluded to in the interviews between Board and staff and within the staff have done nothing to benefit higher education in the state. There are a variety of ways that such problems can be resolved, and the investigator strongly recommends that such avenues be explored.

Staff Management and Coordination

This investigator could find evidence from both the interview data and observations that one of the most pressing problems facing the OBR was a management difficulty within the staff. Although some ongoing staff activities were managed well, often special assignments were done in an inadequate or haphazard manner because of a variety of reasons; insufficient time was allowed, insufficient data were available, staff members were careless or gave problems insufficient consideration. Instead of continuing to work on these projects, they terminate work and go on to other more pressing matters, though follow through would have produced more satisfactory results. During this study, the Board returned many reports to the staff for further
work because they were inadequate. As an example, in the March meeting of the Board, a report was given on matters relating to the conversion of Columbus Technical Institute to a State General and Technical College. The report was found to have inaccurate information in it, and was returned for further work and correction. At times, the lack of staff coordination was blatant. During one formal meeting, as the Board was asked to vote in favor of a proposal by one staff member, another staff member suggested that the Board reject the proposal. The presidents, and members of the legislative and educational communities present were shocked.

Communication networks at all levels need to be improved.

2. The Ohio Board of Regents should take a stronger role of leadership in solving creatively the problems of higher education in the state.

Providing Leadership

The interview data suggested that many felt the OBR should provide fundamental leadership in solving problems. The Chancellor should continue to encourage new and creative approaches to solving problems in the state, including the obtaining of funds for such
projects. The recent success in dealing with the energy problem shows that such leadership can be beneficial.

Creative Problem Solving

Many of the problems in higher education today such as declining enrollments, fiscal crises, declining national achievement and life-long learning have never been dealt with before under present conditions (Berdahl, 1975). Creative approaches are therefore needed if solutions are to be found. Staff members two and four and Board members one, two and six all concurred with this need for leadership.

3. The Ohio Board of Regents should strongly reconsider the kinds of qualities necessary for staff members who deal directly with academic functions. Not only should these individuals have an understanding of state government but they should also possess strong academic credentials including the Ph. D.

OBR Staff Changes

This recommendation is not meant to criticize the present members of the OBR staff. This recommendation was an attempt to deal with a problem cited by several individuals and observed by the investigator; the low credibility of the staff. The problem was manifested in two ways. First, the Board was unwilling to accept staff recommendations regularly. Especially,
in the area of program approval, the Board would be more willing to accept recommendations made by professional educators or academicians. Second, the university community also perceived the staff as lacking credibility. The graduate deans, for example, were very upset when the staff assigned an individual with an M.B.A. to conduct a study evaluating and proposing changes in masters and doctoral programs. The overall size of the OBR's staff need not be increased but the proportion of staff members holding the Ph. D. should.

4. The Ohio Board of Regents should re-examine its role in the capital improvement process, and consider streamlining the procedures.

As mentioned earlier in this dissertation, this area greatly concerns many members of the Board and staff, and members of the academic community. The Board should reconsider the establishment of different procedures for institutions of different size. Much of the resentment that this process creates is due to the feelings of larger institutions that many steps in the process are a duplication of effort and therefore a waste of valuable time although the process may be imperative for smaller institutions. An entire re-examination of this process is necessary.
5. The Ohio Board of Regents should consider its role in the reorganization and internal management process of Ohio University.

The investigator thinks the issues raised in question 3 of the previous chapter should be discussed and the implications examined.

In conclusion, the investigator believes that if the recommendations suggested in this chapter are followed, the overall problems facing the Ohio Board of Regents will be reduced.
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APPENDIX I

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

April 12, 1976

Name
Address
Address

Dear M.,

As you know, I am doing a study of the Ohio Board of Regents for my Ph. D. dissertation at The Ohio State University in the Faculty of Educational Development. In studying the formal operations and functions of controlling and coordinating boards such as the OBR, I have developed a conceptual framework or classification system to use as a tool for analysis. In order to complete my study, I would like to interview you for approximately one hour at a time and place convenient for you.

In addition to the interview, I would like you to please fill out the enclosed form, upon which the questions in the interview will be based. If you do not find an opportunity to fill out the form before the appointment, or if you have questions concerning it, we can work through the form, together, during the interview, although this will probably require an additional half hour.

