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Chapter 1

An Overview of the Problem of State Level Policy-Making for K-12 Education

Introduction

Education is a unique governmental function requiring unique constitutional, statutory, political, and administrative arrangements. Educators are the only proper guardians of the educational function and their autonomy is essential to the public interest. The community will be wisest in its responses when it listens to educational experts. Education must be taken out of politics because politics are a sordid affair.

Thus, Sayre recounted some of the basic tenets of a popular doctrine founded in the anti-politics of the early twentieth century. This doctrine has had a remarkable longevity and its aftermath helped delay the viewing of education as a political enterprise until comparatively recently. Consequently, the study of the policy-making processes of educational systems has been a relatively recent occurrence. In the decades of growth after World War II, the study of policy-making was regarded as unimportant as all involved scrambled to cope with the increasing school age population. Resources were plentiful and, educational policy revolved around finding teachers, classrooms and equipment to accommodate large numbers of new students. In such a situation, it was not surprising that the processes of policy-making received little attention.
However, in the latter sixties and through the decade of the seventies, conditions have changed significantly. A crisis in public confidence in governmental institutions has brought a parallel increase in interest in the processes of public policy-making. In modern societies, complexity, rapid change and tensions are the norm while the structures and techniques of traditional policy-making agencies are often still rooted in the nineteenth or early twentieth century when they were dealing with a much more stable and predictable society. Nowhere is this more evident than in the fields of elementary and secondary education. Falling enrollments, lack of funds and a lack of public confidence in traditional public education have all caused educational policy-makers and administrators to confront problems with which they have had no previous experience.

During the last fifteen or so years there has been a rapid growth in the number of studies of public policy-making and a consequent growth in the theoretical literature relating to the policy process. (See chapter 2 for a discussion of these developments.) Perhaps because of the natural conservatism of education systems, this expansion of interest and knowledge in policy-making has been slower to reach education than most other areas of public concern. Yet, it cannot be denied that, in terms of problems faced, proportion of public resources consumed, and impact on society at large, education is one of the most significant areas
of public enterprise. Thus, it is important that research is conducted into areas of educational policy-making and that theoretical propositions, developed in the general policy sciences area, are related to education where they are applicable. This study attempts both to examine some policy-making procedures and relate what exists to what could be accomplished if some theoretical concepts are applied to the policy-making processes at the state level.

Background to the Problem

Although constitutionally the State Governments in the United States have a prime responsibility for public education, until the decade of the seventies the role of the state and the possible impact of the state legislatures on educational policymaking were largely ignored by educators, legislators and researchers. This "myth" that public education had no part in state politics has probably resulted from two major factors; public schools have traditionally been financed by levies at the local level and educators themselves tended to foster the notion that education had a special sanctity and that only they, the educators, could judge how much of the public resources should be used in what ways for the greatest advantage in the education of the nation's youth. As a result, educational policy-making was left largely in the hands of educators and the dearth of literature relating to educational policy-making at the state level prior to 1970 underlines the lack of importance attached to such processes.
However, since 1970 some interest and some important studies relating to the processes of public policy-making in education have been generated. This increased attention has stemmed from a number of changing societal and political values. Among the most important of these seem to be:

- an unwillingness of local tax payers to grant increased taxes for education and a concomitant increase in state level fiscal support.\(^4\)

- an increased demand for other "social services" in the community and a consequent increase in the competition for resources.

- a realization by teachers, parents, advocates of special education and similar groups that gaining support for their desired programs was a political activity.

- a concomitant realization by politicians that education policies are politically important and, as a result, a shift from a passive to an active role in educational policy-making by state governors and legislators.

- an increased demand for accountability.

- an increasing demand for schools to undertake educational tasks far beyond the development of basic literacy and numeracy.

Many of these educational tasks were previously accomplished by the family, the church or society at large. This demand for all sorts of social education is often in conflict with the equally strong demand for a greater concentration on the "basics."
One only has to consider the host of "design for living" elements in school curricula today to see that one of the unspoken demands which society makes on public schools is to educate students in "life skills".

- an intrusion of federal initiatives into the K-12 education arena.

The increasing number of federal programs in the late sixties and early seventies created a new dimension in the state bureaucracy to administer these programs. Hence, the local school districts became accustomed to relying on state level organizations in order to obtain money.

These, and other similar pressures, mean that educational policy-making at the state level is, and will continue to be, a highly political process.

In addition, the complexity of problems facing elementary and secondary education in the 1970's and beyond make it almost certain that individual school districts will be unable to make policy independently. The state legislature, the state board of education and the state department of education will become, in all probability, more and more important in a large number of policy areas. Thus, the problem is basically one of devising policy processes which allow some independence for local school boards yet produce state-wide initiatives to help overcome the inequities which have become apparent and to provide assistance to local districts in dealing with the problems enumerated above. To do this, state-level policy must involve more than simply appropriating money and/or legislating in important yet peripheral
areas such as education for the handicapped and vocational education. State-level policy-makers are, and will continue to be, involved in the very bases of the K-12 education process. How they are involved, what processes they use and how these processes could be improved form the core of this study.

It is assumed that the basic need for state-level policy-makers is policy-making about how to make policy or "meta-policy-making." That is, a formulation of guideline procedures which may improve the flexibility and effectiveness of state-level policy-making for K-12 education. It is to this end that this study is directed. An attempt has been made to examine some aspects of policy-making in one state and to relate this examination to some theoretical constructs in the hope of suggesting some beginnings of a meta-policy for education at the state level.

Statement of the Problem

State level policy-making in education, like most policy-making, has tended to be reactive. That is, policy-making has been a response to crises and difficulties, or to the pressure exerted by lobbyists working on behalf of groups or individuals who have specific concerns. This is not necessarily the fault of state level policy-makers. Traditionally, educational policy in the United States has been made by school boards and administrators at the local level and the state has only been involved
with problems which local districts have been unable to solve.
As a consequence, state level policy-making has developed, in
many states, the sort of mentality that encourages state legis-
lators to see themselves in a role where their "interference" is
required only when a crisis eventuates. 7

While such processes may be generally acceptable when re-
sources are readily available and state legislatures are rarely
involved in substantial policy-making, it seems that such pro-
cedures are unlikely to be effective when, as seems to be the
case currently, state legislators are being forced to accept more
and more policy-making for education as a normal part of their
legislative duties. If the policies enacted are a result of
pressures or crises then educational policy-making will either
be a stumbling from one crisis to the next or the reaction of
legislators and administrators to whichever group can exert the
most pressure. Neither of these seems a reasonable basis for
educational policy-making at the state level.

The problem then is to develop and suggest some methods of
policy-making which can avoid, to some extent, the pitfalls of
crisis reaction and sectionalism. Such policy-making could be
labelled "interactive." In this context, "interactive policy-
making" implies that policy should not be generated as a result
of a single crisis situation or on the basis of representations
from a powerful lobby group, but as a result of the interactions
of a large number of policy inputs from as broad a section of society as is possible.

Such a conceptualization has a number of implications for various phases of the policy process. In particular, it seems, a great deal of attention will need to be centered upon:
- the initiation phase; to ensure equal ability for all sections of the community to initiate policy action.
- the intelligence phase; to facilitate the input of relevant fact and opinion from a wide variety of sources.
- the enactment phase; to ensure that what is enacted reflects the important data revealed during the intelligence phase.
- the implementation phase; to ensure that what is implemented is in the spirit of what was enacted; that is, to ensure a minimum of administrative interference.
- the oversight phase; to give policy-makers the opportunity of determining whether the policy made, is in fact, being carried out as intended. 8

In brief, the problems addressed in this study may be depicted as finding the answers to the following questions:
- how is state-level policy for K-12 education currently made in Ohio?
- what specific strengths and weaknesses of the process can be observed or implied?
- what changes in policy-making procedures, particularly in initiation, intelligence, enactment, implementation, and oversight,
can be suggested in the light of theories of public policy-making?
- can these suggestions be encapsulated in the beginnings of a theory of meta-policy-making for K-12 education at the state-level?

Scope of Study

Systems theory suggests that policy-making cannot be adequately considered apart from the environment in which it takes place. As Anderson observes,

Demands for policy actions are generated in the environment and transmitted to the political system; at the same time the environment places limits and constraints upon what can be done by policymakers.

Thus, although the basic aim of this study is to produce a theoretical model which could be used to develop a meta-policy-making framework for K-12 education at the state level, it is pointless to attempt the development of such a model "in vacuo." Consequently it is necessary to examine some specific instances of policy-making in a specific environment before attempting to relate educational policy-making to theoretical constructs advanced by scholars in the field of policy science. Ideally, such examination of actual policy processes cover a wide range of policy initiatives, over a considerable period of time, in a variety of environments. However, such an examination may be nearly impossible and certainly is beyond the scope of the present study. As Cistone indicates,
Contemporary public policy-making takes place within a social, cultural, economic, and political environment whose complexities, cleavages, and conflicts defy wholly subjective assessments on the one hand, and frustrate purely rational analyses on the other. Even at the best of times, public policy-making today is an imperfect art and an imprecise science.

Thus, it is clearly necessary to limit the scope of this study in a number of ways. These are:

- level. Policy-making for education may take place at federal, state, regional, district, school, and even individual classroom level. However, in this instance, only policies which are specifically and discretely the province of the state level policy-making bodies are considered.

- area of interest. Only policy-making related to the operation of elementary and secondary schools (K-12) is examined.

- geographical area. The state of Ohio is the only arena considered.

- time. The years 1975-1979 are used as the limits of any policy examined. However, no attempt is made to examine all policies enacted during this period. Only those policies revealed as crucial in some way by interviews with important policy actors are considered. (See chapter 3 for details of methodology.)
elements of the policy process. These have been variously
described by a number of writers, but, in general terms, the
whole policy process could be described as including:

- factors generating policy initiation.
  These include, environmental influences, values of actors,
  needs of groups, crises and the interactive influence of
  other policies.

- initiation strategies.
  The methods by which policy initiatives are promoted into
  policy-making arenas.

- investigation or intelligence gathering.
  The methods and scope of data and opinion collection
  which are used in making policy decisions.

- promotion.
  The techniques used to "sell" the policy idea to those
  who have power to enact such policy.

- enactment.
  The processes by which the policy becomes law or is
  promulgated by way of administrative edict.

- implementation.
  This phase includes the preparation for implementation,
  both in preparing resources and people, and the actual
  process of implementation. That is, the methods used
to ensure compliance with both the spirit and the letter of the enacted policy.

- evaluation.

Two distinct elements are implied within this phase. The first can be described as "oversight." That is, the efforts made, formally and informally, by both enactors and initiators of policy to ensure that the policy is carried through in a manner compatible with their original values. The second is the evaluation of a policy in qualitative terms using such criteria as effectiveness in accomplishing a stated goal.

In this case, six elements of the comprehensive process form the basis of the investigation and discussion. These are: initiation (both the identification of prime initiators and an examination of methods used to initiate policy considerations), investigation or intelligence gathering, the enactment process (the actual decision-making process), preparation for implementation, implementation and the oversight element of the evaluation phase.

Apart from the necessity of limitation to the study of the policy-making phases of initiation, investigation, enactment, preparation for implementation, implementation and oversight, for K-12 education in Ohio at the state level, because of the constraints of time and cost, there are other reasons for delimiting the study in these ways. Initially there is some evidence from
previous studies that these phases contain the elements which apparently have given rise to many of the policy-making problems encountered by policy-makers at the state level. In particular, such studies point to a relatively narrow band of public input at the initiation phase, an unequal ability of various individuals and interest groups to influence the enactment phase, the ability of lobbyists to bias the intelligence gathering process, a lack of preparation for implementation, implementation processes that are prone to distort the impact of policies because of administrative procedures, and a remarkable absence of any real oversight by policy-makers or policy initiators.

In addition the six elements studied here have a further appeal as items of study as each seems to be amenable to change, at least in theory. While it may not be easy to change an established policy process, it can be argued that the establishment of some meta-policies could have a significant impact on each of these six elements. The establishment of procedures less favorable to the "power elite" could do much towards overcoming problems caused by unequal access to initiation avenues and intelligence gathering and giving procedures. Problems stemming from lack of preparation for implementation, inept implementation procedures and lack of oversight can usually be traced to a lack of understanding of policy procedures or to unintentional neglect by policy-makers. (See chapter 2, pages 44-49 for a discussion of
this point.) Hence, the establishment of some meta-policy guidelines should help to overcome both lack of understanding and neglect, and so improve the overall policy-making function.

Definition of Terms

The terms used to describe the six phases of policy-making being studied have been described previously so that any further definition of them would be superfluous. In addition, some terms used, such as "policy actors" and "power elite", are so commonly used in the social and political sciences that there is no need to define them anew. However, some terms are used here with specific connotations which do require some clarification.

Public Policy

The literature abounds with definitions of public policy. They range from such broad definitions as, "the relationship between a government unit and its environment"\(^\text{12}\) to more elaborate and restrictive description like Friedrich's,

\[
\text{----------- a proposed course of action of a person, group, or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to overcome and utilize in an effort to reach a goal or realize an objective or purpose.}^{13}
\]

Here, a definition of public policy more akin to the second is used. Public policy is viewed as the outcomes of the interactions between individuals or groups in dealing with matters of concern
which are included in enactments, prescriptions or regulations at the state level. Defining policy thus, precludes the consideration of some statements, usually by organized groups, which they term "policies." In reality such statements are really "desired outcomes." For instance, it may be that an association of educational administrators states as a "policy" that all educational administrators should be allowed three weeks per year for personal and professional development. However, if this particular concern has not been the subject of an initiation attempt by the appropriate interest group, it cannot be viewed as a policy initiative within the context of this study.

One further qualification is necessary. The preceding discussion of the difference between "policy" and "preferred outcome" may suggest that anything that has not been enacted and is thus unenforceable is not regarded as part of the policy-making process. Such is not the case. On many occasions policy is made by inaction rather than action. If a policy initiative is introduced to the state legislature but is not acted upon or if a policy initiative is enacted but not implemented then, policy has been made. In this case the policy is to take no action. Such an "un-policy" process is considered in both the examination of educational policy-making in Ohio and in the theoretical consideration of meta-policy procedures.
Meta-policy

Although this term has been briefly described previously as "policy-making about how to make policy", the concept is so important to the theoretical aspects of this study that some further discussion is warranted. Dror indicates that meta-policy-making relates to the broad, general guidelines which exist to guide policy-makers in the processes of making policy. He further indicates that what meta-policy does exist is usually the result of past procedures and "generally accepted" practices. In this study an extension of the term to include rather more specific guidelines, as Dror suggested should be the case, is used. Meta-policy-making as used in the following pages, describes any enactment or regulation which provides guidelines or a framework within which the process of formulating public policy is carried on. Meta-policy may suggest, for instance, that no new subjects may be required in public school systems unless the policy-makers provide the necessary fiscal support for their implementation. Meta-policy-making is also concerned with the policy process and hence, meta-policy may also require, for example, that state level administrators be the subject of an independent evaluation every five years.

Prime Initiators

There is a need to distinguish between those persons or groups who originally conceive a policy idea and make it public
and those who later adopt the policy notion and help to insert it into the policy-making system. The persons or groups who originally generate the policy notion are referred to as "prime initiators."

**Secondary Initiators**

This term refers to those individuals or groups who adopt a policy notion originally proposed by others. Usually, such individuals or groups form a coalition with the prime initiators to ensure that a policy notion reaches the enactment phase, although, on occasions, it may be that prime initiators, through lack of power, interest or resources, do not proceed with a policy idea. In such a case a role change, usually undetectable to the researcher, may take place with the initial authors of the policy notion seeming to join a coalition after the idea has been taken up by other individuals or groups. In any case, the prime initiators will be distinguished as those who first make a policy notion public and secondary initiators as those who join a coalition after an idea has been made public in the hope of ensuring its enactment and implementation.

**Outline of Study**

The second chapter of this dissertation reviews some of the important literature relating to policy-making. This review is in two parts. The first part deals with theoretical presentations about the public policy-making process. An attempt is made to
combine theoretical constructs from a number of sources in order to apply them to the processes revealed by the actual study of some state-level policy-making. There is also an attempt to identify key areas where improvements to the processes of educational policy-making at the state level can be made. The second part of the literature review examines studies which have attempted to analyse or describe some aspects of educational policy-making at the state level. This review seeks to identify some of the major elements in policy-making of this type and are also used as a guide to indicate key problem areas to watch for in the descriptive phase of the study.

The third chapter describes the methodology used to examine the current practices in educational policy-making in Ohio and makes some explanations relating to data collection, collation and interpretation. Chapter four, reports the information collected as a result of the study of educational policy-making in Ohio and offers some interpretation in that an attempt is made to make some general statements about the current policy-making procedures used.

Chapter five contains a discussion of the enactment procedures in the Ohio legislature and a brief case study of the enactment of one piece of legislation. The information gathered from these processes is then combined with the information gained from the interviews reported in chapter four and an overall view of
the policy-making system for K-12 education at the state level in Ohio is presented.

Chapter six contains a discussion of the conceptions gained of policy-making in Ohio in relation to the theoretical concepts of policy-making developed in chapter two. No attempt is made to determine whether the current educational policy-making practices in Ohio are "good" or "bad" in comparison with those used elsewhere, but rather, there is a comparison between current practice and an idealized notion of what could be developed as a policy-making system derived from the theoretical literature previously reviewed. At the conclusion of this chapter a scheme for meta-policy-making, designed to enable some more effective uses of the policy-making processes used in Ohio, is presented.

In the final chapter, the study is summarized and conclusions drawn about the value of the findings. In addition, the model developed in chapter six is examined further and some comments are made about its possible generalizability to other environments and other times. Finally, some suggestions for further research are made and some limitations of the findings of this study are emphasized.
Notes


11. The Educational Governance Project, the Report of the Select Joint Committee on Public School to the Florida Legislature, and the Milstein, Jennings study of the New York system, and similar studies are reviewed in chapter 2.


Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Although public policy making dates back to the dawn of organized human society, remarkably little is known about it except for discrete bits of information, a small inventory of studies and a few suggested frameworks and models for policy analysis.¹

Introduction

At best the existing literature on public policy-making is in the exploratory and descriptive stage. The complexity of the environment, the fluidity of the processes and the changing nature of society probably all contribute to the dearth of specific studies of the policy-making process. In the field of education, the literature is even sparser and, when one looks purely at the state level, it is almost non-existent. This lack of substantive literature offers one good reason for undertaking an exploratory study of this nature. However, there are two sources of information relating to policy-making which must be considered important.

The first area of this literature is quite extensive. There are numerous books and articles which deal with the theory of policy-making. Although these works are of a general nature and tend to deal with policy-making almost as a political abstraction, if the premise that educational policy-making is a political activity is accepted, many of the theoretical constructs advanced by
the various writers may be applied to the process of educational policy-making: at least, at the state level.

The second group of studies comprise a "pot-pourri" of descriptive works detailing the policy systems of single states or comparisons between a number of states, reports on individual policy innovations, and journal articles and unpublished dissertations dealing with specific policy initiatives. Although none of these has attempted the "macro" view which this study takes, each offers some specific insights into either the mechanics or the politics of the policy-making process.

Theoretical Constructs of Policy-Making

In order to suggest changes which could be applied to an existing policy-making system it is necessary to develop a theoretical framework which allows comparisons between what exists in the real world and a system which can be termed ideal. This body of literature, largely emanating from the fields of political and social sciences, covers a wide range of writings which deal with all aspects of the policy field from the discussion of specific aspects of the legislative processes to those, more normative in character, which attempt to present an idealized view of an effective policy-making structure. The following review of these writings does not attempt to be comprehensive. As the purposes of this study are to examine the structure of a state policy-making system and to suggest some theoretical structural/
organizational changes which could lead to improved policy-making for K-12 education, studies which offer frameworks for structural analyses form the basis of this literature review.

Most authors who compile summaries of policy-making procedures tend to group them into two major parts; these may be described as "decision-making theories" which are applied to explain the ways in which policy-makers reach decisions and theories or frameworks which are used to enable researchers to describe and analyse the structural and interactional aspects of policy systems.²

Although decision-making is an integral part of policy-making, it is just that, a part of the wider process of policy-making. In this instance it is sufficient to draw attention to the three major constructs relating to decision-making which, with minor variations, encompass all the elements available to the decision-maker. The first of these is generally referred to as the "Rational-Comprehensive Theory."³ It can be summarized as including the following elements:

- the decision-maker, when confronted with a problem can separate it from other problems.
- the goals, values and objectives which guide the decision-maker can be clarified and ranked according to their importance.
- the various alternatives for dealing with the problem can be formulated and examined.
- the consequences, costs and benefits, that would follow from the adoption of each alternative can be investigated.
- each alternative, and its probable outcome, can be compared with other alternatives.
- the decision-maker can choose the alternative that maximizes the possibility of attaining the goals, values, and objectives ranked as most important.