All of the information you provide me will be kept strictly confidential. Only aggregate data will be reported in the dissertation and it will be impossible for anyone to trace any answers back to individuals.

I am most appreciative of your efforts in this endeavor. Shortly, I will be calling you for an appointment.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sheila R. Ronis
Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Directions for Filling Out the Forms

There are four items attached:

1. a list of operations and functions of the OBR
2. a list of definitions of categories
3. Form I and
4. Form II

Attached you will find fifty-four "operations and functions of the OBR" that have been identified by this investigator. You will recognize most of them as coming directly from The Ohio Revised Code and your own rules and regulations. In addition, you will find two forms to be used to classify each operation and function into at least one of the categories given on each form. Definitions of each category are provided.

Form I contains "political", "economic", "educational" and "miscellaneous" categories. Form II contains "control", "coordination", "both" and "neither" categories. The "miscellaneous" and "neither" categories are for those operations and functions that do not fit under any of the other categories. Please use them if you feel they are appropriate. Please feel free to classify an activity under more than one category if you feel it is appropriate. You will note that the operations and functions are numbered. Please place the activity's number in the appropriate box on the form.
Definitions

The three major categories are "Political", "Economic", and "Educational". The subcategories under political are 1) legal, 2) internal organization, 3) external political, 4) administrative regulation. The subcategories under economic are 1) capital funds and 2) general operating funds. The subcategories under educational are 1) policy-making and planning, 2) establishment or approval of educational programs, 3) establishment or approval of educational facilities and 4) establishment of procedures for approval of funds in support of educational programs or facilities.

Any operation and function concerning money would be classified as "economic". This category has been divided into two subcategories; "Capital Funds" and "Total General Operating Funds." "Capital Funds" deal with construction and major physical plant alterations. This subcategory incorporates all those activities that deal in any way with the construction, major maintenance, renovation or acquisition of any physical facility. "Operating Funds" are all others that deal with operations. These funds are used for expenditures which include salaries and wages, personnel benefits, supplies, equipment, or grants.

The "Political" category has been divided into four subcategories: legal, administrative regulation, internal organization, and external political. "Legal" operations and functions are those that have been mandated directly and specifically by the Legislature. Operations and functions numbered 1 through 33, directly quoted from The Ohio Revised Code are automatically included. In addition, several rules of the Board are established directly from legislative acts, which further specify and clarify them. It may appear that these are duplicated, but the law is general and less specific than the rule generated by the Board to carry out the law, itself. "Administrative Regulation" operations and functions are those rules and regulations established by the Board.
for controlling action by public institutions of higher education whether they directly or indirectly stem from mandated legislation. "Internal Organization" operations and functions are those activities that concern the internal administration and organization of the Board and its staff. "External Political" operations and functions are those activities that require the interaction of the Board with outside individuals or agencies such as other state agencies: e.g. the General Assembly, the Governor, the Office of Budget and Management, or institutions of higher education, whether public or private. "Miscellaneous operations and functions are those activities that do not fit under any of the other categories specified.

Operations and functions that pertain to "educational" matters have been divided into four sub-categories; "Establishment and/or approval of educational programs," "facilities," or "monies," and "policy-making and planning." These sub-categories are self-explanatory, except it should be noted, here, that although almost all educational decisions have some financial consequences, there are specific educational operations and functions that are more directly related to economic considerations. These include "educational" rules that govern how money is spent.

"Coordination" is defined as the process of securing cooperative action in the areas of management, academic affairs, and inter-institutional action using a coordinating board. "Control" will be used to refer to that phenomenon which, when exercised at a given level, results in specific and required behavior at a given subordinate level.
Operations and Functions of the OBR

The Ohio Board of Regents shall:

1. Make studies of state policy in the field of higher education and formulate a master plan for higher education for the state, considering the needs of the people, the needs of the state, and the role of individual public and private institutions within the state in fulfilling these needs.

2. Report annually to the governor and the general assembly on the findings from its studies and the master plan for higher education for the state.

3. Approve or disapprove the establishment of new branches or academic centers of state colleges and universities.

4. Approve or disapprove the establishment of state technical institutes or any other state institution of higher education.

5. Recommend (to all state supported institutions of higher education) the nature of the programs, undergraduate, graduate, professional, state financed research, and public services which should be offered by the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education in order to utilize to the best advantage their facilities and personnel.

6. Recommend to the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education programs which could be eliminated because they constitute unnecessary duplication, or for other good and sufficient cause.

7. Recommend to the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education programs which should be added to their present programs.

8. Conduct studies for the state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education to assist them in making the best and most efficient use of their existing facilities and personnel.

9. Make recommendations to the governor and general assembly concerning the development of state financed capital plans for higher education; the establishment of new state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education; and the establishment of new programs at the existing state colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education.

10. Review the appropriation requests of the public community colleges and the state colleges and universities and submit to the department of finance and to the chairman of the finance committees of the house of representatives and of the senate its recommendations in regard to the biennial higher education appropriation for the state, including appropriations for the individual state colleges and universities and public community colleges. The board shall work in close cooperation with the director of finance in this respect and in all other matters concerning the expenditure of appropriated funds by state colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education.
11. Seek the cooperation and advice of the officers and trustees of both public and private colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education in the state in performing its duties and making its plans, studies, and recommendations.

12. Appoint advisory committees consisting of persons associated with public or private secondary schools, members of the state board of education, or personnel of the state department of education.

13. Appoint advisory committees consisting of colleges and university personnel, or other persons knowledgeable in the field of higher education, or both, in order to obtain their advice and assistance in defining and suggesting solutions for the problems and needs of higher education in this state.

14. Approve or disapprove all new degrees and new degree programs at all state colleges, universities, and other state assisted institutions of higher education.

15. Adopt such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

16. The Ohio Board of Regents shall approve or disapprove proposed official plans of community college districts.

17. The Ohio Board of Regents shall prepare a state plan and do all other things necessary for participation in federal acts relative to the construction of higher education academic facilities.

18. Private institutions of higher education with less than $12,500,000 endowment may use eminent domain in acquiring land approval of the Ohio Board of Regents.

19. The Board may enter into agreements with non-public schools of medicine and dentistry to receive state support.

20. Each school or college of medicine supported in whole or in part by the state shall create a curriculum for and maintain a department of family practice, the purpose of which shall be to acquaint undergraduates with and to train postgraduate physicians for the practice of family medicine. Funds appropriated by the general assembly in support of family practice programs shall not be disbursed until the Ohio Board of Regents has certified that the intent and requirements are being met.

21. The Ohio Board of Regents shall establish and administer an instructional grants program for full-time undergraduate students in an Ohio institution of higher education which is state assisted or which has received a certificate of authorization from the Board.

22. Subject to the provisions of the applicable appropriation measure, appropriations made to state supported and state assisted institutions of higher education and to the Ohio Board of Regents for the purposes of this division shall be transferred by the treasurer of state at the times and in the amounts necessary to meet all payments required to be made by such institutions and by the Ohio Board of Regents to the Ohio public facilities commission pursuant to leases or agreements made by them with such commission.
23. All public post high school technical education programs shall be operated by technical colleges, community colleges, universities, or their branches, state colleges, state-affiliated universities and state universities subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the Ohio Board of Regents.

24. If the board of trustees of a state university fails to undertake appropriate action to establish a university branch campus within one year from the enactment of a capital improvement appropriation for the development of such university branch facility, the Ohio board of Regents may act as it deems necessary in place of the board of trustees.

25. Capital improvement laws have provided that capital improvement funds be released by the State Controlling Board only upon recommendation of the Board of Regents.

26. Certain fees pledged to pay off bonds and notes can only be increased with the Board approval.

27. The Board has been authorized to define a full-time equivalent student for subsidy purposes.

28. The Board has been designated as the state agency to handle phases of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

29. The Board is authorized to set up rules for disbursement of Developmental Instructional funds.

30. The Board must approve printed material contracts to any out-of-state vendor hired by an institution of higher education. The out-of-state contract must be denied if an in-state vendor can meet all conditions of such contracts except price.

31. The Board may prescribe forms for reporting institutional out-of-state travel.

32. The Board has the authority to disburse monies for payment to private institutions of higher education for educational services provided to the state if approved by the Board.

33. The Board shall promulgate rules and regulations prescribing an operating manual for state institutions with respect to various areas of management.

There are fourteen major rules that have been created by the Board of Regents to carry out the laws established by the Ohio General Assembly. Rules 34 - 47 are all part of the first OBR regulation.

Although these rules may not appear as significant as those operations and functions mandated in the law, they must initially be treated equally, since they have the force of law, and are equal under the law.
34. The Ohio Board of Regents organizes for the conduct of business yearly by electing from its membership a chairman, vice-chairman, and by electing a secretary who may or may not be a member of the Board.