Such a decision-making process may have seemed almost feasible when the rather simplistic nature of Weber's ideal bureaucracy was a reasonably accurate assessment of the sorts of situations faced by decision-makers. However, in the complexities of today's public policy-making arena, the rational-comprehensive approach is likely to place impossible demands on the decision-maker. It assumes that enough information can be collected, digested and assessed to allow the rational choice of alternatives, that participants agree upon goals and have consistent priorities and that, the consequences of adopting any particular policy solution can be predicted with some accuracy.

An alternative to the "Rational-Comprehensive Theory", was proposed by Charles Lindblom. This theory, now generally known as the "Incremental Theory", seeks to avoid the problems of scope and complexity inherent in the rational-comprehensive approach and, at the same time, is descriptive of the way in which a large
number of public policy and administrative decisions are made. Incrementalism can be described by enumerating the following processes:

- only some alternatives which differ only marginally from existing policies are considered as solutions to a problem.
- for each alternative only a limited number of important consequences are evaluated.
- the problem is continually re-defined allowing for successive ends-means, means-ends adjustments.
- the test of a good decision is that most participants agree upon it.

Such a process has the effect of making decision-making more manageable. However, it also clearly makes its use as a policy-making tool more geared to the amelioration of present conditions rather than the promotion of any future goal; that is, it is essentially remedial. Although incrementalism is a conception which allows one to take a more realistic and pragmatic view of the policy process, the adoption of a philosophy which espouses only marginal change to the existing system seems to present significant problems for the educational policy-maker. Such factors as severe financial crises, falling enrollments and declining confidence in public education are unfamiliar to present day policy-makers and are likely to require novel and creative solutions which are unlikely to be developed as a result of incremental changes to past policies.
Etzioni,\textsuperscript{5} while agreeing with the above criticisms of incrementalism, also suggests that these procedures are likely to reflect the interests of only the most powerful and organized groups in society. Thus, he suggests a third approach to decision-making which is usually described as "mixed scanning". This approach seeks to incorporate the best elements of both the rational-comprehensive and incremental approaches. It is best described by using Etzioni's own example of weather forecasting where he suggests that the rational-comprehensive approach would involve the collection of all data, world-wide, and its analysis. The incremental approach would focus only upon those data which revealed similar patterns in the recent past.

A mixed-scanning strategy would include elements of both approaches by employing two cameras: a broad-angle camera that would cover all parts of the sky but not in great detail, and a second one which would zero in on those areas revealed by the first camera to require a more in-depth examination. While mixed-scanning might miss areas in which only a detailed camera could reveal trouble, it is less likely than incrementalism to miss obvious trouble spots in unfamiliar areas.\textsuperscript{6}

Thus, Etzioni suggests a scheme whereby some of the processes referred to in the rational-comprehensive approach can be utilized. By using "mixed scanning" the intelligence required, the alternatives to be considered and the goals and priorities upon which consensus must be reached are reduced to manageable proportions.
At the same time, this process does not restrict policy-makers to building new policy only from the perspectives given by already existing policy. The creation of new, innovative solutions to unfamiliar problems is clearly possible when "mixed-scanning" is used. Such an approach seems to offer the most useful approach for K-12 educational policy-making at the state level, and so, Etzioni's model will be used in both the development of a model for a theoretically ideal system and the construction of a practically applicable system for Ohio in later chapters.

The other group of theoretical studies relevant to this investigation suggest policy analysis frameworks which can be generalized under five major headings; namely, "Political Systems Theory"7, "Group Theory"8, "Elite Theory"9, "Functional Process Theory"10, and "Institutionalism".11 These "theories" each present a distinctive position from which to view the policy-making process and, some of them present a theoretical framework for considering possible changes to policy-making procedures. It is necessary to discuss each briefly.

**Political Systems Theory**

If this perspective is adopted, public policy is viewed as the responses made by a political system to the demands of its environment. Thus, individuals and groups make demands on the political system for action to satisfy their particular needs and, in return, provide support for the system by accepting election results, paying taxes, obeying laws and generally accepting
decisions generated by the political system. Thus, public policy-making is the result of continuing interaction between the policy-making system and its environment. Such a conceptualization explains the interactive nature of policy development but is of limited value as a basis for further theorizing about the structural/organizational aspects of the policy system, partly because of its very general nature but also because it offers few insights into the impact of traditional structures and processes by which policy is developed and enacted within the political system. It does, however, alert the student of policy-making to several important questions relating to policy-making. Among these are:

- how do environmental demands affect the content of policy?
- how does public policy affect the environment and, consequently, the subsequent demand for future action?
- what forces in the environment generate demands on the political system?

**Group Theory**

This theory suggests that public policy is the product of a struggle between groups. Latham states, "What may be called public policy is the equilibrium reached in this struggle at any given moment, and it represents a balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to weight in their favor."12
A natural extension of this depiction of groups is that the individual is significant in the process of policy-making only as he is a representative of a group. Thus, as various groups gain or lose influence public policy changes to accommodate to this change in power structure and the role of the public-policymaker is that of referee. He decides who is winning the power struggle between groups and makes rules to accommodate the preferred values of this particular group or coalition of groups.

Again, such a conceptualization does focus attention on the importance of formal groups and their lobbyists but tends to ignore the importance of individuals, particularly legislators and public officials, in determining policy outcome. It is also probable that abstract ideals, held by large sections of the community but not belonging to any particular group and the existence of large institutions which exert influence just by being there, are also significant factors in policy formulation. Thus, it is not very profitable to visualize policy-making as solely the outcome of a struggle between groups if one is attempting to devise an ideal policy model.

Elite Theory

This theory views public policy as the enactment of laws and regulations which serve the values and preferences of a governing elite. Such a view assumes that the masses are largely irrelevant in determining public policy and that it is decided by a ruling
elite and put into effect by public officials who are servants of that elite. Dye and Ziegler summarize the elite theory in six statements which may be paraphrased thus:

- society is divided into the few who have power and the masses who do not.
- the few who govern are not representative of the masses; they are drawn largely from the upper socio-economic strata of society.
- only the non-elites who have accepted and internalized the elite values can gain admittance to governing circles.
- elites share a consensus of values and seek to preserve the current social system.
- public policy reflects the values of the elite and hence is incremental rather than revolutionary.
- elites influence masses but masses have little influence on elites.13

This rather pessimistic view of policy-making has, of course, an essence of truth about it, but to any student of policy science it is nihilistic for, if it is accepted, there is no point in further investigation of the policy system. In addition, such a view tends to ignore such recent phenomena as the Civil Rights movement where blacks were able to influence the course of policy through appeals to the conscience of white elites. Thus, although the elite theory may provide a reasonably accurate view of a substantial amount of current policy-making, such an approach is unlikely
to allow the assessment of processes which may be adapted to develop a theoretically ideal model.

Institutionalism

This "theory", or perhaps more accurately, this framework for studying policy-making relates to the analysis of the structure and functioning of various formal organizations which are major participants in the policy-making process. (Anderson\textsuperscript{14} gives the study the name "institutionalism".) Institutionalism refers to a series of descriptive and interpretive studies of such formal organizations as legislatures, executives, government departments, courts and political parties. Institutionalism, then, tends to concentrate upon the formal and structural aspects of institutions. Such studies are useful in understanding the policy process as rules and structures give rise to differing sets of behaviour patterns which certainly impact upon the way policy is made and the nature of policies enacted. However, despite the significance of institutional structures, arrangements and procedures in impacting upon public policy, analysis of these alone would provide a minimal view of the dynamics of policy-making. Any attempt to devise an improved policy-making structure must be based upon an analytic process which enables the consideration of structure, group interaction and individual participation.
Functional Process Theory

Although Lasswell described his conceptualization as a "decision process model", he really presents seven concepts which can provide a functional analysis of the process of policy-making. He depicts these concepts as:

- intelligence: the processes by which information about policy matters that come to the attention of policy-makers are gathered and processed.
- promotion: the way in which alternatives for dealing with issues are made and promoted.
- prescription: the enactment of rules and policies together with the appropriate sanctions or rewards to ensure their acceptance.
- invocation: the act of formally indicating who determines whether given rules or laws are being contravened and who is to demand and oversee the application of the rules and laws.
- application: the actual task of enforcing laws or applying policy.
- termination: the ending or modifying of rules or policies once values have changed.
- appraisal: the determination of methods of classifying success and failure of policy initiatives.¹⁶

This scheme of analysis has a particular power and appeal which the others depicted do not. In particular, the fact that the scheme is not tied to particular institutions or political arrangements allows it to be used in a variety of settings and for the
analysis of many levels of human decision-making including policy-making. It is possible, using this model to enquire how each of these different functions are being performed, to what effect and by whom and to use the data so gathered in a comparative way even though they refer to different units at different levels of government and even though the perceptions are related to different policy events.

Lasswell also provides some other key concepts which are valuable in establishing a framework for studying policy. He delineates "five intellectual tasks" which could form the basis of policy-making strategies and suggest sections of the policy process which could be targeted for improvement. These are:
- goal clarification: what is the intended future state?
- trend description: what do past and recent events suggest about the possibility of achieving the preferred terminal state?
- analysis of conditions: what underlying conditions have affected these trends?
- projection of developments: if current policies continue, what is the likely outcome?
- invention, evaluation and selection of alternatives.

In almost every way these tasks can be seen as a "game-plan" for the implementation of Etzioni's "mixed scanning" approach referred to earlier. They suggest a careful and thoughtful analysis of relevant information but avoid both the overwhelming impossibility of omniscience inherent in the rational-comprehensive model and the lack of creativity which the incremental model is heir to.
A Scheme for Application

Lasswell's conceptual model provides the framework for the analysis of policy-making but Dror\textsuperscript{18}, using Lasswell's functional process theory, provides the basis of a scheme which can be used to suggest methods of applying the results of theoretical analysis to the actual process of policy-making at the state level. Dror, building upon Lasswell's theoretical framework, observes that public policy-making is:

- very complex. It consists of many interconnected components.
- dynamic. It involves continuously changing activity and requires continuing input.
- comprised of a great number and variety of components.
- affected by the differing contributions of each group and structure involved.
- concerned with deciding issues and providing major guidelines.
- future oriented.
- mainly limited to government organizations.
- formally aimed at achieving what is in the public interest.\textsuperscript{19}

Using these descriptors of the policy-making process Dror analyses various methods of policy-making which approximate those outlined above and, finally, specifies some concepts which, he
believes, must be the basis for any development of the public policy-making process. He lists nine major specifications for optimal policy-making. Namely,

- many diverse groups should participate but not necessarily in every situation.
- at least one group must be involved in every phase of policy-making.
- some phases of policy-making must have units specifically charged with carrying them out while others should occur spontaneously.
- contributions of various phases should duplicate and overlap each other.
- some units participating in policy-making should be isolated from certain other units.
- units in the coalition whose power will motivate the execution of the policy must be included in the policy-making structure.
- units that execute policy must be included in the policy-making structure.
- unit outputs must be integrated in a way which will maximize their aggregative contribution to policy-making.
- policy-making structures must be periodically re-examined and redesigned.20

These specifications for optimal policy-making emphasize the practical nature of Dror's concepts. It can be seen that these concepts
deal with the structural aspects of the policy-making machinery; these aspects are amenable to change unlike the values and interactions of other parts of the policy-making procedures.

In addition, Dror examines what he believes are some areas where major improvements are needed in the public policy-making area. He specifically stresses the need for greater planning and conscious consideration of the policy-making process. In particular, he claims the need for more meta policy-making, more systematic determination of policy strategies, development of long range planning units and a greater search for policy alternatives.21

One other aspect of Dror's conceptualization of the policy process is interesting to note. He observes that some successful policy-making can be attributed to extra-rational processes, that is, to the intuitive decisions of various policy-makers. Dror not only accepts this as a natural part of the policy-making process but also suggests that extra-rational processes should be encouraged by attempts to identify individuals with extra-rational capabilities and their inclusion in key positions in the policy-making hierarchy.22 This statement by Dror serves as a warning to would-be designers of the perfect policy system that, after all, policy-making is a human activity and thus not subject to totally rational control. However, Dror's conceptualization certainly suggests that the difficult task of planning and adapting a complex policy-making system in order to improve upon what has evolved by natural processes is not impossible.
Summary

The choices of Etzioni's decision-making model and Lasswell's and Dror's frameworks for policy analysis and policy model building are not meant to imply that the other theoretical constructs have no validity or importance. As explained previously, a conscious choice has been made to use the conceptions of these three writers because their views offer what seems to be the most comprehensive framework for analysis. In addition, each of these writers offer some guidelines which can be applied in the search for some structural changes to the K-12 policy-making system for education in Ohio.

Studies of Policy-Making for K-12 Education

Perhaps the most extensive study of state level policy-making for K-12 education completed to date is the "Educational Governance Project" (EGP). This study is reported in State Policy-Making for the Public Schools. It records the outcome of a large scale investigation of educational policy-making in ten states: California, Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Tennessee, and Texas. In particular, the researchers examined the roles of State Boards of Education, (SBE), Chief State School Officers (CSSO), Governors, and Educational Interest Groups in the processes of state level policy-making.
The EGP indicated that State Boards of Education were generally a weak influence in the policy-making processes of the states examined and that both Governors and CSSO's had significantly more impact in both the initiation and enactment phases of the policy process. Further, Campbell and Mazzoni observed that there are several identifiable reasons for the minimal influence of boards. These may be summarized as:

1. Board members are rarely representative of the community they serve and hence do not have the legitimacy which accrues to those representing an identifiable constituency.
2. Board members are part time and inexperienced in educational matters.
3. Board members have little or no access to research or information gathering procedures; they lack staff assistance.
4. There is little public awareness of the role and function of the SHE.\(^{24}\)

Similar findings relating to the selection and performance of CSSO's suggest that their roles in state level policy-making are weaker than one would expect. In part this may suggest the need for the redefinition of roles for CSSO's and as the EGP writers have indicated that the lack of national searches and the limiting of appointees to those already within the education
sphere could mean that the best persons are not always selected for these important positions. When this is added to the expressed concern that SDE's are often staffed by large numbers of individuals with similar backgrounds - teaching or administrative experience in rural or small town areas within the state - the point that some branches of the state level policy-making structure are likely to reflect a narrow and provincial view-point is clear.  

Campbell and Mazzoni confirm a trend towards increasing centralization which parallels mounting costs and a greater number of contentious issues in education. However, they also note an increasing politicization of the processes of policy-making and the more frequent involvement of contending interest groups and their lobbyists. Thus, there appear to be some contradictory forces operating in educational policy-making at the state level. On the one hand there is a tendency for greater centralization while, on the other, there is an increasing amount of involvement by a large number of interest groups. Thus, the tendency for centralization, bemoaned by many, but clearly the case, when recent developments in school finance are considered, may be balanced in part by the wider involvement of various lobbies. Perhaps the only danger is that the lobbies are not representative of some important sectors of society.

Other studies of educational policy-making are somewhat more limited in scope in that they do not look at the generalities of
the process, but are most often confined to one issue or one group of actors and often, but not always, are concerned with one or two states. This restriction to individual issues and environments is probably a result of the complexity of the policy process which has necessitated a similar limitation of this study to a single state. However, such studies produce some findings which provide direction and focus for a macro approach to the problems of state level policy-making. In general there is a consensus that state level policy-making is becoming more complex and more open to a variety of influences. As Peggy Siegel observes,

--- the entire educational system at the state level is in flux. Where a small number of educational experts and legislators used to be able to sit down in relative ease and privacy and hammer out a school aid formula, this is no longer the case. The educators can no longer agree among themselves on most school issues.\(^{27}\)

Ron Hoekstra, although concentrating specifically on the role of the governor in educational policy-making, also concluded that one of the most significant recent changes in the mechanisms for making policy determinations was the growing role of educational interest groups. He also observed that this changing role may broaden the base from which educational policies are made.

In the past the number of persons who shaped education policy has been small - often no more than a dozen. Increased power and activity (of lobbyists and interest groups) serve to bring additional participants into the process. Additional numbers of participants may serve to widen the scope of the interest groups and may broaden the issues of education policy determined by the state government.\(^{28}\)
He also indicated the possibility of the existence of what he calls a "closed membership alliance." In essence, he is claiming that the politicization of educational policy-making can lead to the development of powerful relationships between individuals or groups which can, in turn, dominate the policy-making processes. This possibility is particularly strong in situations where educational interest groups are not well organized or not acting in coalition. This phenomenon is part of the changes over previous decades which have led to changes in educational policy-making practices: it is documented by Hoekstra, Cistone, and Milstein. These changes in particular refer to the increasing influence of sectional interest groups, and expanded roles for both state and federal governments. The reverse of this, the relative success in achieving solutions which have a broad support base through coalition of interest/pressure groups, is illustrated by Peggy Siegel in her account of the fight for state aid for education in Ohio. Overall, there is a considerable amount of evidence that, in this era of political decision making for education, the role of the educational interest groups is vital in influencing the quality of state level policy-making for K-12 education.

Another significant aspect of state level policy-making which is revealed in recent writings is that of citizen involvement. It may be argued that, theoretically, people in general have access
to the policy-making processes through contact with their local members of the legislature, through membership of groups which exert political pressure or through the ballot box. However, most involved in education would recognize that, although these opportunities exist, they are rarely used by the majority of citizens. Thus, there have been a number of attempts to involve citizens in the policy-making process which have been reported. Recently, Dickson\textsuperscript{34} reported upon a Canadian experience of "Involvement by Decree". Although this study relates the experiences for a particular policy area, (Early Childhood Services), and explains that the mandated involvement of citizens was aimed at program involvement rather than broadening the policy-making base, there is evidence that, "--- decision-making power can be allocated to citizens at the local level without reduction in provincial government power ----".\textsuperscript{35} The study also highlights the need to identify individual and group participants early in the policy process and ensure that mechanisms are available to facilitate their input\textsuperscript{36} and some suggestions relating to the importance of all groups having equal access to policy intelligence are made.

A number of analyses of federal policy-making in education have also contributed some possible conceptualizations for aspects of policy-making. Bailey and Mosher\textsuperscript{37} examined the policy inputs relating to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
and, in doing so, identified an extensive array of variables involved in the process of making educational policy. The examination portrays an interactive process wherein a number of events occurring simultaneously precipitate a policy decision. Wirt and Kirst\(^3^8\) studied intergovernmental interactions which influenced subsequent policy-making under Title I of this same law. Their study indicates the variety of implementations and interpretations which can result from the enactment of a single set of policies and, thus, emphasizes the importance of the implementation and oversight phases in determining the overall quality of enacted policies.

A final group of studies may be described as those which deal with the process of "citizen involvement". This practice is relatively recent in origin and may be described as the deliberate attempt by policy-makers to utilize grass-roots involvement as a method of either generating new approaches to complex problems or gaining acceptance for policies by using citizen groups to validate policies already conceived. The emergence of such groups, significantly, has coincided with the emergence of such complex problems as desegregation, lack of finance for education and the decline of confidence in public education. The fact that some of the following reports indicate at least partial solution to some of these major problems through citizen involvement indicates that there
may be important improvements to be made in the policy-making process by the more frequent inclusion of citizen involvement processes.

In general, the theoretical assumption in the United States has been that educational governance is best when there is local control; that is, when citizens' elected representatives play the major role in the formulation of policies and then ensure that professional staff implement these preferred policies. However, there is recent evidence that this local control is becoming something of a myth. Meranto documents the extent to which federal and state funding has usurped local control and Berke and Kirst concur in suggesting that, at least, the federal government sets very rigid boundaries beyond which local policy-making cannot take place. Similarly, there are a number of recent statements indicating both financial and program areas where state governments have intruded upon what had previously been local domains. Studies by Bailey and Mosher, and Safran as well as the Educational Governance project previously referred to, all give evidence of this growing phenomenon.

This pattern of increasing federal and state intrusion into the policy-making and operational functions of the local school district could suggest a break-down in the local control system; that is, local systems have been unable to deal with recent problems and state and federal governments have stepped in to ensure
the survival of public schools and, incidentally imposed a measure of central control. Others may argue that state level policy-makers have enacted and implemented policy in a centralist fashion on the doubtful premise that it is "more efficient". Several recent experiences have indicated that, irrespective of whether centralization of policy-making is desirable or undesirable, citizen involvement, or at least proper representation of a wide range of societal viewpoints, may be a partial solution to some of the problems which beset education today. Evidence for this second view is contained in several reports which relate what has happened when specific plans for citizen involvement on the local level have been implemented. Dickson, in his study of mandated citizen involvement in Canada, concludes that citizens at the local level can make significant contributions to the intelligence, promotion and implementation phases of policy-making.

In the United States of America the Detroit Education Task Force, the St. Louis Public Schools Issues Seminar and, most recently, the attempts to improve education in Florida, all give an indication that the process of organized citizen involvement may be a viable policy option. A brief description of the processes and findings of the Florida consultants will suffice here to demonstrate the nature and possible impacts of the involvement of citizens at the local level.

The program to improve Florida's education system began with the work of a Citizens' Committee on Education appointed by
Governor Askew in 1971. This committee, over the nearly three years of its existence made over 100 recommendations for improving public education. Their major recommendations may be summarized as:

1. Education should be individualized as much as possible in order to allow for differences in children's needs and learning styles.

2. Education should be competency based.

3. The renewal and maintenance of quality education can best be accomplished by those closest to children - parents and teachers.

4. School management, at the school level, should be reformed with greater emphasis given to the autonomy of principals.  

Underlying each of these recommendations is the belief that the quality of education is best served, not by a plethora of laws and regulations, but by allowing as much local decision-making as possible within a broad policy framework devised at state level and designed largely to create a basis for comparability between local districts.

As a result of these recommendations in 1973 a number of legislative reforms were enacted. In 1977 the consultant team was appointed by a joint select committee to assess the effectiveness of the reforms dealing with school based management, school finance
and parent participation. The findings of the consultant team supported the concepts of localizing as far as possible the school decision-making and management processes and noted that the policy initiatives had generated a substantial quantity of public involvement which, by implication, had strengthened the policy process itself.

Specific recommendations which may have implications for the general policy process at the state level can be stated thus:

1. More attention needs to be given to the processes of informing policy actors (particularly, principals) about the meaning and implications of new policies.

2. More advice (intelligence) needs to be sought from parents and teachers.

3. A permanent citizens' advisory committee to the state legislature should be established. This committee should maintain a technical assistance advisory capacity which would enable more meaningful involvement of local parent groups through greater access to information and expertise.

4. The State Department of Education should offer technical assistance related to three areas of policy-making:
   - explication of the structure of the task to be accomplished
   - techniques/methods to be used
   - outcomes to be achieved
5. Much greater attention should be given to the implementation phase. In particular, the training and utilization of "implementation experts" should have high priority.

6. Legislative oversight was generally lacking and the techniques of establishing regular contacts between the legislature and the educational system through the use of education interns, site visitation teams and Education Department monitoring of the activities of the Senate and the House should be implemented. 48

Thus, the Florida experiment indicates that, at least in one state, manipulation of the policy process has been seriously considered and that a range of experts consider the chances of improving the system by such manipulation to be good. It demonstrates the belief that policy-making is not merely a process which occurs spontaneously through the interaction of various environmental and social forces but a series of events which can be modified to some extent in order to provide for richer more varied inputs, the more intimate involvement of a larger number of policy actors, the more rational use of implementation procedures, and the development of viable oversight practices.

Summary

Although the literature relating to actual policy procedures may be disparate and disjointed in many ways, there are two important factors which may be gleaned from it. First, there is the
general factor referred to above; that policy processes can be changed. They do not "just happen". Second, the literature on educational policy-making has repeatedly indicated, at least by implication, that four policy phases, above all others, may be important in developing a policy process which can cope effectively with the complexities of the current milieu; namely, initiation, intelligence, implementation and oversight. Furthermore, with the first three of these, there appears to be some evidence that the old saw, which educationists have often been accused of using to justify more money and more programs, that "more is better" may well be true in the policy-making field. That is, it may be that, in educational policy-making the incorporation of the views of as many sections of society as possible through the involvement of individuals and groups in the intelligence and implementation phases is both desirable and necessary.

**Conclusion**

The fore-going discussion indicates only some of the possible views of the policy-making process and the findings of a few relevant studies. The literature was reviewed to find a theoretical basis which would provide a framework for the subsequent investigation of the policy-making system for K-12 education in Ohio. The works of Etzioni, Lasswell and Dror were selected to provide this basis as they seemed to offer the most comprehensive system for description and analysis of a state level system.
After the decision to adopt this theoretical posture had been made, the literature which described previous studies on similar topics was reviewed. This review provided some indications that such elements as:

- the role of the State School Board
- the role of the State Department of Education
- the role of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
- the role of organized interest groups
- the inclusion of a wide range of societal attitudes and opinions in the consideration of policy
- the scope and nature of policies which are dealt with by state level policy-makers,

may be important factors to consider in any attempt to design an ideal or improved policy-making system. These considerations were used as key determinants of the investigation reported in chapter 4.
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Chapter 3

Methodology

Methodological problems exist for all research, and policy research is not without its share, especially given the complexity of its subject matter. These problems may impede or limit policy research, they may make it frustrating at times but they do not prevent it.¹

Introduction

In this study an attempt is made to approach the problems of state level policy-making for K-12 education in three ways. First, there is an attempt to describe the existing practices of educational policy-making by collecting the perceptions of persons with a considerable knowledge of and interest in the policy processes in Ohio. Second, there is an attempt to describe the policy processes used in the initiation, enactment and implementation of a specific single policy issue in Ohio and finally these processes are compared with those suggested by the theoretical writings reviewed in chapter 2.

Such an approach to the study is clearly descriptive and exploratory and thus, the technique of an unstructured interview was chosen as the most satisfactory method of obtaining information. The data obtained in this way are obviously based upon the opinions of major participants and to some extent rely upon their ability to accurately recall past events for any validity.
it may have. However, the complexity of the process examined, the subjective nature of the descriptive data - by whatever means it is obtained - and the speculative nature of the resultant conclusions all helped to determine that the methods described below were the only possible ones for an individual study of a state level policy-making system.

**Justification of Method**

The context within which policies are made - in this case the state legislature of Ohio and its administrative department for K-12 education (the State Department of Education), is a constantly changing one. The actors change, the issues change and the environmental constraints change. As a consequence any attempt to define the policy-making context by objectively categorizing actors, issues and elements would either be valid only for one single issue on one particular occasion, or be so extensive that it would include almost all possible participants, issues and factors to such an extent that it would be a meaningless description of the whole state of Ohio.

In order to obtain some sense of the overall policy-making pattern in Ohio it was necessary to establish which issues, which actors and which environmental influences were most significant in the policy process. The only feasible method for accomplishing this was to seek the perceptions of persons identified as knowledgeable in the area under study. Hence the semi-structured
interview was selected as the method for determining the most important aspects of the K-12 educational policy-making system in Ohio and for gaining the data upon which a description of its major characteristics could be based.

It is recognized that the use of perceptions of persons who have been intimately involved in the policy-making process is bound to be dangerous in that it requires double interpretation: interpretation first by the person being interviewed and then by the researcher in his interpretation of responses. In order to lessen the danger of gross mis-representations of reality, it was decided to examine the documentary evidence available describing one recent piece of legislation. Any gross discrepancies between procedures revealed or implied will then be the subject of further investigation to determine whether the perceptions of the interviewee or researcher are at fault.

Once the policy-making processes have been described it is intended that some comparison will be made between processes revealed by the descriptive study and "ideal" processes described by writers who have made significant contributions to policy-making theory. There is no intention to attempt a formulation of theory based upon the imperfect observation and description of what happens in Ohio; rather, the "leap of faith" from actuality to theory will be based upon a philosophical commitment by the author to the constructs of policy-making suggested by Etzioni, Lasswell, and Dror.
The arguments for some guidelines for policy-making, or the establishment of meta-policy, developed and presented in chapter six, are intended as guides to practical policy-making, not as a theory about policy-making theories. Thus the methodology of qualitative, descriptive, analysis coupled with the application of some theories of policy-making seems acceptable provided that the reader accepts the philosophies and constructs of Etzioni, Lasswell and Dror, at least to the extent that they can be regarded as worthy of consideration as the basis of one possible method of deliberately setting out to adapt the policy-making process in ways which may be beneficial.

**Procedures**

**Selection of Persons Interviewed**

An initial list of prospective interviewees was developed after discussions with three persons who had considerable experience in dealing with the K-12 policy-making system in Ohio. In addition, each interviewee was asked to identify individuals important in the policy-making process. The few who were mentioned a number of times were added to the list of interviewees. Thus, the list of interviewees, (see Appendix B) is assumed to include those individuals, or representatives of groups who are acknowledged as having been involved in the policy-making process and who are deemed to be knowledgeable in the area. No claim is made
that the list is exhaustive or that it necessarily gives a balanced view of policy-making processes. It is admittedly an "insider's" view. No attempt has been made to incorporate "man in the street" perceptions, nor even perceptions of teachers or school level administrators. These omissions are deliberate. It is the intention of this study to describe the inner workings of a state level policy system and, as far as possible to reveal the importance of interactions taking place amongst "insiders". Hence, the selection of such people to provide impressions, while seemingly biased, is designed to reveal actual processes not always apparent to those not so intimately involved.

Guidelines for Interview Questions

In order to determine the mechanics and interactions of the K-12 educational policy-making system in Ohio it is necessary either to observe the process or to use the perceptions of others as surrogates for observation. Traditional qualitative research has extolled the virtues of participant observation. However, in a field as complex as policy-making the process of participant observation is almost impossible. As McCall and Simmons observe, in cases such as this the use of informants is not only legitimate but necessary.

"--- (a) common use of the informant is to report events not directly observed by the field worker. Here the field worker substitutes the observations of a member for his own observations --------. Such a procedure is
not only legitimate but absolutely necessary to adequate investigations of any complex structure. In studying a social structure by participant observation there are two problems of bias that override all others, even the much belabored "personal equation." One results from the fact that a single observer cannot be everywhere at the same time, nor can he be "everywhere" in time, for that matter - he has not been in S forever, and will not be there indefinitely - so that, inevitably, something happens that he has not seen, cannot see, or will not see. The second results from the fact that there exist parts of the social structure into which he has not penetrated and probably will not, by virtue of the way he has defined himself to its members, because of limitations on the movement of those who sponsor him etc. —— To have a team of observers is one possible solution; to have informants who stand in the relation of team members to the investigator is another. The virtue of the informant used in this way, is to increase the accessibility of S to the investigator.

Thus, despite the problem of possible faulty recall by respondents, it was decided to use participants in the policy process as surrogate observers and an interview guide was developed. (See Appendix A.) The interview guide is just that; a series of general questions designed to guide the researcher and ensure that the specific areas of the study are adequately discussed and that crucial points in the policy-making process are revealed.

The general nature of the questions in the interview guide is a result of deliberate choice. Consideration was given to the use of a more structured questionnaire but this was discarded on two grounds. First, there was the real possibility that a structured questionnaire would omit reference to some crucial aspects of the policy-making process and second that the researcher's own
perceptions could limit the responses. Both of these could lead to bias in the description of the policy-making process which can be avoided, to a large extent, if respondents are allowed to discuss their perceptions within a broader context.

The interview guide questions were structured around the five areas of specific interest; namely, - initiation of policy, research and intelligence, preparation for implementation, implementation and oversight. In each case respondents are encouraged to describe the particular procedures mentioned and are encouraged to identify important actors and issues at each stage. In addition, a general section invited respondents to indicate strengths and weaknesses of the policy-making structure as they saw them, to suggest possible changes and to give examples of "policy-making by default"; that is where policy-makers' or policy implementors' refusal to act constitutes the establishment of a policy position.

While this process was designed to give respondents the opportunity to respond in whatever ways they saw fit, it was considered important to identify major participants in the initiation, research and implementation phases of policy-making in such a way that some statement about their overall relative importance could be made. Hence, in addition to the general questions referred to above, these sections of the interview guide contain specific questions which ask the interviewee to rate various actors in terms of their importance on a scale of 1-5. (1 = least important, 5 =
most important). It is hoped that this process will allow some 
assessment of the overall importance of individuals and groups 
in various phases of the K-12 educational policy-making process 
by creating a composite score.

**Interview procedures**

As far as possible, respondents who agreed to participate 
were interviewed in their places of occupation. However, several 
respondents were unavailable for personal interview and so inter-
views were conducted by telephone. There appeared to be no dif-
ference in the amount or nature of data obtained by telephone or 
face to face interviews.

In the face to face interviews respondents were given the 
option of having responses recorded on tape or recorded by the 
interviewer. About half preferred each method. No pressure was 
exerted to suggest either method should be used. In general the 
responses were free and open with either method of recording.

Interviews varied somewhat in length from 45 minutes to two 
hours; the average time for each interview was one hour. In 
several instances, because of other commitments of the partici-
pants, interviews were not completed on one occasion and a second 
visit was necessary to obtain responses to all the items. Again, 
there was no perceivable difference in the quantity or nature of 
the data obtained from such interrupted interviews.

In general, it may be observed that the method of recording, 
the time taken and whether the interviews were face to face or by
telephone were non-significant variables in this instance. However, it must be admitted that the procedure is open to the general biases of the interview technique described by Webb et al. When they observe that,

Interviews and questionnaires create as well as measure attitudes, they elicit atypical roles and responses, they are limited to those who are accessible and will cooperate, and the responses obtained are produced in part by dimensions of individual differences irrelevant to the topic at hand.9

In this case care was taken to minimize the creation of attitudes and the elicitation of atypical responses by the unstructured nature of the procedure. However, it is true that the responses relate to a group of those involved in policy-making who were accessible and available. Thus, the overall picture of policy-making gained from these interviews and explained in chapter 4 must be regarded as a view of those in positions which enable them to see the intricacies of the policy-making process and in no way attempts to present a view of policy-making which may be held by school administrators, teachers, parents or others who are further removed from the sphere of state level policy-making.

Examination of the Enactment of a Particular Law

The interview sought information about five of the six steps in policy-making enumerated in chapter 1. The sixth, the enactment process, that is the actual process of passing a policy
initiative into law and so making it an active policy, was delib-
erately excluded from the information sought from interview
respondents. It was considered best to derive this information
from two sources; the examination of the process used to enact one
piece of legislation and the use of secondary sources which describe
the mechanics of the process and the interactions of legislative
participants.10

The piece of legislation used to establish the basis of the
enactment phase, Amended Substitute Senate Bill 493, which con-
tains the provisions for the creation of the School Loan Fund, was
chosen because of its recency and its overall impact. The exami-
nation of this piece of legislation is also used as check of the
perceptions revealed by examination of the data produced by the
series of interviews.

Comparison with Theoretical Ideal

The final stage in the methodology of this study is to make
some connection between three specific patterns or models of policy-
making. It is possible to use the concepts devised by Etzioni,
Lasswell and Dror to construct a theoretically ideal model for
educational policy-making. (Although this model is reported in
chapter 6 it was formulated by the author prior to the interviews
and thus helped guide the interviewer's perceptions and questions.)
Similarly it is possible, using the perceptions presented by inter-
view respondents and the review of a piece of legislation, to
represent a generalized view of the policy-making process in Ohio. Unfortunately, the theoretically ideal model tends to assume unlimited access, unlimited resources and unlimited time; none of these is present normally in the practical world where educational policy-making takes place. Thus, a third stage will be devised in chapter 6. The actual model for Ohio and the theoretically ideal model will be compared and points of overlap, approximate correlation and wide separation will be observed. Such a process should allow for the development of a third pattern of policy-making best described as the "practical preferred model". This model will contain the elements of a meta-policy-making model which accepts the fact that massive and radical changes cannot be made in the real world. Rather it will suggest that, where the actual model approaches the theoretically ideal, some specific structural changes could adapt the practice of policy-making in a beneficial manner.

Conclusion

This chapter outlines a methodology which in some ways is novel in the study of educational policy-making. The study incorporates the collection of multiple perceptions of a complex process through interviews, the theoretical assessment of general policy-making models and the use of comparative analysis of these two views to develop a third, practical model, for improved policy-making for K-12 education in Ohio.
In addition, the method of investigation described here is used in the belief that it may be possible to establish a process by which key elements in state level educational policy-making can be identified and alternative approaches recommended in environments other than Ohio. That is, the discussions of policy-making in Ohio are regarded as examples of how the models can be applied. The intention is to develop models which can be easily adapted and applied in a variety of different settings.
Notes


2. Evidence to support this statement can be found in both the interview responses (chapter 4) and the analysis of previous studies (chapter 2).


6. The three were:
   Dr. Luvern Cunningham - Novice G. Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration, Ohio State University.
   Dr. Carla Edlefson - Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, Ohio State University.
   Dr. Peggy Siegel - Lobbyist, Cleveland City Schools.

7. The initial list proved to contain most of the individuals named by other participants. Only five members of the state legislature were added as a result of repeated identifications by other participants.


10. The following five publications:
Ohio Legislative Services Commission, A Guidebook for Ohio Legislators, Columbus: Ohio Legislative Service Commission, 1977.

form the basis of the secondary sources used in the analysis of the enactment phase.
Chapter 4

Some perceptions relating to the existing policy-making processes in Ohio.

Introduction

The drama (of policy enactment) is not easy to encapsulate. In one sense there are as many dramas as there are states and programmatic campaigns within states. In a more general sense, however the politics (of education) run a course similar to the politics of any other controversial issue in a democratic society. Some people want something from government and build a coalition of influence to get it; other people want to block or modify the designs of the first group; strategic and tactical campaigns are fought; constitutional wielders of power determine winners and losers by laws passed and executive and judicial actions taken. The process is never-ending. As soon as a governmental decision is made a new dialectic begins.

Although the statement above refers to the situation in the North Eastern United States in the early 1960's, Bailey's description of the political nature of the policy-making process is still a reasonably accurate portrayal of the situation in Ohio today. In an attempt to gain an acceptable overview of the policy-making process for K-12 education, persons representative of four major groups - educational lobby groups, state level administrators, legislators and their aides, and persons who, although not currently involved, are knowledgeable concerning the policy process were interviewed. In general, the perceptions gained from these people, reflect almost exactly the perceptions outlined by Bailey.
The following discussion reveals several interesting perceptions:

1. that each group, lobbyist, legislator, administrator, shares a slightly different perspective of the importance of the various policy-making phases.

2. that there is an ambivalence of attitude towards the policy-making process. All believe that it should be rational and usually act as if it were, while, at the same time, suspecting that it is often far from rational.

3. that the process for policy-making is relatively the same for each piece of policy varying in intensity rather than form from one piece of policy to another.

4. that state-level policy-making deals with issues "of the moment" rather than long term issues.

5. that the policy-making processes exist as a result of a long term evolutionary process and that thus, there is little expectation of changing them.

The material gathered from interviews was largely related to policy-making within the last three years and, because of the guide questions used (see Appendix A) the information gathered focused upon the initiation, research and intelligence, preparation for implementation, implementation and oversight phases of policy-making. The other phase, enactment, which schematically belongs between intelligence and preparation for implementation, is treated
separately in chapter 5 as the information regarding this phase was gathered in a different manner. In order to illustrate the similarities and differences in perceptions of the various groups this chapter is organized in such a way that the perceptions of those whose prime connection is with lobby groups, administration, and legislation are grouped together. Then within this grouping, the various policy phases are discussed separately. The perceptions of those who are not currently involved in policy-making have been used as a further basis for the general summary which concludes the chapter.

Throughout the chapter words within quotation marks indicate actual words taken from the transcripts of interviews. However, as anonymity was guaranteed to respondents, no further acknowledgement of these statements is made.

The information on which the following discussion is based was derived from twenty interviews conducted with persons listed in Appendix B. Although an attempt was made to use the "Interview Guide" (Appendix A) in all cases, only fourteen of the interviews rigidly followed the guide and hence only these responses were classified in the summary tables (Appendix D). The fact that only fourteen of the twenty provided classifiable responses should not be taken to indicate lack of cooperation by some interviewees: rather, it indicates that some chose to discuss other matters related to the policy process and, as these seemed important and
the interviewer was loathe to place his own perceptions upon any respondents, information was recorded as it was given with no attempt to force participants into a response pattern which they did not readily accept. In addition, a number of minor contacts was made with other policy actors; the information gleaned from such contacts is also incorporated in the following discussion.

However, no claim is made that the persons interviewed represent, in any way, a valid sample and thus any interpretations and comments can be expressions of significant bias. The information presented here, indicates the opinions of a number of knowledgeable policy actors in the State of Ohio. It is presented to indicate some of the matters which are seen as major concerns about the processes of state level policy-making for K-12 education in Ohio by this particular group of respondents. Only those elements of the policy process which are indicated as problems by most respondents are seriously considered in the discussion which leads to the formulation of policy models in chapter 6.

The Policy Process - Views of Interest Groups

Initiation. All interest or lobby groups viewed themselves, and other similar groups as prime initiators of policy. Each group claimed some sort of formal or informal structure which provided the opportunity for any individual or small sub-group to begin the initiation of policy. However, each member of an interest
group interviewed agreed that lobbyists, staff members and executive officers (usually in that order) had significantly more input at this stage than "grass roots" members.

In answer to question II, 1, of the interview guide,

"Can you name some individuals, groups, or sections of the community who, in your opinion, have been particularly influential or active in initiating educational policy-making at the state-level?"

in every case the immediate reaction was to identify the lobby groups Ohio Educational Association, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Ohio School Boards Association. The only other generally provided answer may be best described as "crisis policy-making". The general perception was that legislators only reacted to crises (albeit that some crises were local, that is "the folks back home are making a fuss"). A few respondents indicated that the State Department of Education was starting to generate some policy initiatives and that this trend could be expected to increase in the future. One respondent suggested that this was a result of "some sort of chemistry between the State Superintendent and the governor's office."

Two other points of general agreement emerged from the answers to this question. All agreed strongly that an individual or an unorganized group had little or no hope of initiating policy. All believed that a professional lobbyist was a virtual necessity and the representative of one group, which does not have a permanent
professional lobbyist, suggested that their influence depended largely upon "coat-tailing on others' initiatives as we cannot afford to employ a person to establish the liaisons within the state house necessary to initiate policies of our own." In addition, all implied, although only two directly stated it, that what can be described as "negative initiation" forms an important part of the interest group's policy-making role. By this they implied that their function was, in part, to oppose initiatives suggested by others which were not in accordance with their own values. All claimed to be working for the betterment of education within the state, but, predictably, each group interpreted the individual interests of its members as being congruent with the interests of better education.