35. The Board of Regents shall appoint a Chancellor as its chief executive officer. The Chancellor shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The duties of the Chancellor shall be prescribed by resolution of the Board. The Chancellor shall appoint members of the administrative staff, with the approval of the Board or under authority delegated by the Board.

36. Regular meetings of the Board of Regents shall be held on the third Friday of each month, except as the Board may otherwise determine from time to time.

37. The Board shall keep an official set of minutes of all official business transacted by the Board.

38. The Board may authorize such standing or special committees as it may deem desirable from time to time. The Chairman shall designate the members of such committees.

39. The Board may authorize the appointment of advisory committees from time to time. Such advisory committees will normally report to the Board through the Chancellor.

40. The Board shall transmit an annual report at or near the conclusion of each fiscal year to the Governor and to the General Assembly. The Board shall also publish a Master Plan as required by law to be prepared by it, and may publish such other studies or reports from time to time as it may deem desirable. All published reports shall be made available to the Governor and the General Assembly and to the general public.

41. All internal budgetary decisions are established by the Board.

42. The Ohio Board of Regents defines "Full-Time Equivalent Student," at all levels; establishes criteria for determination of enrollment; defines Ohio residency; establishes rules for enrollment records and reports; calculate the appropriate subsidy payments to each institution upon the basis of the enrollment reports submitted by each institution; designates resident credit centers; and establishes enrollment limitations.

43. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the release of funds from appropriations for capital improvements.
44. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the approval of associate degree programs.

45. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the consideration of new degrees and new degree programs other than doctoral degrees and associate degrees.

46. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the procedure to be followed in giving public notice of rule-adoptioin hearings under the Administrative Procedure Act which states, "Each agency shall adopt a rule setting forth in detail the method which such agency shall follow in giving public notice as to the adoption, amendment, or rescission of rules."

47. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for the consideration of new doctoral degree programs.

48. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes procedures and general standards for issuance of certificates of authorization to monitor academic standards of institutions of higher education in Ohio.

49. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules and regulations governing The Ohio Instructional Grants Program.

50. The Ohio Board of Regents defines "Ohio Student Residency" for state subsidy and tuition surcharge purposes.

51. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules and regulations concerning the release of appropriations for contracts for services.

52. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules of compliance for the development of family practice departments and guidelines for distribution in each school or college of medicine.

53. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes the rules of compliance for the development of the Fifth Pathway Medical School Program.

54. The Ohio Board of Regents establishes rules and procedures in accordance with the "Sunshine" law so that any person may determine the time and place of all regularly scheduled meetings and the time, place, and purpose of all special meetings.
### Political

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Internal Organization</th>
<th>External Political</th>
<th>Administrative Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Economic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Capital Funds</th>
<th>General Operating Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Establishment or approval of educational programs</th>
<th>facilities</th>
<th>procedures</th>
<th>policy-making and planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For approval of funds in support of educational programs or facilities*
**FORM II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

Presentation of the Data

Question 1

Did you have a chance to look at the materials I sent you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>yes, but did not finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>yes, but just glanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>yes, but did not do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>yes, but did not do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>yes, but did not do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2

2a. Are there any formal activities of the OBR that I have left off the list?

2b. Generally speaking, what activities does the OBR engage in?

Note: only S1 had sufficiently looked at the materials to answer 2a. All others answered 2b, only, though S1 answered 2b as well.

S1 - 2a) no, but some specific Federal legislation might have been. 2b) OBR is probably 1) an administrative agency that assures statutory charge and governmental charges. Is ongoing and assures a continuity of process on decisions of budgeting, program approval and new ventures. and 2) kind of forum where the board, itself identifies, formulates debates and influences the issues of higher education and its policies.

S2 - the Board performs certain legal functions imposed upon it. It seeks to pull together in a productive way all resources for the higher education system in the state. We attempt to represent higher education to the state and the state to higher education.

S3 - The OBR approves all new programs. We try to combine the total statewide budget. We try to get colleges to talk to each other. Sales more than regulatory. Try to convince college and university presidents to cooperate better with their...

B1 - Coordinate higher education to a large extent, coordinate capital appropriations, programming; make policy which affects higher education; deal with the planning process and the master plan; process of getting funding for the state and staying within means yet continue to improve programs.

B2 - The responsibilities are prescribed by statute but board interprets those laws and can be rigid or loose. The major responsibility is to coordinate educational opportunities for as many people as possible who are qualified with the available resources. Encourages access in all areas of the state - inspires quality education. Can influence legislative thinking to appreciate the outcomes of high standards in both two-year and four-year colleges and universities.

B3 - The OBR is a coordinating agency and the representing agency of higher education to the legislature and the Feds. a cohesive voice. To some extent, a planning agency that attempts to let institutions be as autonomous as possible.
33 cont. - neighbors. Act as a resource for the newer and smaller college presidents - give them counsel and advice. Try to convince legislature that we know what we're talking about.

34 - The OBR coordinates and plans higher education at the state level.

54 - The responsibilities given to us by law to coordinate the activities of colleges and universities in the areas of capital improvement, giving budget approval, set policy and make sure the policy is carried out, make certain authority is used. Although, sometimes we tend to try to usurp more authority then that legally given to us, within the fact that each institution is autonomous, we are really quite limited in what we can do because of many reasons such as lack of time, etc. We make policy decisions.

55 - The responsibilities are pretty well drawn by statute which grants some powers and withholds others. Legislature prescribes the decentralized nature of institutional control. The main powers are over the budget. Keep institutions autonomous. Political decisions are anathema to what we are all about.

56 - The OBR mainly plans and coordinates higher education in the state.
Question 3

What formal activities does the OBR engage in that it should not?

S1 - There are some activities that are diversions of attention, such as the administration of the O.I.G. program. Our role in the capital improvement process, not in the planning stages but in the implementing process. The kind of monitoring responsibility given the OBR to oversee the bailing out and re-organization of the management process at Ohio University, can lead to the loss of institutional autonomy.

S2 - No, but the capital improvement process is messy - state agencies should get out of this business.

S3 - No

S4 - Dealing with problem of manpower needs and jobs available in society. How to plan for future - it's appropriate for us, but we should not have to go it alone.

B1 - Responsibilities such as dealing with disturbances on campuses - the capital improvement process.

B2 - Recommending of new degree programs and eliminating of others - institutions should do more of this. Should not dictate building designs to institutions. Tendency to perpetuate sameness on campuses

B3 - Capital improvement process.

B4 - No, not really, except O.I.G. is inconvenient, and should not really be under our control.

B5 - Federal things we don't like. Shouldn't determine fee limits.

B6 - In the area of architecture and construction quality and scheduling, the OBR should have full or no responsibility.
Question 4

What formal activities should the OBR engage in that it does not?

S1 - We're not making our studies for the effective use of resources often enough. We should be using the authority we already have to abolish and establish needed programs.

S2 - We ought to carry on a much more intensive communication function 1) from higher education out into the community and 2) internally - to get colleges and universities to communicate effectively with each other - admonishment doesn't go very far unless you are able to work with and talk to - not at each other. Talking otherwise doesn't do much.

S3 - We have to be more powerful, more decisive, look at the system. We need more clout with the Legislature.

S4 - If our board is to be responsible and have control, there should be a similar function in the private as well as the public sector. There is an unfair advantage of the private over the public, but state institutions receive funding so maybe that balance is assured. We should encourage institutions to deal with society's problems because when they fail to respond, the legislature takes over giving the OBR centralized authority, such as the

B1 - We need more responsibility for overall enforcement of a plan - so much is advisory. For example, branches are set up when we don't feel they are appropriate. The legislature can over-ride us. There is a proliferation of courses and programs so that by the time they get to us (board members) they are pretty far gone - overall recruiting and counseling of students on the state level is needed - would help private and public institutions. The competition aspect between institutions is horrible. Need to establish things like day-care centers and OIG funds for part-time students to really make higher education accessible.

B2 - The Master plan should be more definitive. It should chart a definite plan for action. I'd like to see a system of general colleges who could take students who are not ready for our major institutions - a modified California plan. Need to be more creative in our attempts to deal with problems in higher education.

B3 - We should rely on the institutions, themselves to determine correct amounts of money for their institutions and programs. We should deal more with statewide problems that could be affected by the board, such as the relationship between jobs and the training market. We should be looking at the problem of employing our graduates.
SL cont. - the medical school's refusal to deal with society's needs for family physicians. Departments of Family Practice are now mandated by the Legislature.