Question II, 2.,

"Which areas of educational policy-making at the state level have been most important in Ohio in the last 3-5 years?"

brought the unanimous response, "Finance". As each respondent pointed out, until the recurring financial problems are solved the other areas of educational policy-making are not given much attention. When pressed to discuss the financial situation, most agreed that some thoroughly researched, long term policy was necessary to remove the financial uncertainty from Ohio school systems but only one believed that it was in any way possible to attain
this objective in the foreseeable future. The most commonly expressed reason for this lack of long term fiscal policies was that any advocacy for financial reforms of a drastic nature was "political dynamite" and thus, unlikely to be viewed favorably by legislators.

Question II, 3,

"Can you rank each of the following on a scale of importance (1 = not important - 5 = very important) as sources for initiation of educational policy in Ohio"

gained responses from all interviewed in this group. The responses, summarized in Table C3, Appendix C, must be regarded as purely clarifying individual perceptions. They should in no way be interpreted as indicating the actual importance of individuals or groups in the process. Not all persons or individuals were ranked by all respondents and the individual respondents during the course of the interview. Thus some of these could have received further ratings if they had occurred to the individuals or if they had been included in the list suggested by the interviewer (see Appendix A).

A quick examination of the data presented in Table C3 indicates that the numerical rankings exhibit some differences from the verbal responses given as answers to the initial question which required the identification of important policy-makers. Whereas, in the first instance, the lobby groups were always mentioned first, in the table only the Ohio Education Association
ranks above the median value for importance as initiators. It was suspected that, in ranking groups and individuals on a five point scale, respondents disregarded the fact that the question was related only to policy initiation and tended to rank the perceived importance of various actors in the overall policy-making process. (This problem of interpretation probably indicates that respondents do not normally think of the policy process in terms of separate phases.) As a consequence, each respondent was questioned further regarding the values ascribed to each actor as an initiator.

In general, the interviewer's perception that general importance rather than importance purely as an initiator was ranked but several respondents pointed out another aspect of initiation which increased the importance of various actors. They suggested that, although such individuals as the governor, or groups such as the State Controlling Board and the Education Committees of the house and the senate, rarely developed entirely new ideas, they did, in fact, initiate policy by changing, developing, opposing or emphasizing various aspects of policy concerns which had been originally introduced by others. This phenomenon could be called "secondary initiation". There is no doubt that the changes in direction resulting from the interventions of the actors ranked highly in Table C3 are a significant force in the initiation phase.
Two lobby groups particularly emphasized the growing role of
the State Department of Education and the State Superintendent as
policy initiators. They suggested that, in recent years, the State
Department has developed its oversight role and, as a result, is
in a position to recommend state-wide policy initiatives.

Policy Research. This section of the interview guide caused the
greatest difficulty for most of the respondents. It appeared that
few had given much thought to policy research at the post initi-
ation stage and believed that the research usually took place be-
fore initiation. That is, interest groups tended to regard the
research phase as the process of gathering facts and assessing
the political climate to decide whether a proposal had "a chance
to fly". Thus, the question (III, 1.) "Can you explain how a
policy, once initiated, is researched?" often brought puzzled and
non-committal replies. In general lobby groups saw research as
supplying "ammunition" to support their own point of view or to
help "shoot down" a policy initiative introduced by another group
if its intent seemed inimical to their own position. They saw
policy research as a political tool in the political game of having
policy enacted.

Question III, 2,

"Do you believe that policy-makers have adequate infor-
mation available to them in making decisions?"
brought the response that "too much rather than too little infor-
mation" is the problem. Further probing revealed that this usually
implied that it was impossible for policy-makers to assimilate and use all the information available and that, as a consequence, they often "take most notice of those who make the most noise". The interviewer believes that "most noise" here can be interpreted to mean the greatest political power. There was also a suggestion by one respondent that a great deal of the information provided to legislators is biased and, as they have neither the resources nor the time to generate new data themselves, they are forced to accept data which are slanted towards the view preferred by the data supplier. The same respondent hastened to add that this practice is not necessarily bad, but that it is just a "fact of politics".

Question III, 3.,

"Do the amount of research and/or information
- nature of " " " "
- source of " " " "
have an impact on the likelihood that a policy initiative will be enacted as policy?"

brought what was, to the interviewer, a quite surprising series of responses. There was general agreement that amount, nature and source of research depended largely upon the nature of the policy initiative. They regarded issues of finance as the ones likely to generate the greatest amount of research and issues related to curriculum as likely to generate least. No one saw any particular connection between the amount, quality or source of research and the likelihood of its enactment. In the words of one respondent
"If some influential legislators want something it will pass even if there is not a shred of hard evidence and if they don't want it the number of facts we gather doesn't make a damn bit of difference." Although not stated as bluntly, there was the general feeling that being able to play the political game and ensure the right sponsors for policy initiatives was far more important than research.

Question III, 4, asked respondents to rank the importance of various sources of policy research. Two declined to do so, one claiming insufficient knowledge and the other claiming the matter was of little importance. Table C4 indicates the responses of those who did reply.

In the eyes of the respondents the State Department of Education and the Ohio Education Association are clearly the pre-eminent providers of intelligence. Most interviewees pointed out that these are the only two bodies to possess the capabilities for collecting and presenting data on issues which are as complex as most educational issues today. A number also indicated that the emergence of the State Department of Education as the prime generator of policy research is of relatively recent origin and that, before the last year or so, the Ohio Education Association had to be relied upon for data as only they possessed the capability to generate them.
Preparation for implementation. The specific questions in the interview guide for this section proved ineffective in eliciting appropriate responses from respondents in the early interviews and, subsequently, interviewees were generally encouraged to talk about any instances of preparation for implementation. Most of the persons representing educational interest groups had difficulty in visualizing preparation for implementation as a separate policy-making phase within the process of state level policy-making as it operates in Ohio at the moment. The most frequent response in this area was that, through their intimate involvement with the processes of the state legislature, they knew what was likely to be implemented. Each interest group had an established procedure by which they kept members informed of the progress of various legislative initiatives and believed that this knowledge was the basis of preparing people for implementation.

The general belief that preparation for implementation entails little more than knowledge of forthcoming policy and the establishment of a system whereby individuals can get advice on "what to do" either through scheduled meetings or through informal "call up" systems, may seem rather naive. However, when one considers the major concerns of state level policy-making in Ohio over the past few years (see Appendix D), it is not surprising that this is the predominant view. Eighty percent of state level policy-making over the past three years has been concerned with finance, salaries and conditions, basic administrative procedures, transport
and non instructional matters related to students. It seems probable that fore-knowledge and the ability to discuss the possible implications of such proposed policy may be all that is required as preparation for implementation of policies which, in essence, are directed at changing the mechanics of a system rather than demanding any new approaches to problems.

Comments relating to the effectiveness of implementation procedures usually drew attention to weaknesses in legislation itself. The few comments elicited normally indicated that certain bills, usually related to school finance, had unsuspected flaws in them and that, as a consequence, implementation was difficult and they had to be modified subsequently. Although such comments, on the surface may not appear to be related directly to the phase of preparation for implementation, it may be an indication that some trial run or detailed pre-implementation discussion with persons in the field could avoid problems resulting from incomplete or unclear legislation. This consultation could, and perhaps should, take place at the pre-enactment phase but, regardless of when it is carried out it is a preparation for successful implementation.

Overall, the preparation for implementation phase was seen as of little consequence at the state level although several interviewees stressed its importance at both the federal and local levels. The recent desegregation orders implemented in large
urban school districts were cited as examples of the importance of preparation for implementation of a program mandated through the action of the federal courts. In this case the success of the Columbus desegregation program was seen as a direct result of attempts to inform and educate all those involved. Similarly, it was often suggested that local initiatives related to curriculum required considerable preparation for implementation. One interviewee cited the example of a local district which initiated an education for the gifted program only after two years of meetings with teachers, parents, principals and educational experts. Thus, it appears that representatives of educational interest groups do not deny the importance of the preparation for implementation phase but, rather, indicate that the sort of state level policy-making currently concerning Ohio, does not require extensive preparation for implementation.

Implementation. The view of the educational interest groups in relation to responsibility for implementation was unanimous. All believed that it was the task of the State Department of Education to ensure that policy was effectively implemented and, in general, the lobby groups believed that recently the department has been quite effective in doing so. One respondent indicated that, "In the old days we had to implement the policies. If we didn't tell our members about the changes they never knew. Over the last few years this has changed and the state department is now doing something."
The same respondent cited as an example the introduction of the uniform accounting system for school districts according to federal recommendations. The department, with a substantial appropriation from the state, has devised an implementation system which includes meetings, seminars and workshops designed to familiarize treasurers with the system. With the added fact that the system has been well publicized the interviewee felt that the uniform accounting system will provide an example of successful implementation. Of course what is described here is, in part, preparation for implementation which could have been cited in the previous section. However, the respondent chose to talk about it here which further emphasizes the fact that interest groups tend to see preparation for implementation and implementation as the same process. Although one must agree with this perception in part, the distinction has been made deliberately and the reasons for this will become apparent in the overall discussion of policy-making models in chapter 6.

Other discussions of successful and unsuccessful implementations tended to return to consideration of what can best be described as good and bad legislation, not legislation that is necessarily good or bad in terms of its effect on K-12 education but good or bad legislation in terms of its wording and clarity of intent. Senate Bill 282, which requires all public school students
to be fully immunized or risk suspension from school, could be regarded as a bill which has minimal impact on K-12 education. Yet, nevertheless, it was generally regarded as good legislation because its intent and application were quite clear and thus it presented no implementation problems. By contrast, House Bill 920, which sought to limit the increase of inside millage due to inflation, was regarded as bad legislation because of its unanticipated consequences and unclear wording which gave rise to a number of implementation problems.

In general then representatives of educational interest groups saw implementation as directly related to the quality of legislation. They tended to believe that, if legislation was carefully written and carefully considered, then the implementation of policy resulting from it would be relatively easily accomplished by the promulgation of the appropriate regulations by the State Department of Education and the publicizing of these regulations was basically all that was required. Again, this rather limited view of implementation may have resulted from the restriction that interviewees consider only the last 3-5 years and the fact that policy made during this time has been largely concerned with fiscal measures, salaries and conditions and administrative procedures. (see Appendix D)

Oversight. Respondents, in answer to question V, 1, which asked how Ohio policy-makers ensured that policy was being implemented
and applied as they intended it, identified three formal groups and an informal mechanism which provide policy oversight. The formal groups were identified as the Education Review Committee of the State Legislature and the Legislative Budget Office. They were primarily concerned with fiscal matters which they monitored quite closely. It was also indicated that these committees can and do suggest modifications and amendments as a result of their oversight function. The State Department was seen as a major oversight agency largely through its collection of data and the eventual presentation of these data for public and legislative scrutiny. Although not pressed upon the subject, only one of the respondents appeared to feel that there was an incongruity in the State Department being both a major implementor and a major oversight functionary. The advantages and disadvantages of this dual role are discussed in relation to Dror's theoretical perceptions in chapter 6.

The informal mechanisms for policy oversight were mentioned by all respondents. Each indicated that legislators know by informal feedback largely from constituents whether or not policy is being effectively implemented and whether it is accomplishing its stated purpose. A majority of interviewees indicated that such feedback was more common and more vehement in relation to fiscal bills. Several respondents also indicated that their associations encouraged informal feedback from their members at
meetings and through telephone contacts. These interviewees claimed that they, or the chief officers of their associations, usually had a good impression of how a particular policy was working and how it was viewed by their members. This intelligence could often form the basis for future policy initiatives.

**General comments on the policy-making process**

Representatives of the educational interest groups interviewed also demonstrated a common viewpoint regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the state level policy-making process for K-12 education in Ohio. They agreed that it is complicated, often unwieldy and invariably takes a long time to get things done. However, they felt that it was truly democratic, allowed input from various sources and results in a "trade-off" of interests so that extreme views of any sort were unlikely to be accepted. It was also pointed out by two interviewees that in a conservative state like Ohio this slow moving system of checks and balances fits well with the expectations of the general population who would not tolerate radical changes.

The weaknesses of the system were seen as peripheral and often transient. The "smoke-filled room" of "Tammany Hall" politics is evidently not entirely absent from educational policy-making in Ohio. The major criticisms of the policy process tended to center upon the powerful liaisons which developed from personal friendships, the power of the party caucuses and the seemingly growing
power of the State Controlling Board. While these processes were seen as undesirable, they were usually regarded as minor irritations rather than major flaws in the system. A more pervasive weakness mentioned by two respondents was the inequality of the system. They emphasized that, although in theory the system was accessible to all, only those who were well organized and knew how to operate within the system could hope to have any real input into the policy-making process.

The responses to question VII, 2, which asked respondents to indicate any desirable changes to the policy-making system, indicated that very little thought had been given to this. The response of one interviewee, "We are so busy trying to figure out how the system works and then getting it to work to our advantage that we don't think about how to change it. I can't see any way of changing it." seems to sum up the general feeling. The nature of the interviewees, largely lobbyists, who are by necessity action oriented, probably predetermined that they would see learning how to operate effectively within the existing system as far more important than considering possible changes to the system.

The final question of the interview guide, (VII, 3) asked respondents to indicate whether policies, once initiated were often not enacted or if enacted, were not implemented. Each respondent indicated that somewhere between 20 and 40 percent of the policies initiated by their interest group were successful in
surviving to the implementation stage. The perception of a low success rate for policy initiatives is confirmed by the Ohio Citizens Council which indicated that only 14 percent of policy initiatives are successful. None could recall a recent incident of policy being enacted but not implemented.

**Summary of views expressed by educational interest groups**

Overall, despite obvious and expected differences in viewpoint of such diverse groups as the teacher organization (Ohio Education Association) and the Ohio School Boards Association, the perspectives expressed by the five representatives of the educational interest groups in the survey group are remarkably similar. All view the policy-making process as thoroughly political and believe that the interests of their members can best be served by understanding and manipulating the political process. A schematic representation of the generalized view of policy-making through the eyes of interest groups is given in Figure 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy initiation</td>
<td>Policy ideas generated by members of interest groups. Processed by formal organizational mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research</td>
<td>A &quot;case&quot; prepared. Data gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy initiation</td>
<td>Sponsor(s) selected. Initiative introduced into legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy initiation and policy research</td>
<td>Policy refined, adapted due to &quot;trade-offs&quot;, new information and attitudes of other interest groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy enactment</td>
<td>Policy &quot;shepherded&quot; through the political processes. Further sponsors sought and publicity organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for implementation</td>
<td>Policy reported to members; updates through newsletters and bulletins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implementation</td>
<td>Policy to state department for writing of regulations and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy oversight</td>
<td>Formal oversight by State Department, informal by legislators, interest groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy initiation</td>
<td>Feedback loop - information from members leads to future policy initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1.
The Lobby Groups' Perceptions of the Policy-Making Process for K-12 Education in Ohio.
Notably, such a view emphasizes the need for organized action. From this perspective policy is initiated only through the actions of organized groups and seen to a successful conclusion only through the efforts of professional and expert lobbyists. However, it was admitted by some that a number of recent policies have originated because of crises in the system without any overt action by lobby groups. This view also emphasizes the importance of political alliances, personal contacts and the ability to bring pressure to bear on legislators. The lobbyists representing educational interest groups see policy-making as a continuing series of political "trade-offs" so that everyone is accepting less than what was originally desired for fear that maintenance of an extreme position could lead to getting nothing at all. Thus a policy is in some ways the average between what some want and others will allow.

It must be remembered that the perceptions upon which this representation of the policy process is based are those of a few actors in the major educational interest groups in Ohio. Thus, the opinions are probably biased in favor of organized action; that is, the respondents have tended to emphasize the importance of their own roles and the roles of the groups which they represent in the policy process. It is hoped to minimize the biases by attempting to amalgamate the views of each group into a composite picture of the policy process later in this study.
The Policy Process - Views of Legislators and Legislative Staff

The group of persons involved in the legislative aspect of policy-making which was interviewed included both legislators and legislative staff. However, all staff claimed that their views tended to reflect those of the legislators or legislative group with whom they worked. As far as it was possible to check this perception it was apparent that this perception was true; the closeness of the working relationships established in the legislative area tend to bear out one aide's comment that, "I know what his attitude is going to be before he does." Thus, it seems that the opinions reflected in this survey can be taken as reflecting those of key legislators.

Although the group interviewed was chosen, deliberately, for their interest and involvement in educational policy-making, and consequently could be claimed to have shown bias towards educational matters, the comment that, "Education in the public schools is the most important single issue facing the state legislature." merits some attention. This comment reflects both the growing politicization of public education and the increasing involvement of the state government in elementary and secondary education. These two factors in turn emphasize the importance of examining and adapting the state level policy-making machinery in the light of this increased interest and importance.
Initiation. The legislative view of the initiation process varies significantly from that expressed by the educational lobby groups. Whereas, the lobby groups saw themselves as the prime initiators, legislators tended to regard lobbyists as persons who provided pressure for adaptation and change of policy initiatives once they had reached the discussion stage within the legislature. Legislators and their staff members saw "crises or problems" as the main generators of state level policy. There is no doubt that legislators see the role of state government as one of dealing with problems which cannot be solved at the local level. This statement appears to suggest that, despite some fears expressed by such groups as the Ohio School Boards Association, there appears to be no overt effort on the part of legislators to "take over" the local school systems.

The legislators also indicated several other sources of policy initiation which were not discussed in detail by the educational interest groups. These were:

- individual legislators who brought to the attention of the legislature problems occurring in their "back home" school districts.
- the party caucuses which generated initiatives often as a result of party policy or election promises.
- the "summit council", a group organized by the Governor which included leaders from the house and senate, the state superintendent and, on occasions, representatives from interest groups.
the state department of education which, through its reports to the legislature indicated areas of concern which required legislative policy-making.

In answer to question II, 2,

"Which areas of educational policy-making at the state level have been most important in Ohio over the last 3-5 years?"

the legislative group concurred with others that fiscal matters have dominated the policy-making process. Policy relating to school management, the school funding formula and the policy that school districts should not close through lack of funds (forcing districts to accept state loans if necessary), were all cited as examples of important legislation.

As could be expected from the verbal responses recorded above the ratings given to the various policy-making groups on a scale of 1-5 (1 = not important, 5 = very important) for their importance as initiators varied significantly from those given by the educational interest groups. (These rankings are displayed in Appendix C, Table C5.)

In comparison with the lobby groups' responses, the legislative group provided a more extensive list and a wider range of values (maximum spread of 2 for lobby group but 4 for legislative group), ranked individual legislators (twelfth on lobby list, first on legislative list) much higher, and interest groups lower with
the exception of OEA (second on both lists). (The rest of the
lobby groups were ranked together at seventh through eleventh on
the lobby list but ranked generally in the bottom third of the
legislators' list). It is also interesting to note that the gover-
nor ranked first in the lobbyists' list and eighth in the legis-
lative list despite the fact that two Republicans and two Democrats
were respondents to this question. This may be a result of the
"historic tension between legislative and executive branches of
Ohio government" mentioned by several respondents.

It is suspected that this group of respondents more carefully
considered the importance of legislators as initiators specifically
than did the lobby group respondents and this may account for some
of the differences. However, it may also be that lobby groups
have tended to overestimate their impact on the initiation process
and that legislators regard the political and administrative sec-
tors far more importantly than organized interest groups. The
importance attached to the contributions of individual legislators
also suggests that politicians may be more susceptible to grass-
roots pressure in individual districts than they are to organized
pressures of sectional interest groups, unless, like the OEA, they
are large, vocal and well organized.

Policy Research. The phase of policy research looms large in the
legislator's view of the policy process. All regarded it as a
vital process by which initiatives were accepted or rejected as
the basis for eventual policy-making. The research discussed by the legislative actors can be seen as being of two distinct types. The first of these can be best described as "factual research"; that is the process by which factual material is gathered, sorted and assessed to determine whether the issue warrants further attention and, if it does, how precisely the policy will be incorporated in legislative action. There was unanimity among this group that the major source of such research was the Education Review Committee, a bi-partisan group of legislators appointed jointly by the speaker of the house and the president of the senate. Also mentioned were "ad hoc" committees formed from members of the legislature to investigate specific issues, the Legislative Services Commission, individual staff members working for legislators or committees, the Ohio Education Association and the State Department of Education.

Legislative actors, like most policy-makers, claim that these researchers provide a mass of information which is too much rather than too little. The problems which faced most were those of time to digest and use information and methods of determining whether information was reliable and accurate.

The second type of research referred to by legislative actors can be termed "political research". This aspect of research relates to the possibility of getting policy enacted and involves assessing the political climate, testing the political alliances
and determining when and how to introduce policy, and corresponds closely to the promotion phase of Lasswell's theory described earlier. Generally, those interviewed claimed that this "political research", or rather the knowledge resulting from it, is the most important factor in determining whether policy will be enacted; far more important than the amount, quality or source of "factual research".