B3 - We should be encouraging the institutions to look at the quality of their own programs.

B4 - We should get into the internal management of the finances of individual institutions more, which, of course is only about half of each institution's budget, since we have no responsibility for the funds that do not come from the state. We should exercise our existing authority to evaluate and perhaps limit existing bad programs.

B5 - We should encourage and examine what programs should be dropped.

B6 - We should encourage in the Master Plan program such things as consortia. We should act as a catalytic agent in getting together problem-solvers in the areas of medicine, the field of energy, economic research and development for the state. We should encourage better channels of communications. We should provide fundamental leadership. We should encourage a sharing of expertise on the state level, a utilization of our total brainpower.
Question 5

Are there any formal activities that the OBR engages in that need to be improved?

S1 - I have no real quarrels.

S2 - The single most important change would be to improve communications and take leadership in programs that would demonstrate this. For example, the Citizens Task Force Report and the Chancellor's Committee on Instructional Development were the result of effective communication.

S3 - We should be more powerful. We do too much in the area of building planning and not enough in educational planning. We do too much on internal financing. We're not at all equal in approving programs; we give more established schools less pressure - we quibble about minor issues at 2-year schools and let a medical school slip in the back door - just think of the financial implications. We have too much PR in the wrong places for example, spending money on TV ads for the OIG is ridiculous since we have run out of funds. Society owes anyone the opportunity to become the best at whatever he wants whether that is a carpenter or a physician.

S4 - Mainly, we need to improve our reporting system and our assessment of the cost of higher education.

B1 - All the imaginative things in H.B. 155 were cut. We need more leadership to creatively solve higher education institutions own problems. Need improvement in continuing ed. It is one thing to come up with a five year master plan, but we need more long-range thinking, which takes funding and money and there isn't enough.

B2 - The preparation of the budget and its presentation to the Legislature needs to be more definite. We should be stating our priorities better. We need to cooperate more with private colleges and take a more Regional approach. A good loan program should be established in addition to the OIG program - we're always giving. Perhaps we should also establish a good work-study program. We also need more emphasis on ETV and continuing education programs.

B3 - The degree-approval process and cost implications. The cost information is inaccurate and inadequate. The control over degrees is not so important, the coordination aspect is. We shouldn't meddle in institutions affairs.
B4 - The capital improvement program process. The relationship with institutions in the financial areas; we need to standardize reporting and cost information for determining subsidies and degree program approval. Continued expansion is not so great. We need tough procedures; we have problems in this area.

B5 - The degree-approval process needs improving although we are moving in that direction. The administration of OIG needs improvement. We need a new way to budget things like life-long learning.

B6 - Our relationship with the Legislature needs improving. The relationship between institutions and us also does. The legislature is bewildered. If we can enhance and improve the prestige of the OBR; if we do a good job, then the legislature will stop listening to others. Our liaison with Washington is non-existent; need much more to find out what types of funds and programs are available that would justify Ohio's fair share. We need to improve communication; need some type of information service to educate the people of the state as to what's available and help them better understand the OBR.
Question 6

What are the three most successful activities of the OBR?

**S1** - The OBR has no axe to grind, for example we sent out master plan drafts and encouraged criticism and feedback. We budget very well - we can carry on this responsibility. The formula approach is good and sensitive. The general themes of Master planning have been accurate even though numbers and specifics were all wrong. We have interpreted our needs to the legislature about as well as possible.

**S2** - To prepare and sell a budget that maintains the autonomy of the institutions given the Ohio system of higher education. We came out well in the competition with other state agencies in the legislature. Our information system, the computers, is very good and well executed. I hope to see it become even better.

**S3** - Our program approvals. Presenting enough operating budget to the legislature. We are serving as a vehicle through which people can talk to one another.

**B1** - The formula system for higher education has been successful. It has been refined is sensitive and remarkable since it treats institutions equally according to program areas without telling people what they have to do. We have a general understanding of the problems of higher education and the diversities within the different kinds of institutions. We understand the differences in dealing with different institutions. The Task Force on higher education was excellent. It served as a great input of information. The Committee structure of the board, though would like to see Regents, themselves more active.

**B2** - The OIG program is well done. We have been effective in coordinating new degree programs and energy programs for the state. The energy program should act as a model for others. Our budget formulas are good.