In ranking groups which they felt were important generators of policy research (Appendix C, Table C6.) legislative actors revealed that they see research as a largely internal function of the legislature. Only one interest group, OEA, was rated and, as was explained on several occasions, then only because of its "computer capability". It is also apparent that the State Department is not highly regarded by legislative actors as a source of useful policy research. As one legislator remarked, "The state department can provide figures but even then they are not always accurate."

If the views reflected in these data are accurate, it follows that most policy research is affected to some extent by political considerations which may suggest a weakness in this phase of the system. Two legislators separately and unsolicited, indicated that substantial legislation is sometimes "rushed through" without real consideration, research or concern for eventual consequences if the political climate seems right while some relatively
trivial matters are "researched to death". Although it may seem trivial, the example of House Bill 419 which was cited by one interviewee provides a good illustration of political expediency. House Bill 419 requires energy conservation to be included as part of the curriculum in all public schools in Ohio. Early in 1978, when this bill was passed, energy conservation had become a highly visible political issue and thus, it is suspected, legislation was "rushed through" to indicate that Ohio legislators were aware of its importance. As far as can be determined, there was no research as to the cost or likely impact of such legislation.

**Preparation for implementation.** This section of the interview evoked only the most cursory responses from the legislative actors interviewed. Apparently, they do not regard this as their function - perhaps rightly so. However, most indicated that properly supported requests for money to prepare for implementation of a specific policy from the State Department of Education could receive favorable consideration. One respondent did observe that the Agencies Rules Review Committee, which examines regulations promulgated by state departments, did have the power to have preparation for implementation provisions included in such regulations.

**Implementation.** Again, the responses to this section of the interview guide were brief. The legislative respondents believe that implementation is the business of the administrative group, the
State Department of Education. Two interviewees expressed some dissatisfaction with the State Department's performance in this area and suggested that the Education Review Committee, through its thorough research efforts, is in a position where it can direct future implementation efforts and supervise them to such an extent that they can ensure that policies are implemented as they were intended. As an example, one respondent suggested that some large school districts have deliberately ignored some attempts to implement policy by the state department but that, they would be less inclined to do so if they knew that a section of the legislature had a significant role to play in the implementation procedure because the legislature "controls the purse strings".

Oversight. To their credit, all legislative actors interviewed claimed that they were vitally concerned with what happened after a policy had been enacted while admitting that they did not always have the time nor the ready access so information to perform the oversight function as well as they would like. However, they did indicate a number of ways in which oversight is carried out. Again the Education Review Committee was cited as a major source of oversight through its constant review of the K-12 education scene in Ohio. Recently, this has been particularly in the realm of school finance, according to the respondents. The reactions of the educational interest groups and the reports legislators received from their constituents were also seen as important but informal oversight mechanisms.
In response to question VI, 2,

"Does the oversight given to policy vary relative to the policy area in question?"

the answer from all respondents, in one way or another suggested that "political visibility" was the vital determining factor. If the policy was highly visible and an individual legislator's political credibility could be affected by the success or failure of such a policy, then, oversight was likely to be much more thorough than when a policy has low "visibility".

General comments on the policy-making process. Legislative actors tended to be much more critical of the policy-making process than did the interest group representatives. They generally felt that the "tools are still being fashioned" for educational policy-making at the state level and that organizational and structural problems within the State Department, lack of technical services, the inability of the system to engage in long range, over-all planning and the natural concern of the legislature to deal with the immediate crises were seen as major weaknesses. Although the diversity of groups involved in the process was seen as a strength, several also saw it as a weakness. As one respondent put it, "We have checked and balanced ourselves to a stand-still." While recognizing these problems no interviewees could offer easy solutions.
In answer to question VII, 2, of the interview guide,

"If you could change the policy-making system in this State what changes could you make?"

all prefaced their remarks by indicating that the economic and political climates of Ohio prevented radical change but then gave a variety of responses. The responses included the following:

- employ more professionals to provide useful information.
- make drastic changes in the State Department of Education.
- make the Governor appoint the State Board of Education so that he cannot avoid responsibility for educational policy-making by claiming that the State Board makes policy and not he.
- develop a comprehensive over-all plan for the future.
- move for further consolidation of school districts.
- develop uniform processes for dealing with labor relations, minimum competency and similar issues.

These comments reflect what seems to be a genuine concern for the efficiency and effectiveness of the policy-making system but also, they tend to indicate that some of the most influential legislators do not feel that they can change the system in the short term.

The answers to the final question regarding the percentage of initiatives which do not become policy confirmed the previous view that only a minority reach the enactment stage and that even fewer are implemented. The consensus view was that "less than 20 percent" of initiatives become policy.
Summary of views expressed by legislative actors

The legislators' views are somewhat more diverse than those expressed by the educational interest groups. However, certain commonalities did become apparent during the interviewing process. No-one interviewed was satisfied with the system as it presently exists and all seemed willing to change it by "chipping away" as one respondent put it. It also became clear that legislative actors all were acutely aware of the political sensitivity of educational policy-making in Ohio today and that "playing the political game" is the most important part of educational policy-making at the state level.

A schematic representation of the legislative actors' view of policy-making (Figure 4.2) is in many ways similar to the lobby group representation (Figure 4.1). However, it differs in one significant aspect - the legislative actors see most of the initiation, research, enactment, and oversight phases concentrated within the legislature and the preparation for implementation and implementation phases almost totally outside of it.
Policy initiation - Policy ideas generated by legislators and committees in response to difficulties and crises. Minor inputs from other groups.

Policy research - Conducted by legislative committees with requested inputs from others. Used to determine whether initiative will proceed to enactment.

Policy enactment - Committee hearings, floor debate, conference hearings, governor's scrutiny.

Preparation for implementation - Carried out by Department of Education with some input by Education Committee and Rules Review Committee.

Implementation - Carried out by State Department of Education.

Oversight - Task of the legislature. Accomplished through, Education Review Committee, reports from interest groups, and informal information from constituents.

Policy initiation - Feedback loop - information from groups above leads to future policy initiatives or to amendment of previous policies.

Figure 4.2.

The Legislative Actors' Perceptions of the Policy-Making Process for K-12 Education in Ohio.
The Policy Process - Views of State Level Administrators

The third distinct group of respondents has been designated "state level administrators", but this description, without explanation, could be misleading. This group contains three members of the State Department of Education and two members of the State School Board. The grouping of these respondents together may seem somewhat incongruous when one considers that the State School Board is supposedly a policy-making body. However, both board members interviewed indicated that they felt the board was providing reactions for the state department and in almost all instances, on matters of policy they "went along with" the views presented to them by the State Superintendent and other members of the state department. Thus, it seemed likely that their overall views of policy-making at the state level would be relatively similar.

An inspection of the primary data, the interview records, indicated that for all practical purposes the impressions of the board members were indistinguishable from the impressions of the administrators. As a consequence the combined views of the state level administrators and the school board members are presented in this section as the administrative view of the state level policy-making process for K-12 education.

Initiation. When asked to identify the individuals and groups who have been most influential in initiating state level policy-making for education these respondents named the same core group of interest groups and the legislative leaders suggested by previous
respondents. However, interesting additions were the mention of the courts, three times and the federal government twice. It appears that administrators see that a great deal of state level policy emanates directly from either federal legislation or court decisions and thus they saw the courts and the federal government as the prime initiators. It is possible that previous respondents had considered these two sources of policy but had not discussed them as they felt that they fell outside of the realm of state level policy-making.

This group of interviewees maintained the consensus that fiscal policy was the most important policy area dealt with in Ohio during the last five years. Two respondents added that they felt fiscal matters would occupy less time in the future and that minimum standards of achievement for students would become the next big issue.

Like the previous groups of interviewees, the administrative respondents were asked to rate the importance of policy initiators by using a scale from 1 through 5 where 1 represents the least importance and 5 represents the greatest importance. (These data are displayed in Appendix C, Table C7.)

Understandably, this group tends to rank the importance of the State Superintendent, the State Department of Education and the State School Board somewhat higher than do other groups. However,
it is important to note that, like the legislative group, the administrative group feels that legislators and legislative committees are more significant initiators of K-12 education policy in Ohio than the educational interest groups, again with the one exception of the Ohio Educational Association.

**Policy research.** There is no doubt that administrators feel that the State Department of Education should be the primary source of all educational policy research for K-12 education in Ohio. However, there was some difference of opinion regarding the department's present capability and its probable future role in this area. The state board members tended to believe that departmental officers already supplied an excellent research service while members of the state department themselves felt that this capability was in the process of being developed. One respondent had some doubts concerning this development. Although he believed that the state department should provide most of the research needed, he felt that political considerations were hampering the development. He claimed that many influential legislators would prefer to maintain a research section within the structure of the legislature itself so that, "data can be used for political purposes without professional scrutiny." This question of where the policy-making research unit should be situated will be discussed in detail in chapter 6.
The administrative group also tended to reflect the legislative view that there may be too much information rather than too little information and that the problem of information is really related to processing and presenting research findings although there was one suggestion that often the wrong information is sought; that is, some minor areas are "researched to death" while more basic areas are sometimes ignored. Similarly, administrators subscribed to the legislative view that amount, source, and nature of research had very little connection with the likelihood of a policy initiative being adopted. All saw the policy-making process as thoroughly political and assumed that the chances of a particular issue being translated into an effective policy depended largely upon the political alliances which were operating at the time of its inception.

In response to question III, 4, which requested the rating of groups for their importance as generators of policy research, most declined to rate them claiming that they rarely had any knowledge of what research was being generated by others. (The researcher's belief is that these remarks suggested that most administrators were not "officially" informed of other research efforts. It is difficult to believe that they actually had no knowledge of what other groups were producing in the way of intelligence.) This response, added to some other general comments (discussed later), suggested that the administrative group, with the exception of the State Superintendent, often felt that they were on the periphery
of the policy-making process rather than intimately involved. This view was neatly summarized by one interviewee who stated, "The legislature is the ultimate school board. They are the ones who make policy."

Preparation for implementation and implementation. Although the interview guide attempted to distinguish implementation and preparation for implementation as two separate phases of the policy-making process, the responses of the administrative group were such that it was impossible to distinguish the two adequately in this case. Administrators tended to see the process of preparation for implementation and implementation as interlocking aspects of the same phase. They saw the "actual implementation" of legislated policy as the responsibility of district and school level administrators but that the state department had prime responsibilities for:

- translating legislation into regulations and having them approved by the Agencies Rules Review Committee.
- informing district level administrators of the implications and requirements of new policies.
- providing information and assistance "if requested".

Administrators claimed that it was rare for either "time or money" to be provided for specific implementations and that thus it was unusual for the preparation for implementation phase to be anything more than a process of informing district level administrators.
Unlike the other groups interviewed, each of the respondents in this group felt able to rank the importance of groups as suggested in the interview guide question IV, 3. However, rather than ranking groups for their importance as actors in the preparation for implementation phase as the guide suggested, they ranked (on a scale 1-5, 1 = not very important, 5 = very important) actors for their importance as combined preparers for implementation and implementors. This difference from other groups interviewed underlines the feeling that members of the state level bureaucracy see themselves as individuals whose major task is to carry out the policies of the legislators as enacted in state legislation.

The emphasis on the importance of administrators of all levels, state, district and school, as preparers for implementation and implementors is clear. (See Appendix C, Table C8.) Even allowing for the possible bias of the interviewees in favor of administrators, the message is clear that successful implementation requires the participation and cooperation of administrators at all levels. This perception in turn has implications when considering changes to the system of policy-making. These implications will be discussed in detail in chapter 6.

Oversight. The views of the interviewees in the administrative group were somewhat divided on the matter of oversight. While all believed that the State Department should play a substantial role
in policy oversight only two of those interviewed (one board member and one officer of the department) believed that they actually play a significant role. Those who doubted the state department's importance in this area tended to believe that most policy oversight was carried out informally by legislators and interest groups and that both legislators and the major interest groups wanted it this way as very few enacted policies had "any teeth" which enabled the state department to enforce compliance from unwilling school districts. The respondents adhering to this point of view also implied that any extensive oversight by the State Department of Education would require the establishment of new units and the hiring of new personnel. This was regarded as most unlikely to occur in the near future for three reasons:

- cost. The present economic climate would prohibit hiring extra personnel.

- distrust of centralism. The people of Ohio tend to resist any move which may impair their local autonomy and any move to create oversight units within the state department would be seen as an attempt to dictate conditions to local school districts.

- belief that everyone should have direct access to legislators. According to the interviewees, one of the reasons for quite strong feelings against greater staff participation in policy oversight is the belief that decision-makers would then be buffered by "layers of bureaucracy" and so not be as accessible to individuals or interest groups as they currently are.
The consensus view is that the State Department of Education is an important oversight group when legislation is "clear cut", particularly in fiscal policy, but of minimal importance in areas such as student performance. As one respondent observed, "Sure, we know when districts are not complying with minimum standards policy but we can't do much about it. We can threaten financial sanctions but the big school districts know that, if they go to their local legislators, these (sanctions) will not be applied."

General comments on policy-making. In response to the last section (VII) of the interview guide the administrative group indicated two aspects of the state level policy-making system for K-12 education which had received little attention from other respondents. They generally admitted the past lack of effective influence of the state department and the state board but claimed that the increasing information gathering/providing capability of the state department, the good relations between the legislators, including the governor, and the State Superintendent, and the increasing reliance of school districts upon state finance, all indicate that the State Department of Education will become an increasingly important actor in the process of policy-making at the state level.

Concomitant with this increasing future influence, most respondents felt that one of the biggest weaknesses of previous policy-making, a preoccupation with a narrow range of policies, largely
related to finance and control, could be overcome. In fact, between them, the five respondents suggested seven major policy areas which could become important if the State Department of Education and the State Board become more vital parts in the state level policy-making system. These are:

- development of better information systems.

- development of better assessment/evaluation systems.

- development of metropolitan school districts or, at least, the sharing of some administrative and support functions between contiguous districts.

- development of school building level advisory councils.

- development of alternative education programs some of which may not be even within the normal school structure.

- programs to use other professionals, (such as social workers) in schools in order to help "problem students".

- provision of legislation to allow enforcement of state policy.

Summary of views expressed by administrator groups

The overall impression gained from these interviews was that, apart from the State Superintendent, the administrative group saw itself as somewhat out of the mainstream of policy-making. The Board is seen as a legitimating body for the State Superintendent's policies and the State Department sees itself as an administrative unit to administer the legislators' policies.
The view of the policy-making process obtained from these interviews was not markedly different from that reflected by the interviews with the legislative group. However, there are subtle but important differences depicted in Figure 4.3, particularly in the perceptions of where the major responsibilities for the various policy-making phases lie.

The view of the policy-making process depicted below is the view of the system as it currently exists. Although this group expressed a number of dissatisfactions with the process and tended to indicate that, in their view, the policy-making process was largely confined to actions of elected legislators, they did indicate that there were hopes of change and, although none were specific about how change would occur there was the implication in a number of comments that the future would bring changes in the policy-making process. These changes seem to center around the notion that both professionals (officers of the State Department) and representatives of the public (State School Board members) are gradually moving to a position where they will have more input and, as a consequence they will be able to expand the scope of state level policy-making.
Policy initiation - Policy initiated by legislators. Inputs from most interest groups and administrators have minimal impact and these only become policy initiatives if seized upon by influential legislators. Policy also initiated by the Ohio Educational Association and the State Superintendent on some occasions.

Policy research - Largely conducted within the legislature or by others at the request of the legislature.

Policy enactment - Largely a legislative function upon which the State Department has only a minor impact.

Preparation for implementation - Carried out as an administrative function by the State Department of Education.

Implementation - Carried out by State Department of Education.

Oversight - Largely informal carried out by legislators and interest groups except with highly specific (especially fiscal) pieces of legislation where the State Department has a role to play.

Note: No specific mention was made of any feedback mechanisms.

Figure 4.3.

The Administrative Actors' Perceptions of the Policy-Making Process for K-12 Education in Ohio.
The Policy Process - Some general views

In addition to the interviews of actors within the three groups referred to above, interest groups, legislators, and administrators, a number of interviews of persons who have considerable knowledge of the policy-making process but are not currently participants, were made. In general, these interviews were conducted after the other interviews were completed and, the material from previous interviews was used as the basis for an open, non-directed interview technique. A general summary of impressions gained from previous respondents was given and this group was asked to react to the interviewer's interpretations of the process.

Further information was gathered from two sources; short informal contacts with a number of individuals, usually administrative and clerical staff attached to the groups mentioned previously and written records of a number of interviews with legislative actors conducted by the 1977 doctoral class in Educational Administration at Ohio State University. 5

These sources provided data for the general overview of the policy process which follows. Because of the way in which the open interviews in this phase of the research were conducted and the way in which the written material was presented, the organization of the following section is somewhat different from the organization of those sections which precede it. In this section material from interview records, notes made recalling brief contacts and the
secondary sources mentioned has been organized under headings relating to the three major groups of actors used in the previous sections, interest groups, legislative actors, and administrative actors.

**Interest groups.** The general perception of interest groups' position in the policy process could be summarized as "sometimes initiators and always agitators." This perception is derived from the often expressed view that some interest groups initiate policy in some areas but that, in general, they have not initiated most of the major policies in the last several years. The Ohio Education Association was invariably named as the major initiator among the interest groups, although several individuals mentioned transient, special interest groups which had successfully initiated policy relating to such areas as vocational education and education of the handicapped. Overall, however, it seemed to the interviewees that the majority of recent policy initiatives did not emanate from the educational interest groups.

Even though educational interest groups were seen as somewhat less important as initiators than their members believe, they are certainly viewed as being major factors in the process of "seeing a policy through the legislature to its final enactment"; that is, they are seen as agitators who ensure that a particular policy progresses through the intricacies of the political system or alternatively, as agents who ensure that a policy is not enacted.
The opinions relating to interest group participation in the other policy phases was somewhat varied; some saw the lobby groups as the major providers of policy research while others saw them as minor contributors of relevant data; some saw them as major forces in successful preparation for implementation and implementation while others viewed them as not having much involvement in these phases; most saw them as exercising some informal oversight over policy but one respondent vehemently denied that interest groups could or should oversee anything except "the welfare of their own members." In general, these perceptions can be interpreted as indicating that the participation of interest groups in the policy-making process is both issue specific and organization specific. That is, if the issue is of sufficient interest to the lobby organization's members to generate strong support it is a factor in the policy process. The other general observations which may be made are that, of all the existing lobby organizations, only the Ohio Education Association has sufficient strength in numbers and resources to influence most legislation, and that, stronger influence on policy-making could only result from a coalition of interest groups which, at the present, seems unlikely.

Legislative groups. The general interviewees were unanimous in their view that educational policy-making in Ohio is thoroughly political. The belief is quite strong that party politics, the political strength of various actors, (Governor Rhodes, the speaker
of the House, Vernal Riffe, the president of the Senate, Oliver Ocasek, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Myrl Shoemaker and the chairman of the Senate Health and Education Committee, Marc Roberto, were all mentioned) the reactions of powerful individuals in home constituencies, and the likelihood of political gain or loss from the support or non-support of various issues, were all seen as major determining factors of which policies are enacted and which are not.

The legislative actors were regarded as the major initiators, the major generators of research, (although research generation often implied that their actions and statements caused others to do the research) the enactors, and the providers of oversight. The perceptions of oversight were particularly interesting. The initial reaction of respondents was, "What oversight?" implying that oversight is not a significant part of the policy process in Ohio. However, on reflection, most qualified that initial statement by suggesting that, although few, if any, formal oversight procedures existed, there was a considerable amount of informal oversight in operation. The picture of oversight given was congruent with responses from previous interviewees. Informal reports to legislators, reactions of educational lobby groups, reports from the State Department of Education and investigations conducted by internal sub-groups such as the Education Review Committee were cited as the usual mechanisms for oversight. Two respondents observed
that such an informal system was, in some ways, desirable but left the decision on whether oversight was exercised or not open to the vagaries of the political climate at any particular time.

The persons interviewed generally believed that preparation for implementation and implementation were tasks which should be part of the administrative function of the State Department of Education but that, on some occasions the legislative actors took these tasks upon themselves, at least to the extent that publicity releases, statements and explanations often emanated from political rather than administrative offices. The persons who expressed this view were questioned further. It appears that the two who responded believe that legislators who usurp the preparation for implementation and implementation functions are doing so for the sake of either personal or political power. One respondent also suggested that, "Legislators complain about the State Department as an inefficient group but then undermine its authority by not letting it have any real say in the policy-making process." Despite these comments, there has been no other evidence that there has been an attempt to undermine the State Department.

The administrative group. The impressions derived from the interviews are such that it is necessary to distinguish three elements within the broad framework of the group designated as "administrators." These actors are, Dr. Frank Walter, the State Superintendent,
the State Department of Education as an administrative entity and the State School Board.

The unanimous verdict of those interviewed is that Frank Walter is a "good" superintendent. Further investigation suggested that "good" here means that Dr. Walter has re-established some credibility for the State Department, he has established a sound working relationship with all sections of the legislature, and is seen as a professional who can make creative and unbiased inputs into the policy-making process at the state level. The one criticism of the State Superintendent's performance (the same criticism from two separate respondents) relate to his inability or unwillingness to change radically the structure of the State Department.

Although two respondents referred to the State Department of Education's improved data gathering capacity and its greater efforts to stay informed on "What is really happening in the schools", most replies indicated that their is a strong feeling that the State Department of Education is inadequate and inefficient in many areas. The predominant view seems to be that "bureaucratic inefficiency" has prevented the State Department from exerting any real influence over the policy-making process. Further, most doubted that the State Department played an effective role in preparing for implementation or implementing policy even though these should be amongst their prime roles. As one respondent put it, "Education in this state is controlled first by local school boards,
second by the state legislature, third by the federal courts and fourth by the teachers organizations. Influence by any groups beyond that is barely worth speaking about."

If the State Department of Education seems to have been dealt with harshly by the respondents, the State School Board has been even more roundly criticized. Although all believed that an elected State Board was theoretically "a good idea" as it should provide a forum whereby the views of the general public can be aired (presumably this "public" is made up of each board member's constituency) and the views of the informed layman injected into the policy-making system, all except one regarded the board as being, at present, a worthless institution. The criticisms of the board fell into two broad categories:

- it is not representative of the state as a whole. Although one board member is elected from each congressional district it was felt that they did not truly represent their constituents. One respondent described the board, rather unkindly as, "A club for retired superintendents."

- it only acts as a "rubber stamp" for actions of the State Superintendent and the State Department.

Although these criticisms may be somewhat harsh in light of information from board members themselves, the fact that the State School Board is seen as a "useless institution" by many is in itself a problem which will be addressed again in chapter 6.
Summary

The preceding interviews are not intended to give, nor do they give, a complete overview of the processes of public policy-making for K-12 education in Ohio. Apart from the fact that the actual enactment phase has been ignored, (this will be dealt with separately in chapter 5) the whole process of obtaining information has been limited to the identification and interviewing of a few major actors from three groups, lobby groups, legislative actors, and administrators. This process, while not adequately describing the whole range of activities which constitute state level policy-making (the role of the courts for instance has been under-emphasized) does enable the distinguishing of some particularly important points in the policy process. In a study such as this, it has been necessary to rely upon the perceptions of key informants to help identify the major aspects of policy-making within the theoretical framework adopted at the beginning of the investigation.

The process used in gathering the data for this chapter, then, is based upon Etzioni's "mixed scanning" approach. Initially, the decision was made to make an attempt to discern and clarify the structural and organizational aspects of the policy-making process in Ohio. Subsequently, the descriptions resulting from the interviews made have indicated several key areas for further consideration. These are:

- initiation. The sources of policy initiatives in Ohio at the
moment are restricted to a few politically powerful groups and/or individuals.

- policy research. There is no one generally accepted source of intelligence for policy-making nor is there any evidence of capability for long term research as a basis for policy-making.

- preparation for implementation and implementation. No "ground rules" or guidelines for general policy implementation seem to exist and only in a few special cases is consideration given to these policy phases.

- oversight. There is little or no formal oversight mechanism or where it does exist there are no established channels for feeding back information gathered into the policy-making system. Oversight appears to depend upon "ad hoc" informal arrangements.

These issues will be examined in detail in chapter 6 to determine whether it is possible that improvements can be made in the system to cope with problems that they suggest or whether, because of Ohio's distinct environment, they are historically fortuitous developments peculiarly suited to the process of making policy for K-12 education.

An overall summary and schematic representation of Ohio's K-12 educational policy-making system is included in the next chapter after the final policy phase, enactment, has been examined.
Notes


3. The State Controlling Board was created in 1973 by the passage of Senate Bill 174. The legislation is contained in The Ohio Revised Code, 127.12.
"There is hereby created a controlling board consisting of the director of budget and management or an employee of the office of budget and management designated by the director, the chairman of the finance-appropriations committee of the house of representatives, the chairman of the finance committee of the senate, two members of the house of representatives appointed by the speaker, one from the majority party and one from the minority party, and two members of the senate appointed by the president, one from the majority party and one from the minority party."


5. The following unpublished papers, all by students at the Ohio State University, March, 1978, were used:
Ogawa, Rod, and Murphy, Joe, "A Brief Analysis of Educational Decision Making in the Ohio Senate."
Daugherty, Louis, and Smith, Arthur Jr., "Policy Making and the State Education Agency in Ohio."
Alexander, Priscilla and Smith, Curt, "Policy Formulation in the House of Representatives of the Ohio General Assembly."
Reger, Mike and Rogers, Judy, "The Governor's Role in Educational Policy Formation: An Analysis."

Chapter 5

The mechanics of the enactment process in Ohio.

Legislation covers an immense ground: virtually any stray idea can gain some sort of hearing among legislators; virtually any proposal stands something of a chance of finding legislative expression. The instability of legislation differs only in degree from the instability of fashion and public taste. No statute is likely to settle a matter for all time; at best it can only temporarily conclude a problem. In all probability, subsequent legislatures will undo the statute, rework it, perhaps remove it altogether.¹

Introduction

In the preceding chapters, the actual processes of enactment, that is the mechanics of incorporating an issue in the legislative process and encouraging its eventual inclusion in the laws of the state, has been ignored. This exclusion of a phase of the policy-making process is not intended to suggest that this phase is of no importance; rather, it indicates that, in the perception of most political analysts,² it is a phase which is not amenable to change by structural adaptation nor can it be easily changed to conform to theoretical perceptions of an "ideal" policy-making process. The enactment phase is thoroughly political and while the alliances and coalitions which enable enactment to take place are probably the most controllable phase of policy-making for the experienced legislator, it is not possible to plan for such changes in a systems model.
However, it is necessary to consider the processes involved in the enactment phase in order to discuss the other phases which are the essential parts of this study. Thus, in this chapter, a generalized view of the process in the Ohio legislature is given and a brief "case study" of one piece of education legislation is discussed to complete the description of the phases of policy-making.

After the discussion and delineation of the enactment process, the case study is used to further clarify the enactment phase and as a summary view of the major elements of the other phases referred to in detail in the previous chapter. This case study in turn leads to a final summary and schematic representation of the policy-making process for K-12 education in Ohio as it has been revealed by the investigations conducted as part of this study.

The Enactment Process

In order to describe the mechanics of the enactment phase of policy-making in Ohio, publications by various citizen action and sectional interest groups have been used as the initial sources of information. However, in addition, comments by various persons interviewed and contacted during the process of gathering information about the perceptions of legislative actors have also helped to clarify the process and identify some specific areas where informal interaction takes place. This informal interaction was not always apparent in the descriptions given in the publications
referred to above.

In order to delineate the enactment process a series of figures depicting the stages are presented below. These figures are based upon those prepared for the Federation for Community Planning, but have been modified to account for the facts that this discussion refers only to education legislation and that some "hidden" processes have been revealed through the interview process.

Need for legislation determined by:

- Legislators reacting to crises, problems, findings of Education Review Committee, or administration requests.
- Interest groups reacting to perceived needs, problems, or inequities.
- Administration, legislator, Legislative Service Commission (LSC), or Legislative Reference Bureau (LRB) drafts bill.
- Interest group drafts bill and obtains legislative sponsor(s).
- LSC or LRB checks bill for style and form
- Bill returned to sponsor(s) for further action.

Figure 5.1.
Preparation of a Bill for Introduction
The initial aspect revealed in Figure 5.1, is the importance of the sponsor system. A sponsor, a member of the legislature, is necessary before the bill can be introduced into either house. The choice of a sponsor is obviously a crucial step as the prestige, political power, seniority and position (such as committee chairperson, ranking minority member etc.) of the chosen sponsor has an important bearing on the likelihood of the successful passage of a piece of legislation. There is also a strong feeling within the state legislature that the sponsorship of a bill by certain members will guarantee both the support of some members and the opposition of others. This automatic response is generally explained as relating either to political philosophy or to past relationships. In either case, the indication is clear that initial support or opposition may be engendered because of personal feelings and alliances irrespective of the nature or merits of the proposed policy. Even this preliminary stage indicates that those with "inside information", the legislators themselves, or powerful lobby groups with experienced and respected lobbyists have a much greater opportunity to introduce effectively a piece of proposed legislation. That is, theoretically any person or group can introduce an initiative to the legislature but, unless the introducer is sophisticated and knowledgeable it is unlikely that the initiative will progress beyond this first stage.
Once a bill has been drafted in an acceptable form and suitable sponsors have been found, it is introduced into the legislative process. For the purposes of this example it was assumed that the legislation was introduced initially into the House, although, in reality, most legislation can originate in either house. The processes of passing a bill through the House and the possible obstacles to its passage are depicted in Figure 5.2.

The action of the first chamber is repeated in the second house, in this case the Senate, but, apart from all the possible "blind alleys" for a piece of legislation in repeating these processes, there are other obstacles to overcome. These are depicted in Figure 5.3.
Figure 5.2.
Action by First Chamber
(Assumed to be the House in this case.)
Figure 5.3.
Action by the Second Chamber
(Assumed to be the Senate in this case.)
Apart from the six possible blocks to a bill's passage depicted in Figure 5.2, three more are shown in Figure 5.3. All of these are represented by actions described in the boxes to the left of each figure. However, bills which reach this stage are still not assured of being enacted into law. The final stage of the enactment process and the final possible obstacles to a policy initiative being enacted in a piece of legislation are depicted in Figure 5.4.
Bill sent to Governor

Governor vetoes Act

If veto not over-riden bill fails

Governor fails to take action

After 10 days of no action bill passes without Governor's signature

If veto over-riden by 3/5 majority in each house, bill passes

Secretary of State receives Act and certifies effective date

Act becomes law

Figure 5.4.

Action by the Governor
The series of Figures 5.2 through 5.4 clearly illustrate the many ways in which a policy initiative can fail during the course of the enactment process. When one considers that to negotiate successfully this "obstacle course" often temporary political alliances must be maintained and evidence must be mustered to pass committee hearings, it is apparent that, under the present system, a powerful sponsor or an active and skilled lobbyist or, preferably, both are necessary to maintain a reasonable chance that a policy initiative will become enacted as a law. It is also possible to assume that policies which originate within the legislature, either as the private initiative of a legislator or as the progeny of a legislative committee, are more likely to be successfully enacted than those which originate from interest groups unless they manage to engender the whole hearted support of a powerful legislator or unless they can couple their policy initiation with strong grass-roots pressure on legislators.

A Case Study

Another way of indicating the processes used in the enactment phase, and incidentally, summarizing the entire policy process in Ohio is to undertake a brief case study of a piece of legislation. To this end, Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 493, especially those portions of it which deal with K-12 education, have been examined and discussions held with legislative staff and interested observers to trace its legislative history.
The Content of Am. Sub. S.B. 493. This bill, refers to the
"Emergency School Advancement Fund" which was created in sections
3317.61 and 3317.64 of the Ohio Revised Code. The fund is ad-
ministered by the Department of Education which submits loan re-
quests it receives from school districts to the Controlling Board,
which has the authority to approve, disapprove, or modify the re-
quests. Other requirements of the fund include:
- only school districts that have been certified by the Auditor
  of State as financially unable to remain open are eligible for
  loans;
- to receive a loan, a district must have applied to a commercial
  lending institution for a loan and been denied. Even after
  receiving a loan from the fund, a school district must continue
  its efforts to secure a loan from a commercial lending insti-
tution;
- county school districts are not eligible for loans from the
  fund;
- no school district may receive a loan from the fund more than
  once in any three year period;
- upon receiving an application for a loan from a school district,
  the Department of Education must immediately notify the legis-
lators representing that district that the district has applied
  for a loan;
- Controlling Board approval of a loan is contingent upon the
school district implementing budget cutting recommendations
made by the Department of Education or recommendations imposed
by the Controlling Board;
- in determining the amount of the loan, the department must con­sider the amount certified by the Auditor of State as necessary
to prevent the district from closing less any amounts saved as
a result of the district not needing to close (such as unemploy­ment compensation) or as a result of recommended or imposed
budget reductions;
- the loans must be repaid according to a schedule adopted by the
Controlling Board;
- the repayment schedule shall include the payment of interest
at the rate currently prevailing for short term loans;
- school districts that make late payments must also pay a pen­alty of one percent per month;
- the department must make quarterly reports to the Controlling
Board and to the General Assembly on the status of the fund;
- moneys in the fund are to be provided by appropriations to the
fund from the General Revenue Fund, by the repayment of loans,
and by the payment of interest and penalties on the loans.

This particular piece of legislation, it could be argued, is
a very specific piece of policy-making directed at a current cri­sis in education (closing of school districts due to shortages of
money) and is thus likely to be atypical of the process. However,
an examination of the bills enacted during the last three years
(See Appendix D) suggests that this bill is reasonably represen-
tative of the type of legislation passed by the Ohio legislature.
Further, it seems from the data collected previously that the
nature and importance of the bill seem to affect the degree and
intensity of involvement rather than the process of policy-making
which is of prime concern in this study. Thus, there seems to be
cause to believe that the processes revealed by the examination
of Am. Sub. S.B. 493 should be reasonably representative of policy-
making as a whole in Ohio.

The Origins of Am. Sub. S.B. 493.

The lack of substantial written records relating to the activ-
ities of committees, floor debates and house senate conferences
make the analysis of policy with any authority difficult. In this
instance, the case study has been re-constructed from the accounts
of a number of legislators, legislative aides, and lobbyists and
from newspaper clippings and various memoranda between and among
the major actors. Notwithstanding these sources, it was difficult
to fill in gaps in the process. When this has been done it is
acknowledged as an interpretation of what probably occurred. In
general, such assumptions have little bearing upon the major policy
processes but are necessary in order to make the account under-
standable.
During late 1977 and early 1978 there had been a rash of school closings or threats of closings due to financial difficulties of a number of school districts, particularly the larger ones. Newspaper reports indicate that up to 156 of the state's 616 school districts faced financial crises which did or could have led to school closings. In addition, Judge Paul Riley had ruled in a Cincinnati case that the state's financing system was unconstitutional, declaring that Ohio's so-called equal yield formula discriminates against poor districts. Thus, it was apparent that a crisis existed in relation to school finance and that some policy-initiative was inevitable during 1978.

As 1978 was a major election year, the political situation also contributed to the process of policy initiation. By mid May the issue of emergency funding for schools had become a central issue in the election campaign. By the end of May Governor Rhodes was proposing the use of an expected state budget surplus for the establishment of a school emergency loan fund, a proposal which was receiving at least the tacit support of Democratic leaders in the House and Senate. In fact the democratic majority claimed to have come to the prior conclusion that a loan fund was the answer.

Two other internal activities of the state legislature seem to have provided background information and increased the awareness of all legislators on the issue of the school emergency loan fund. The first of these was House Resolution 64 passed in December
1977, when, at the instigation of Representative Myrl Shoemaker, chairman of the powerful House Finance Committee, the House recommended the change of school district fiscal years to the July 1 - June 30 cycle in order to overcome the cash flow problem. This resolution resulted in an investigation by the Legislative Services Commission of the school district finance situation in Ohio.

The second group of sources of considerable information relating to the substance of the educational content of Am. Sub. S.B. 493 were three investigations by House Standing Committees instigated by House Speaker, Representative Vernal Riffe. The House Finance and Appropriations Committee, Chairman Myrl Shoemaker, was requested to examine why school districts which had closed or threatened to close got into that situation. Specifically they were asked to answer the questions:
- did the legislature provide sufficient moneys for mandated programs?
- were funds properly managed?
- did citizens believe that their schools were financially troubled?

The House Education Committee, Chairman Bob Boggs, was requested to define what "a thorough and efficient system of common schools" (the wording in the Constitution of the State of Ohio which gives the state responsibility for public schools) really
meant and the House Ways and Means Committee, Chairman George Tablack, was requested to investigate the possibilities of moving the school finance system away from the real property tax base. In particular, they were asked to consider the constitutional amendment contained in the House Joint Resolution 61 which would allow the state to directly finance school districts.16

Thus, it appears that in mid 1978 the impending crisis and the political motivation for a policy-making initiative were present and that, in addition, considerable information concerning school finance was being generated. If the extensive media coverage is also considered, it is apparent that an enactment embodying the statements made by various candidates for election was almost a foregone conclusion.

The Enactment of Am. Sub. S.B. 493.

The actual enactment process which passed the school districts emergency loan legislation into law had to be deduced from the sometimes indefinite recollections of various policy actors. It appears that the nature and wording of the legislation was devised by consensus between the governor and the leaders of the house and the senate. It thus became part of a general supplemental appropriations bill known as Am. Sub. S.B. 493. Normally the designation of "Amended Substitute" indicates that there has been considerable internal disagreement between House and Senate or between factions within either chamber. However, in this case there seems
to have been little disagreement. The designation is a result of the "suddenly" discovered surplus which caused the re-drafting of a supplemental appropriations bill which had already proceeded through the senate. Thus, the amended bill was substituted at the senate hearing stage.

The only disagreement with the proposed legislation appeared to have come from the minority Republican group in the House. The House minority leader, Representative Charles F. Kurfess, at a time before Am. Sub. S.B. 493 was being discussed in the Senate introduced House Bill 1216, which, rather than make loans to school districts would have made additional appropriations to education. Once the proposals of Am. Sub. S.B. 493 were agreed to by the legislative leaders there appears to have been little real opposition to its progress.

Although some of the circumstances surrounding the introduction and enactment of this bill, (school closings, election year) may be atypical, the processes used seem, in the light of comments by legislative actors reasonably representative of most of the educational policy-making for K-12 education in Ohio in recent years.

The processes by which the "Emergency School Advancement Fund" gained admission to the political agenda of the Ohio Legislature and was enacted as policy are represented diagramatically in Figure 5.5.
The most interesting aspects of this representation are:
- the indication that lobby groups and other individuals in the broader environment had little or no influence at the initi-
ation stage except that a generally stated "concern" for the problem would encourage legislative activity.

- the inputs of interest groups and the State Department of Education occur as an element of the legislature's own intelligence efforts. That is, these groups appear as providers of information and opinion rather than as prime generators of intelligence.

- the ease of passage when the powerful policy-makers form a coalition.

**Implementation of Am. Sub. S.B. 493.**

Although the major purpose of investigating the passage of S.B. 493 was to gain some more information about the enactment process, two aspects relating to implementation and preparation for implementation were discovered during the investigation process. Both of these have some significance for the suggested adaptation of the K-12 educational policy-making system in Ohio in chapter 6.

The first of these items pertains to the role of the State Department of Education. Two-documents, a transcript of the State Superintendent's presentation to the House Finance-Appropriations Committee and a memorandum from the State Superintendent to City, County, Local, Exempted Village and Nonpublic School Superintendents, both indicate that the State Department, contrary to the opinions of a number of respondents in this study, does carefully
monitor actions in the state legislature and prepare accordingly. Both of these documents indicate considerable analysis of the legislation, its likely impact and possible actions to be required of district level personnel. It is interesting to note that the second of these items was mailed to superintendents the day after the bill was agreed to in the state legislature. This suggests that the ability to quickly prepare implementation plans and to provide relevant and up to date information to administrators in the field does exist within the State Department of Education and that the feeling that the state department is inefficient and ineffective in this area may be a reflection of structural and/or organizational weaknesses within the policy system rather than a lack of ability on the part of officers from the State Department of Education.

The second series of data discovered reflect the legislature's current tendency to undertake many of the implementation and oversight aspects of policy-making itself. In January 1978, the House Finance_Appropriations Committee Chairman and the Speaker of the House both requested information regarding finance directly from superintendents and thus implied that they did not regard information from the State Department as adequate. The chairman, Myrl Shoemaker requested information concerning state aid received, millage levied and delinquent taxes while the speaker, Vernal Riffe, requested copies of certifications by school board clerks which
authorized expenditures of funds. Later in January the State Auditor appeared before the House Finance Committee and in his testimony condemned the lack of control and supervision of school district fiscal affairs and suggested regular reports to the State Department of Education and the legislature.

When S.B. 493 was enacted the law contained provisions which placed the Controlling Board of the state legislature in a position where it decides whether a loan is to be made, the amount of the loan, conditions for repayment and specific budget cuts for the school district involved. This appears to be a legislative usurping of powers which more properly belong to the State Department of Education. The implications of such a process are addressed in chapter 6 and recommendations for an alternative implementation system are made.

Conclusion

The enactment process revealed here, is, one suspects, typical of most democratic, legislative policy-making systems. It is apparent that political alliances, political visibility and the influence of individual legislators within the system are key factors. However, despite the fact that this policy enactment phase can be regarded as the normal interactive processes of a democratic policy-making system, three factors have been revealed which could, in certain circumstances, lead to policy being enacted which is not in the best interests of K-12 education in the
state.

These factors are:

- policy is often determined by the political climate rather than the needs of the education system. That is, it is possible that political considerations will force the adoption of solution A when the needs of the education system and the objective evidence suggest that solution B is preferable.