**B3** - We have been successful at coordination and at adopting a systems concept. Master plan is a good guidance document and provides a good framework.
S4 - Program approval. We have been successful at lobbying and supporting institutions and their budgets. We have been successful in helping institutions develop good capital programs.

B4 - The Board, through its staff can accomplish a great many things in a timely manner. We seem to get a lot of programs approved. We have been successful in getting money from the legislature and presenting a case for higher education.

B5 - The budget function we perform; we received a far higher appropriation than ever before. We were successful in the development of 2-year institutions and the medical complexes and in the determining of the locations of schools in the midst of political pressures. We have been successful in the handling of capital improvement despite the delays involved.

B6 - We are successful in the development of the master plan. We have been successful in the encouragement of the development of the 2-year college system.
Question 7

What are the three most pressing problems of the OBR?

S1 - We are still struggling internally with a changing relationship between the chancellor and the board, itself. The Board wants more responsibility. The planning process is new and is causing problems; we cannot simply do things like they have in the past. We need to deal with the new parameters - we are in a new era of instability and decline as opposed to growth. The philosophical question "who should finance higher education" is still a policy problem.

S2 - Communications. Credibility of the Board. The O.U. situation. The next budget.

S3 - Getting along with a new board - getting the board to come to grips with the real issues. Getting the board to deal with the unique problems of 2-year schools. Getting the board to understand the issues and putting faith in its staff.

B1 - Public understanding of the OBR - don't know what we do. There is not adequate funding for the Board's staff functions - for creative research for higher education problems. The people don't see the needs for higher education.

B2 - A good education cannot be measured necessarily with money - must develop a list of priorities for higher education. Need to provide better access and more regional approaches. We need to develop a system of higher education. We have multiple kinds of institutions - not a system. We need to find every way possible to fight the dilution of quality; we need to advocate stronger coordination between secondary education and higher education; college and university teachers should be trained. We need another little Hoover commission to eliminate waste.

B3 - Employment problems - no jobs for college graduates. Problems with marginal institutions; how long will the public accept the financial burden as in the O.U. problem.

B4 - Getting out the master plan - mechanically, deciding policy in major areas, and planning for serving the needs of higher education and each student in Ohio. Must help maintain the economic well-
Sh - We have the problem of adapting to three new Board members. We don't know what the next five years of student enrollments will be like. We have to help stabilize one institution that is in trouble and make sure it doesn't happen again. We have to establish categorical funds to do specific things such as improved access for higher education; flexible monies to move in new directions.

Bh cont. - being of institutions; help them make good management decisions and keep costs realistic.

B5 - Ohio University - hopefully we're just putting out a fire. Getting the master plan together. Budget for the next biennium. Development of medical centers and their problems.

B6 - Budget - priority setting of expenditures. How to keep independent colleges afloat and not violate public law. Somehow get a handle on quality and timeliness of education, what will today's student need to live in tomorrow's world? Need to monitor quality; what should the future of education be like? University without walls? Life-long learning? How do we prepare for future in education? Utilization of facilities, dorms not being used, etc...
Question 8

What is the role of the OBR in higher education in Ohio? Should it be?

S1 - Administrative agency that is given its mandate by the Legislature. The formal activities are necessary. They describe an approximate role. We are given a generally clear mandate to control and coordinate higher education. We should be whatever the times require of us.

S2 - We need to create an awareness of a responsible system to the individuals in the system. Our role is to help the parts of the system, who perceive themselves as individuals become aware that there are relationships between all the parts of a system.

S3 - The Board represents the people of the state, the taxpayers. They should hear both sides of issues and make the policy - shouldn't get involved in specifics.

S4 - Provide the kinds of broad education that are necessary for a democratic society; trains expertise necessary for society. Has the ability to assist in problems society has created. Higher education is a participant in this.

B1 - We direct and accelerate the budgeting process, primarily. Secondly, we coordinate higher education and plan for the state - the master plan. According to the statute this is what we should be doing, though we should provide more leadership.

B2 - Our role is to provide for the people of Ohio, the highest quality education for the least possible cost for all the people who are qualified.

B3 - Role should be to coordinate and provide direction for higher education. Should also represent higher education to state legislature.

B4 - Role is to assume public, via legislature that there is quality education for residents of Ohio and that they have access to it.

B5 - Our role is to preserve institutional autonomy, carry out mandates and minimize bureaucratic opportunities for arbitrariness.