- the actual reasons for, and the methods by which policy decisions are made in the state legislature are rarely made public. One of the basic tenets of democracy is that law-makers actions and reasons for action should be open to public scrutiny; this does not seem to be the case in Ohio at present.

- the legislature in Ohio appears to have taken over a number of functions which normally would be regarded as part of the administrative rather than the legislative functions of government. In particular, the actions of the State Controlling Board fall into this category.

Whether these factors are desirable or undesirable and whether they should be incorporated in the policy-making system in a more formal way, or changed in some way, will be considered in chapter 6 as part of the process of theorizing about an ideal policy-making system for K-12 educational policy-making at the state level in Ohio.
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Chapter 6

Policy-Making Models

--- political inquiry has concentrated on two distinct types of problems. First, it has sought to illuminate and explain the nature of popular participation. Second, it has given considerable attention to the dynamics of governmental decision-making. However, it has left a gap, because the processes occurring at the two different levels are seldom linked in any explicit way.

The agenda-building perspective directs our attention to this vital linkage and encourages inquiry into the relationship between mass participation and elite decision-making. It raises important, but largely unexplored, questions that may be critical to the vitality of a democratic polity, suggesting that public participation in political decision-making may extend well beyond the mere selection of the governing elite to selection and resolution of the major issues that a government will confront.

Introduction

This chapter attempts to represent three models of policy-making for K-12 education at the state level. The first is a representation of the process currently existing in Ohio; the second is a theoretical model of an ideal system which could probably exist only in an ideal state; the third is an attempt to link the theoretically ideal and the system which has evolved through the pressures of everyday operation. This third model, then, is one conception of how a system could be developed to build upon its current strengths and to help overcome some possible weaknesses.
What Cobb and Elder referred to as "agenda-building" in the passage which heads this chapter lies at the core of each of the models. There is no pretence that any of these models is complete or considers all possibilities. However, using Lasswell's theory to delineate the phases of policy-making it has been possible to describe key aspects of the policy process and as a consequence, arrive at a formulation which agrees with Cobb and Elder's conception that "agenda-building" is a core policy function. These two writers use "agenda-building" to describe a variety of input mechanisms which overlap the Lasswellian phases of initiation, intelligence, enactment, preparation for implementation and implementation. That is, any individual or group input which involves the exercise of opinion, belief, or value preference is part of the agenda-building process. Although not explicitly expressed, it is easy enough to incorporate the other phase, oversight, within the ambit of agenda-building. The oversight phase gives rise to perceptions concerning the efficacy of a particular policy which, in turn, can become inputs for future policy-making.

It is the nature of these human inputs and the impact of the varying power which individuals and groups have to influence the policy-making process which has guided this study and is the basis of the models which follow.
Model: Policy-making for K-12 Education in Ohio

The perceptions of the policy-making process in Ohio gained through the investigations detailed in chapters 4 and 5, while not giving a complete picture of the policy system in every case did indicate the existence of certain key points in the process. Among the more important of these points are those which are represented as "screens" in the ensuing figures. The term "screen" is used here to imply a process or an event whereby certain elements of the process are "filtered" out; that is, certain policy initiatives, ideas, or pieces of information are disregarded, rejected or ignored. This perception should not be regarded as an indication that "screens" are regarded as faults in the system nor as even "necessary evils". Screens are important. Not all ideas can or should be enacted as policy nor can all information available be obtained and considered. The importance of considering screens is to determine whether their operation in their present forms is likely to help or hinder the policy process.
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Policy Initiation, Intelligence, and Enactment Phases. Ohio Educational Policy-Making at the State Level
This schematic representation of the first three phases of K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio depicts the generation and introduction of policy initiatives and their progress through the enactment phase. Most significantly, the scheme depicts three points where major screening takes place. At these points policy initiatives and information which could have a significant effect on the eventual policy decision or implementation are filtered out of the system so that they do not progress to further stages.

The first of these screens (Screen 1, in Figure 6.1) represents the mechanisms operating at the state level in Ohio which ensure that only a portion of the possible policy initiatives for K-12 education ever get consideration in the public policy arena. Policy ideas, both expressed and unexpressed, no doubt exist in the minds of individuals and groups connected with education in any way. It appears from the information collected in this study that there are only three ways in which any of these ideas can gain attention within the legislature. These are through the actions of a large, well organized and powerful, in the sense that it can engender strong "grass-roots" support, lobby group, through the sponsorship of a legislator or through the emergence of a visible crisis within the school system.

Although this initial screening process is obviously a necessity - the system cannot, and should not, deal with all possible policy ideas - the observations which can be made here suggest that
some important policy areas may be neglected because of the screens. The first channel, the lobby groups, naturally undertake policy initiation if they see that a particular policy is likely to benefit their members. This perception suggests that such policy is likely to be limited in its scope and is unlikely to give substantial consideration to possible negative impacts on the system as a whole. When one considers the rankings ascribed to the various lobby groups by respondents to the interviews conducted (see Appendix C) it is apparent that in Ohio, the major lobby group initiatives emanate from the teacher organization, the Ohio Education Association. Such a situation further narrows the likely scope and nature of policy initiatives from this source.

The second channel of initiation is through legislators themselves. It is true that in many cases initiation by legislators may be, in a way, "secondary initiation"; that is, the idea may have been generated by an educational interest group, the State Department of Education, or a specific set of events which are well known to the legislator (most often originating from the legislator's home constituency). However, whether the initiative is "taken up" depends largely upon the individual legislator's or group of legislators' perceptions of the political benefits of espousing a cause, the importance (importance here is almost synonymous with visibility) of the issue and the legislator's own values. Again, the factors operating within this channel suggest
that expediency and visibility may be more significant than long
term importance in deciding which issues are screened out and
which issues are forwarded to the policy-making body, the state
legislature.

The final channel for entry into the policy-making process
has been labelled "crises". Those areas of the K-12 education
system in Ohio which cause major break-downs in the educative
process are the ones which give rise to "crisis policy-making".
Recently, the most notable examples have been in the realm of
finance where schools have been unable to remain open due to lack
of funds. Such an occurrence is highly visible and politically
sensitive and thus gives rise to crisis legislation such as Am.
Sub. S.B. 493 discussed in the previous chapter. Any policy-
making system must maintain a capability to deal with crises and
the emergence of a crisis must necessarily ensure priority entry
into the policy-making system. The discussion later in this chap-
ter will center upon two factors relating to the crisis entry
system; how it is determined whether a series of events consti-
tutes a crisis and whether some crises could be foreseen and
verted by adaptations to the policy system.

Figure 6.2 indicates the remaining phases identified in the
policy-making process for K-12 education at the state level in
Ohio. Again, the existence and nature of screening factors at
each phase is the most significant feature. Once policy has been
enacted by the legislature it proceeds to the implementation phase as described in chapter 4. The screen (Screen 4 in Figure 6.2) here indicates two factors which influence the efficacy of the preparation for implementation and the implementation phases and hence impact upon the final policy outcomes. The first of these factors is a system variable, the amount of resources, time and money, allocated to both the preparation for implementation and implementation of policy. Not only does this allocation of resources affect the likelihood of effective implementation, but the resources or lack of resources allocated by the policy-makers and the implementors tend to indicate to those who will be affected by the policy the relative importance attached to that policy. If a substantial effort is made to develop effective implementation procedures, then the policy is more likely to be viewed as important than if the policy is virtually left to implement itself.

The second screening factor here is a human variable; the perceptions and attitudes of those charged with the responsibility of implementation can have a significant impact upon the effectiveness of implementation. Although there is no direct evidence of implementor interference in Ohio, there are numerous examples of implementors changing the intent and outcomes of policy because of their own value preferences. Probably more wide-spread is a lack of commitment to a particular policy by implementors and a consequently less effective implementation. The possibility of
minimizing implementor interference with policy intent will be examined in following sections dealing with a theoretically ideal model and a practical adaptive model for Ohio.

The next phase of policy-making examined, policy oversight, has been depicted in Figure 6.2 as two separate parts of the same process. The first of these has been described as "Policy Oversight (informal)" and refers to those oversight mechanisms which exist and operate effectively without any structural components within the system. This oversight network includes educational interest groups, individuals who contact legislators, legislators themselves and the media. Again there is a series of screening mechanisms between the reality of the policy outcomes and the information provided by the informal overseers (Screen 5(a) in Figure 6.2). Naturally, because of the non-system nature of informal oversight, all of these are interlocking human variables. The perceptions and values of those who are affected by the policy and the perceptions and values of those who provide the policy oversight obviously contribute to the quality of oversight in any system formal or informal. However, in an informal system such impacts are likely to be of more consequence as there are no "ground-rules" or "guide-lines" designed to minimize the effect of personal bias.

Although the next factor in the screen, the position of overseer in relation to the part of the system being overseen, is related to the previous two it is in another way distinct. This
factor seeks to account for the fact that a teacher will view a policy in way m, while an administrator views it in way n, and a parent in way p. These perceptions are valuable and valid; the real problem is in ensuring that the persons to whom the oversight reports eventually return understand the perspectives and their implications in interpreting such reports. The final part of the screen relates to the credibility of the person or group providing the oversight. In some ways, this factor is related to the initial screening mechanisms detailed in Figure 6.1, Screen 1. The importance of the oversight report tends to be related to the "credibility" of the overseer. A report from the president of a bank in a legislator's home district is likely to be given greater credibility than the report from a blue-collar worker in the local assembly plant. That is, there is a possibility that social position and local prestige could affect credibility more than knowledge and careful observation. Again, such a screen is a natural part of all human interactions; the important thing is to be aware of its existence and possible impact.

The formal policy oversight, largely exercised by the State Department in Ohio, also reveals a number of screening mechanisms which modify the nature and amount of information generated by the oversight procedures. The mechanisms which became apparent during the investigative phases of this study can be divided into three separate classes of screens. They relate to the nature of the
policy-making process, the system variable of resources available and the human perceptual variable. The first of these types has been divided further into two sub-parts, "Nature of Implementing Procedure" and "Nature of Anticipated Outcomes," (Screen 5(b), Figure 6.2). The nature of the implementing procedure adopted, whether the policy has been imposed without consultation at one extreme or developed as a result of cooperative efforts by the administrators and practitioners at the other, appears to influence considerably the way in which policy outcomes are viewed by implementors. This phenomenon, whereby imposed policies are regarded as less effective than cooperatively developed policies, is referred to by Bardach and Downs. There was some indication that this attitude also prevails in Ohio as remarks made by some of the administrative group during the interview process reflected less satisfaction with policies which they regarded as "imposed". Similarly, the nature of the anticipated outcomes seems to affect both the nature of the oversight exercised and the feedback which the oversight generates. It appears that policies which are narrow, specific and delineate clearly what outcomes are expected generate more rigorous formal oversight and more factual feedback reporting than do those policies which are expressed in general terms and suggest only broad policy goals. References during the interview process to the more stringent policy oversight for financial legislation supports this belief. Anderson also refers to this phenomenon
when he observes that demands for oversight or accountability increase with the "measurability" of the policy outcome.

The other two elements in the Screen 5(b), "resources allocated" and "perception of what enactors need to know," parallel the variables in Screen 5(a). Both of these factors were referred to on a number of occasions by respondents to the interview questions relating to oversight. The comments, "They (the State Department) give us the sort of oversight we pay for," and, "The professionals (in the State Department) aren't going to tell legislators all they find out. They only tell them what they think is important or advisable," were echoed in different words by several respondents. These comments suggested that the amount of resources committed to formal oversight functions and the overseers' perceptions of what it is necessary for legislators to know both determine, to some extent, the nature of the oversight and, to a large extent, the amount and nature of the feedback resulting from it.

Although Figure 6.2 indicates the existence of a number of oversight procedures, there is some doubt about the regularity and thoroughness of the feedback system in Ohio partly because of the screens referred to above and partly because of the lack of a regular feedback system. As Figure 6.2 indicates not all the information obtained through oversight procedures returns to the system. This is particularly so in the case of informal oversight system where potentially valuable perceptions are lost to the system
because of its random nature. Even those pieces of information which enter the formal system are subject to a final screen (Screen 6 Figure 6.2). The formal system itself suffers from a certain randomness of action; individual legislators often by their own admission, come into possession of valid and valuable information concerning recently implemented policies. However, because the opportunity does not present itself, the information is not used and is rarely recorded so that, when the occasion for input does arise, this perception is lost. The other element in this final filter refers to the receptivity of feedback recipients, both groups and individuals. A great deal of information about active policies does find its way back into the system, despite the random nature of the process, only to be "shelved and forgotten." This should not be seen, necessarily, as a criticism of policy-makers or their aides; it may be connected with the information processing/utilization problem referred to earlier. In any case, at this stage it is sufficient to observe that there is little evidence that feedback resulting from policy oversight is used with any regularity for developing future policies in Ohio. Some discussion of whether this situation could or should be changed is included in the final section of this chapter.

The representations contained in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 and the accompanying narrative are not meant to represent a detailed or accurate picture of all the elements in state level policy-making
for K-12 education in Ohio. Rather they indicate some key elements in the process and affirm and identify the existence of a number of screening mechanisms within the policy-process. These screens and their impacts upon the process form the basis of the discussion which results in the development of a suggested model for K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio in the final section of this chapter.

**Model: An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making**

Any attempt to construct a theoretically ideal system requires the acceptance of a particular philosophical position. There can be no specific proof that one philosophy is superior to another but, in this case, the theoretical ideals are based upon tenets which are at the core of the Western Democratic systems and hence are likely to be generally acceptable. Specifically, the theoretically ideal system which follows is based upon a belief that participative democracy is the most acceptable system for state level policy-making, that, as stated by Cobb and Elder in the initial quotation in this chapter, "public participation in political decision-making may well extend beyond the mere selection of the governing elite to selection and resolution of the major issues that a government will confront" and that, the policy-making system can be manipulated in some respects to allow imposed structures to serve philosophical ideals.
As indicated earlier, the works of two writers on policy-making, Lasswell and Dror, have heavily influenced the development of the ideal model. Dror's writings have provided the bases for the structures suggested and Lasswell's conceptions have provided the framework for viewing policy-making and the ideas which have led to the development of some schemes for wider involvement and broader perspectives in the policy-making process for K-12 education at the state level. In addition, the collection of information about the policy process in Ohio has focused attention upon the initiation, preparation for implementation, implementation, and oversight phases. These phases are the major considerations in the model which follows.

The first conceptualization in this model is that of a specific meta-policy-making body. That is, a group which:

- processes values. It interprets and orders general societal values, determining which values society holds and providing some assessment of the significance or importance to be attached to these values. In the current situation for K-12 education it may be that such values as, minimizing costs, assuring basic competency (to read, write and figure), providing socialization etc. should be examined and prioritized.

- processes reality. It attempts to distinguish between objective reality and the subjective impressions of reality which abound. Many impressions suggest that the "schools are not doing their job." However, it may be necessary to determine
whether in fact this is an objective impression of reality and
to determine in specific terms what needs "improving".
processes problems. Again, what is subjectively stated as a
problem may not be the objective problem. The stated problem
that "levies do not pass because people have lost faith in the
schools," may be an entirely different problem; it could be
that, "levies do not pass because people are expressing their
frustration at not being involved in the broad range of public
policy-making" or some equally broad societal problem that is
not specifically related to K-12 education. The sort of policy
reaction required for the second problem is quite different
from that required for the first.
evaluates and recommends redesign of the policy-making system
and policy-making strategies. It provides an outside, detached
view of the system, identifies "bottle-necks" or problem areas
and suggests solutions.
suggests priorities and values for policies. It attempts to
ensure that policies which are urgent, rather than those which
are easier to deal with, are considered first.
This group then, is actually charged with the responsibility of
"making policy about how to make policy." 10

The meta-policy-making group is really performing a pre-
policy-making function and thus is outside of the normal policy-
making structure except, as is explained later, for the members
common with other groups in the policy-making process who provide
the continuity and linking functions necessary to unify and co-
ordinate the whole structure.

The creation of a meta-policy group alters and refines, to
some extent, the initiation phases found in most policy-systems.
Such a structure provides a broad, over-arching framework in which
policy is considered and provides a "policy clearing house" where-
by policy issues can be introduced and examined before the overt
political processes of the subsequent policy phases can come into
play. It also provides policy priorities and a general policy
calendar which helps determine which policy initiatives merit
prior attention by policy-makers. In order to ensure the ability
of all to share in the policy initiation process rather than con-
fine initiators to a small group of actors similar to the tradi-
tional policy initiators discovered in Ohio's policy-making system,
it is necessary to turn to another conception of Harold Lasswell.

Lasswell devised a scheme whereby he indicated eight "value
categories" which incorporate the values held by most sections of
society. These were described as follows:

1. Well being - the sections of society concerned with the
   physical and emotional health of the citizens.

2. Affection - the family and organized fellowships which en-
   courage and develop citizens' sense of worth
   through love and acceptance.
3. Respect - those groups in society, formal and informal which afford the individual the opportunity to accept responsibility and membership.

4. Power - those groups and individuals which exercise authority over others in the normal structure of society.

5. Wealth - those who control the physical and monetary resources of society and those at the other end of the wealth scale who suffer deprivation of physical and monetary resources.

6. Enlightenment - the groups of people who are involved with the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. Notably, those involved in higher education and the media.

7. Skill - the job related groups and those concerned with basic education and training in job related skills.

8. Rectitude - the groups concerned with the moral, legal and ethical principles of society.

In order to ensure that the meta-policy group reflected societal values and offered opportunities for a wider involvement in the process of policy initiation, it would be necessary to include individuals who represent each of these value categories in any such group. (Further details of how this might be achieved are
included in the final section of this chapter.)

The establishment and functioning of a meta-policy group would not, and should not, prevent the initiation of policy by interest groups or legislators. However, it would ensure that such traditional initiators made their initiations with the knowledge that they were doing so within a known and recognized policy framework which incorporated a wide range of societal values. This should provide some assurance that policy designed to serve the value preferences of one group at the expense of others is less likely to occur.

One adjunct of the establishing of a meta-policy group is the necessity of establishing an intelligence capability which can maintain a broad data base concerning long range policy, possible impacts of certain types of policies on others and general information which relates to the whole policy area. Such a capability would allow greater access to individuals and groups who do not normally contribute to the policy process and, as a result, could encourage wider involvement. The collection and maintenance of broad policy information and its ready availability to all would enlarge the policy view to incorporate more than the current pre-occupation with immediacy - that is solving the problems of the moment - without destroying the need for individuals and groups to research and provide information on specific policy issues which are of particular interest to themselves. Thus, the initial
phases of a theoretically ideal system for K-12 educational policy-making at the state level could be represented schematically as shown in Figure 6.3 below.

Figure 6.3

An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making at the State Level. Initiation and Intelligence Phases.
The major theoretical advantages of a system such as that depicted above are, the policy-making takes place within a broad but defined framework, that long term societal goals are considered and served in making policy, that, in theory, crisis policy-making is avoided, that the power to initiate policy is distributed more evenly through all sections of society, and that a bank of policy knowledge is maintained at all times obviating the necessity to begin research on each policy question when it becomes apparent.

The enactment phase of policy-making is the most difficult of the phases to deal with as a theoretical construct. Enactment, in a participatory democracy depends so much upon the dynamic interaction of groups and individuals that it is almost impossible to detail a structure which can be termed "theoretically ideal". Perhaps, in the perfect world, one could suggest that all citizens would participate and all would be fully informed, act always for the public good through altruistic motives and always act rationally. Such a "dream" is not very productive in trying to devise a policy-making system.

However, there are two structural and organizational changes which can be considered and which do not seek to interfere with the democratic processes of "checks and balances" which have developed within the legislature in western democratic societies. The first of these relates to a further intelligence function which
seems to be necessary during the enactment phase. At present there seems to be little formal capability for assessing the likely impact of an individual policy once it is enacted although this function is sometimes carried out by legislative committees. The suggestion here is that the ability to carry out this sort of policy analysis and to construct scenarios of possible futures should be incorporated as a normal part of the enactment process.

The second possibility for change relates to a "streamlining" of the legislative process. The normal legislative practice of using a reference committee to determine whether a piece of proposed policy should be introduced into the enactment process seems to be obviated by the use of a meta-policy group. Similarly, it seems that the normal committee discussion in two houses should provide sufficient discussion and consideration of a policy without the creation, as has happened, of further review committees which alter the impact of a policy by making "post facto" changes.12

Thus, a legislative enactment process could be depicted as indicated in figure 6.4 below.
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An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making at the State Level.
The Enactment Phase

Such a conceptualization does not interfere with the normal enactment processes but simply regularizes the provision of what appears to be vital information and seeks to minimize the likelihood of policy being subverted for purely political reasons.