B6 - Our role is to plan and coordinate higher education in the state.
Question 9

What are the respective roles of the nine-member Board as opposed to its staff?

S1 - Legally, we are one. Obviously, we have separate roles. Staff has no vote. Board members bring public view, exercise sound public perspective - suggests separateness. Board should not become "experts" that's what the staff does. The staff is the chancellor - unity there. he is the person who has the responsibility of helping the board to understand educational, political-social service issues that run through higher education.

S2 - The legal authority is the same; does not differ in law or policy. The staff is full-time, professional; the board is part-time and deals with general policy point of view. A good staff is a real sensory system for the board. The staff digests inputs and turns them into issues that can be settled by citizens.

S3 - The Board's role is for setting policy. Responsibility of the staff is to investigate issues and bring them to board who would then vote. Staff supports chancellor, works for board. Board should not administer and should take staff recommendations.

B1 - Regents are responsible for higher education. We appoint the chancellor who is responsible for the staff. The day-in, day-out decisions are made by the staff. It couldn't be any other way. Although the Board is the authority, in reality the staff does the decision-making. It is probably appropriate that the policy-making should be done by the Board.

B2 - There is some distinction. they are not one. Staff should provide creative solutions to problems, should engage in effective research and should recommend new areas for improved Regents-university collaboration. The Regents staff should recommend policy and the board should vote on it.

B3 - Policy questions to board. It is the policy-making group. It oversees the staff to make sure they carry out policy. But, the staff feeds the board its information, and the board sees that the staff administer and carry out the board's decisions.
Sh - The staff carries on functions for the board; acts as adviser to board. The goals are one and the same. We reach consensus with and for the board. We act as resource persons so the board can make policy decisions.

Bk - The Board is responsible for decision-making. It accepts responsibility for good and bad decisions, has ultimate responsibility. The staff via the chancellor is given its orders and directions by the board. It is his obligation to carry out orders of the board and advise the board.

B5 - The Board looks to the staff as "expert". Delicate balance between who runs whom?

B6 - Staff is the agency for sifting facts, trends, analysing needs, recommending priorities and operating programs. Board is the policy, decision-making body, representing the people. Then staff carries out boards decisions.
Question 10

How do you view the role of the OBR with respect to the Legislature and the Governor?

S1 - Both the Legislature and the Governor need to have an agency of government concerned with higher education problems and bringing to them and the governor needed reforms, etc... We are of value as a disinterested party when impartiality is needed - such as budgeting for institutions.

S2 - The Governor's responsibility for higher education is primarily as chief legislator - appoint people to boards; budget. He can be more helpful if he chooses right board members; input in process is useful for higher education if he seekd it. Must be in communication with governor so as never to embaress him; also for budget. As far as the Legislature is concerned, we assist them in helping to sort out issues to help them with policy issues. We assist them as advisers mainly on the budget. We operate with total honesty and candor since they must make the final decision, though we must inform them and act as informed advisers and be impartial among institutions.

B1 - Technically, we give them information and use every possible effort to help them make intelligent decisions. Especially for funding in the legislature. The Governor should be promoting the same policies as the OBR. Should work with Governor. If the governor wants information on higher education, we should act as resource people.

B2 - We act by providing information, preparing research and being strong positive influence so that the Legislature and the Governor may better understand the needs of higher education.

B3 - The governor has an administrative position in the state. He states what higher education needs, gives to the legislature which goes through a process; subsidy controls of OBR. There is a good balance between us, the Legislature and the Governor.

B4 - We're appointed by the governor and we're responsible to him. We act on behalf of him. He is the chief executive; he leads the state and sets policy for the state. We help him do that for higher education. We must make presentations to the Legislature and get their reaction whether good or bad. Since we are appointed for nine years, we can remain independent.
S3 - One of our biggest weaknesses is that we need the support of the governor and we don't have it. For us to really be effective we need the support of the governor.

S6 - It's the board's responsibility to give the best available information for higher education as it benefits the state. We must inform as honestly as possible, and cannot get involved with political aspects - must give them best available information. Based on their decisions, we act. Sometimes they ask for specific kinds of expertise and we give advice upon request.

B5 - Perhaps we should be more active and communicate more with the legislature. There is political domination of higher education - things get done by trade-offs.

B6 - The Board is the buffer between the staff, the governor, and the legislature. The Board is non-partisan.