The preparation for implementation and implementation phases of policy-making seem to be amongst the most neglected in the
whole process. Pressman and Wildavsky\textsuperscript{13} and Bardach\textsuperscript{14} give excellent accounts of the seeming randomness with which these processes are carried out. It seems that, particularly in education, the establishment of a specific group to undertake both the preparation for implementation and implementation phases is worth considering. Theoretically, in almost all systems, the administrative group, usually the State Department of Education, carries out these functions. However, the suggestion here is that there should be, within such an administrative group, a specific unit comprised of trained professionals whose sole task is to undertake the processes of preparing for the implementation and overseeing the implementation of new policies. Ideally, Dror's\textsuperscript{15} conception of involving those upon whom a new policy will impact in the preparation phase should be followed. Thus, the preparation for implementation phases can be visualized as shown in Figure 6.5 below.
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An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making at the State Level. Preparation for Implementation and Implementation Phases
The last phase considered in this study, policy oversight, has received considerable attention in recent years but still remains a significant problem. The way to developing effective oversight appears to require the solution of two long-standing dilemmas. First, how can centralized supervision necessary for efficient adoption of a policy be implemented without it becoming repressive and over-bearing to those who must carry out the implementation? Second, once information is generated relating to how policy has been implemented how does one ensure that this information is used effectively? Again, Dror's conception of a combination between professional expertise and broad involvement of other individuals offers a possible solution to the first of these.

Ideally, within a state department of education there should be a unit whose prime responsibility is to conduct the policy oversight and evaluation functions. The first and most immediate of these, oversight, offers the opportunity to use a task force structure on most occasions; oversight task forces should include representatives from groups who have been involved in earlier phases of the policy-making process. Such a task force structure would also contribute to a solution of the second dilemma; at least, by using such a structure, there would be one person in each phase of the policy-making process who had some "inside" knowledge of the oversight report and hence might act as a catalyst for its more effective use. The ideal oversight function could be represented thus:
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An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making at the State Level. Oversight Phase

* Note: both reports should be freely available to all who request them.
A theoretically ideal system based upon the ideas of Dror and Lasswell, then, requires the creation of several structural units. The first of these, the meta-policy group, as has been already explained, is outside of the normal policy structure and would be entirely new in concept in most state level policy-making systems. The other groups, however, a policy analysis and impact prediction unit (a policy intelligence group), a policy implementation group and a policy oversight/evaluation group probably exist in embryonic form in most state departments of education. State departments usually, to some extent, perform the functions suggested here but, because such duties are often "extras" for departmental officers along with a host of other bureaucratic administrative duties, they rarely receive the attention they deserve. However, it appears even without the benefit of detailed investigation that some reorganization could allow the formation of such units. The organization of such a policy-making structure is depicted in Figure 6.7.

Such an organization includes a number of the elements suggested by Dror as being essential to an effective policy-making system. In particular it emphasizes the participation of diverse units, the separation of policy-making functions into separate units yet the overlap and duplication of some functions and, above all, the existence of one group involved at every stage to provide coordination.
An Ideal System for K-12 Educational Policy-Making at the State Level. Possible Organization Chart

This figure depicts the formal interactions which are implied in the system. It would be possible to include an equal number of informal interactions which would take place - for instance most
groups would at some time interact with the enactors, the legislators - but as these informal interactions cannot be planned such contacts are not part of this systems approach. The essential structural features of this theoretically ideal system are:

- the meta-policy unit which provides an over-all policy direction.

- the existence of permanent professional groups which provide a policy review and preparation function, preparation for implementation and implementation strategies, and policy oversight.

- the use of a small group (suggested as the Chief State School Officer and personal staff) as a unit involved in each phase to provide coordination and continuity.

As a theoretical system, this may appear to be over-organized and thus, antithetical to the interactions which are necessary for the effective functioning of a participatory democratic system. It may seem that the existence of the function specific units could prevent the inputs of groups and individuals who have an interest or concern in the policy-making process. However, the application of this model need not necessarily lead to such restriction of interaction as can be seen in the following section where the theoretical model is applied to the process of state level policy-making for K-12 education in Ohio.
Model: A possible application of the ideal model to the K-12 educational policy-making system in Ohio.

What follows must be regarded as a long term blue-print for the development of a structured policy-making system for K-12 education in Ohio. There is no suggestion that all the changes implied can, or should, take place quickly. Where possible statements are included which indicate a priority for introduction. These priorities are based upon two perceptions of the investigator. The first is used as revealed by reactions obtained during the interview process. If some aspect of the policy process has been revealed as a significant problem, then it has been assumed that there is a need for change and a high priority has been assigned. In addition, it is realized that tradition, precedent and familiarity are all powerful forces in provoking resistance to change, and that, as a consequence, some changes may have to be seen as very long term in order to allow all actors in the policy process to adjust to a changing system.

Perhaps the most striking impression which can be gained from the material gathered during this project is that K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio has been almost totally concerned with solving immediate problems and that almost no attention has been paid by policy-makers to long-term policy goals despite some attempts by the State Department of Education and the Education Review Committee of the state legislature to develop long-term perspectives. This preoccupation with problem-solving policy is understandable and explainable. The policy-makers have been burdened
over the past few years with problems which are a legacy of a changing social situation for which the policy-making structure had not been designed. Traditionally K-12 education had been the province of local government and only recently has state government been forced by rising costs, local resistance to tax increases and shifts of population to assume the burden of solving problems, particularly fiscal problems, which have proved insoluble at the local level. Thus, the state-level policy-making structure has been forced to deal with problems for which it has been unprepared. Thus, if it is assumed that state level involvement in K-12 educational policy-making will be maintained or increased, it seems reasonable to suggest a system change which will ensure a capability for long range policy planning.

In addition, the general impression from material gathered through interviews is that the State School Board, as currently constituted and functioning, is largely ineffective in providing real impact upon the policy-making process. The statement made by two earlier investigators that, "While nominally the policy-makers, it appears that the state board serves as a mere legitimating force for the state superintendent and his cabinet." still seems adequately to reflect the position and status of the school board. Further, there have been a number of indications from the incumbent governor that he is less than pleased with
the State School Board's operation and that he has considered its abolition.

All of these factors lead to the assumption that it would be possible to change the composition and function of the State School Board to assume the role of the meta-policy group indicated in the theoretically ideal model. Currently, State School Board members are elected to represent congressional districts in Ohio and, although the elections are supposedly non-partisan, comments by board members and legislators suggest that party affiliation is still a significant factor in ensuring election. The first change required to make the board a useful meta-policy-making group would be the change from an elected to an appointed board. This would have the effect of allowing the appointment of a group which truly represents the values of society by appointing representatives to represent Lasswell's eight value categories which were outlined earlier. Constitutionally such appointments would probably have to be made by the Governor and approved by the house and senate but no doubt appointment guidelines could be drawn which would ensure the inclusion of representatives from each of the Lasswellian categories of power, enlightenment, wealth, well-being, skill, affection, respect and rectitude.

The nature of such a newly constituted board's function, processing values, reality and problems, setting long range policy goals and making policy about how to make policy suggest that
their method of operation should also follow a process designated by Lasswell as the "decision seminar". The decision seminar approach suggests a permanent core membership of approximately 15 who operate as a policy formation group, in this case broad meta-policy, through an open, face to face, exchange of views, the use of outside witnesses and accumulated information, the systematic consideration of past, present and future and the use of analytic procedures. These problem solving procedures have again been developed from Lasswell's ideas and the "five intellectual tasks" suggested are:

- goal clarification; the determination of future states to be realized.
- trend description; the examination of recent events to determine to what extent they approximate preferred future states.
- analysis of conditions; the determination of factors which have conditioned the direction and magnitude of trends.
- projection of developments; determination of the probable outcomes if current policies are continued.
- invention, evaluation and selection of alternatives; the process of plotting policy directions and strategies.

(A detailed description of the decision seminar strategy is contained in Appendix E)

Thus, the State School Board in Ohio is envisaged as the permanent core group for a decision seminar which would set the broad policy
aims for the state and monitor and encourage the refinement and development of the future policy-making system. Such a change can be seen as the initial step in adapting the currently existing mechanisms to a changed situation where the state is expected to play a more central role in the direction and control of K-12 education.

Another aspect of the Ohio system for state level policy-making for K-12 education which could receive almost immediate attention is the position and actions of the State Controlling Board. This legislative committee, originally designed to check that legislation enacted is fiscally able to be implemented and that moneys were expended in accordance with legislative intent, has recently, particularly in the field of K-12 education assumed a number of the implementation and oversight functions in the policy process. The nature of Am. Sub. S.B. 493, discussed in chapter 5, offers a clear example of this group expanding its function. Such an expansion runs counter to the theoretical concepts for effective policy-making expounded by Dror who suggests that "some units participating in policy-making should be isolated from certain other units." In particular Dror suggests that devising specific implementation procedures should be largely the responsibility of those who have to carry out the implementation and that oversight should be conducted by a virtually autonomous unit which reports its oversight findings to enactors and other
policy actors. From this theoretical perspective it seems reasonable to suggest that, at least for K-12 educational policy, the State Controlling Board relinquish its assumed implementation functions to specific units created within the State Department of Education. However, in order to keep faith with the theoretical model, the oversight unit would need to be a separate semi-autonomous unit within the department but outside of its normal promotional and hierarchical structure. That is, its personnel would probably be specialists recruited for specified contractual periods from a wide variety of sources.

The other adjustment which is suggested by the theoretical model is the creation of a policy review unit which would provide the meta-policy group with a data collection and analysis capability and a means of providing preliminary information to enactors. In particular this information would indicate whether proposed policies are "in line" with the overall long-term policy goals, possible long term impacts of proposed policy, and ways in which proposed policies could impact upon other already enacted policies. Such a group would require a professional staff which can probably be found through a reorganization of State Department of Education personnel, but should also allow for the participation of various interest groups, legislative staff members, and practicing, in the field professionals such as teachers, school level administrators and district level administrators. Thus a small
core group of professionals is envisaged with varying voluntary membership and inputs from other groups.

Thus, the proposed changes for the policy-making structure for K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio may be summarized:

1. the replacement of the elected State School Board with a board of appointed members chosen to represent the eight social values. This group would form the core of a continuing decision seminar group which would fulfill the meta-policy function.

2. the exclusion of the State Controlling Board from the implementation and oversight functions it has assumed and its replacement by units specifically formed to provide implementation and oversight strategies.

3. the formation of a unit to provide the core of a group which can generate long range intelligence and policy review information.

These changes leave one function suggested by the theoretical-ideal model to be fulfilled; that of providing coordination between the policy phases. Clearly, this function can best be performed by a re-ordering of the responsibilities of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. It is envisaged that this state level official, or his representative, would be a participant in every phase thus fulfilling Dror's contention that, "at least one unit must be involved in every phase, sub-phase and component of the policy-making process."
Thus, the practical changes which could be envisaged for the policy-making system in Ohio are represented below in Figure 6.8. The system depicted here is seen as the first stage in a policy redevelopment exercise which would inevitably be a long range program monitored and modified over the years by the meta-policy group.

* The meta-policy group is the appointed group recommended to replace the current State School Board.

** Policy research and oversight units formed by reorganizing the State Department of Education.
Conclusion

The material in this chapter is an attempt to combine a view of reality, the existing system for K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio, with a theoretically ideal view of a policy system based upon the concepts presented largely by three theorists, Lasswell, Dror and Etzioni. A possible plan for the development of a practically feasible policy-making structure which accounts for the criticisms and weaknesses in the existing structure as revealed through the interview process has been presented. The scheme for development of a new structure presented above attempts to provide a solution for three major problems indicated in earlier chapters. The seeming impotence of the school board and the doubts expressed concerning the State Department's ability to contribute as significantly as it should to the policy-making process are both addressed through the suggestions for a new role and structure for the board and the suggestions for the development of new function specific units within the state department. In addition the structure suggested complies with the basic concepts of Dror's description of public policy-making systems (chapter 2 page 36), uses Etzioni's mixed-scanning model in that the meta-policy group uses "the wide angle camera" to identify policy areas while initiators and enactors "zero in on those revealed by the first camera to require a more in depth examination," (chapter 2 page 27). Further, the recommendations are congruent with those suggested by the recommendations
of the Joint Select Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature (chapter 2 pages 46-49). In particular they address the problems of the role to be played by the State Department of Education and the need to involve a wide cross-section of society, in the processes of public policy-making.
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20. The concept of the decision seminar was developed by Harold Lasswell but the suggestions for the application used here are based upon, A Mershon Center Briefing Paper, Number 7502-01, Columbus, Ohio: February, 1975, "The Decision Seminar: a strategy for problem solving," by Larry L. Slonaker and Robert Oldham.
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Chapter 7

Summary, Implications
and Conclusion

Introduction

By revising the theory to bring it into closer correspondence with reality, the elitist theorists have transformed democracy from a radical into a conservative political doctrine, stripping away its distinctive emphasis on popular political activity so that it no longer serves as a set of ideals toward which society ought to be striving.¹

Here, Walker is reflecting a general trend in democratic policy-making which has been supported by the investigations carried out in this study. The classical theory of democracy required that,

the electorate possess appropriate personality structures, that it be interested and participate in public affairs, that it be informed, that it be principled, that it correctly perceive political realities, that it engage in discussion, that it judge rationally and that it consider the community interests.²

Recent research has indicated that these historically perceived requisites are rarely approximated in any western democracy. Most people tend to exhibit little interest in public affairs and even fewer participate actively. Thus, there has been the general conclusion that the classical assumption of public competence is a myth even in those societies where democratic government has been relatively successful.

193
The problem of explaining the continued existence and reasonably satisfactory performance of democratic governments despite the fact that the average citizens do not perform the role ascribed to them by classical theorists has led to the development of a new descriptive theory best described as "democratic elitism". Such a theory emphasizes the importance of groups and interactions of sub-systems in the processes of policy-making rather than the role of the individual. Elder and Cobb designate the revised requisites for such a system as:

(1) social pluralism, (2) diverse and competing elites that are circulating and accessible, (3) a basic consensus at least among the elites on the rules of democratic competition and (4) elections that provide regular opportunities for citizens to participate in the selection of public officials.

The increasing importance of elites in K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio is clearly demonstrated by the data collected during the investigative stages of this study. It is also clear that this revised theory of democracy is empirically more viable as a descriptive statement of functioning democracies than classical theory. However, the problem suggested by Walker at the beginning of this chapter, that the new theory does not provide "a set of ideals toward which society ought to be striving", is a result of what began as a descriptive theory being accepted as a normative theory of public policy-making. That is, our current view of policy-making tends
to stress pragmatism and problem solving and ignore broader societal aims and ideals.

The summary, implications and conclusions which follow are based upon several assumptions or beliefs related to this changing nature of democratic theory. These are:

(1) that the elite theory provides an empirically defensible description of current democratic processes but that it should not, in its present form be accepted as a normative theory.

(2) that the decision/policy-making tasks of government, in many fields but particularly in education, have become so complex that a structured, organizational approach is necessary to achieve solutions to immediate and long term problems.

(3) that through the provision of structural mechanisms it is possible to combine the knowledge and expertise of elites with the desirable inputs from a broad range of individuals and groups outside of the elite structures.

(4) that state level policy-making should provide broad aims and ideals toward which society should be striving and should not be totally concerned with the solution of immediately visible problems.
Summary

The initial purpose of this study was to identify some key elements in the processes used for K-12 educational policy-making at the state level. In order to do so it was necessary to consider a variety of frameworks which would allow the choice of theoretical bases for making future judgements. The "rational-comprehensive," "incremental" and "mixed scanning" approaches to decision-making were examined and "political systems theory," "group theory," "elite theory," "functional process theory" and "institutionalism" were considered as possible frameworks within which the investigation could take place. While each of the theoretical constructs mentioned has a value for certain aspects of policy-making research, (the philosophical considerations mentioned above, particularly the belief that by adapting structure it might be possible to include both the contributions of experts and elites and the inputs of a broader public in educational policy-making), the decision was made that the theories embodied in Etzioni's "mixed scanning approach" and Lasswell's "functional process theory" would provide the most useful frameworks within which to examine state level policy-making for K-12 education.

The policy-making frameworks suggested by Etzioni and Lasswell, together with an ideal policy-making structure suggested by Dror, provided the perspectives from which the literature
relating to practical policy applications were viewed. The exami-
nation of this body of literature confirmed a belief that initia-
tion, implementation and oversight were key phases in K-12 policy-
making at the state level. Hence, a decision was made to investi-
gate six of Lasswell's policy phases which embodied these elements. 
The phases were, initiation, intelligence, enactment, preparation 
for implementation, implementation and oversight.

It was immediately apparent that some specification of the 
area of investigation was necessary, as the scope suggested by the 
chosen phases was such that a general approach was not possible. 
Thus, it was decided that the study should be based upon policy-
making for K-12 education at the state level in Ohio over the last 
3-5 years in the hope that such a process would establish a method-
ology for identifying key issues and suggest a theoretical frame-
work for future developments of policy-making structures which 
would be useful in other contexts. Even when these limitations 
had been placed upon the study, the problem of collecting relevant 
data remained. The traditional "participant observation" approach 
of descriptive research was not feasible in this case and so, it 
was decided to identify a number of key actors in the three apparent 
elites in the current policy-making structure and to conduct un-
structured interviews.

The groups were identified as, educational interest organi-
zations and lobbyists, legislative actors and state level admini-
strators (State Department of Education officers and State School
Board members). A list of possible interviewees was constructed (see Appendix B) and an interview guide (see Appendix A) which sought to focus respondents' attention on the policy phases previously identified. In all sixteen full scale interviews with actors from the three major groups were conducted. In addition, minor contacts and short discussions with twelve others provided information while three persons who could react to and correct the investigator's overall impressions of the policy-making process for K-12 education in Ohio were interviewed during the latter stages of the investigation. The details of the policy process and the specific elements of the enactment phase were further investigated by applying a case study approach to one significant piece of legislation, Amended Substitute Senate Bill 493. (The bill establishing the Emergency School Advancement Fund.)

The data collected enabled the construction of a policy-making description which depicted the views of the policy-making process through the eyes of each elite group and, eventually, the delineation of a general model of the policy-making process for K-12 education in Ohio. Use of the general model led to the identification of some key aspects of the process which were regarded as less than satisfactory and which could be improved by some structural adaptations to the system.

The information gathered suggested that there were several areas of the Ohio policy-making system which have been regarded as
less than satisfactory. Those which were most apparent, that is they were suggested most often, were:

- ineffectiveness of the school board. (This perception parallels the findings of the Educational Governance Project in other states.)

- inability of the Department of Education, as presently organized, to provide the type and quality of support services required for effective policy-making. (Again the Educational Governance Project and some research in California confirm that this perception is not isolated to Ohio.)

- no recognition of the fact that preparation for implementation, while it might overlap a number of other phases, is a part of the policy process. (The Report of the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools in Florida provides similar evidence in Florida.)

- the lack of a recognizable, formal oversight system which provides feedback to policy-makers. (Again the Florida study observes the same deficiency in that state.)

- the limitation of input into the policy process to that from large well-organized groups which tends to encourage elitism and the ignoring of the values of large sections of society. (Cunningham observes this trend in a number of contexts.)

In order to suggest possible system changes which might help to overcome some of the problems indicated by the above observations,
an ideal policy system was devised using the constructs of Lasswell, Dror and Etzioni, and the existing system was compared with it. This theoretical approach allowed the policy-making system to be viewed first as a series of separate phases and then as a total system. This process led to the development of an ideal model for K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio which included suggestions for:

- the replacement of the elected State School Board with an appointed school board selected to represent the major societal values as described by Lasswell.

- the functioning of the school board as an on-going decision seminar with the meta-policy functions of reviewing and adapting the policy system, providing long-term policy goals and constructing a policy-making calendar.

- the creation of specific units within a reorganized State Department of Education to provide policy research, implementation and oversight functions.

- the redefinition of the role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to allow him and his personal staff to provide the policy coordination suggested as necessary by Dror.

- the removal of the need for the legislature to carry out the implementation and control functions which it has included in its role in recent years.
It was recognized that this ideal model could not be considered as a plan for immediate changes in the policy system and thus some suggestions were made for what was designated "stage 1" of a policy redevelopment scheme for K-12 educational policy-making in Ohio. In particular, it was suggested that the school board should be constituted as suggested above, the policy review unit be created and the State Controlling Board relinquish its "supervisory role" over the implementation of K-12 educational policy.

Implications

The original aim of this research was the descriptive analysis of a policy-making system, its comparison with a theoretically ideal system and the suggestion of some adaptations to the existing system. The approach used necessarily reveals some specific elements which, while they may not have an important impact on the major considerations of the study, are worthy of consideration and comment.

Observations of the policy process

The following observations of specific aspects of the policy process while not crucially relevant to the formation of the suggested policy model, were sufficiently clear to suggest that they could be important as departure points for further research. (These are included here rather than in the later section of suggestions for further research as the areas for research suggested here are
somewhat different in scope and nature from the research undertaken in this study.)

Policy strategy. There was an expressed feeling from persons with whom this research was discussed that policy strategy would be highly variable and that strategies attached to one sort of legislation, say fiscal, would be totally different from that attached to other areas, say instructional procedures. However, the perceptions of respondents and observations of the researcher suggested that the processes involved are much the same regardless of the topic of legislation. It seems that any variation is a matter of degree and intensity rather than a difference in process. Such an observation has implications for further research as it may be that, if there is the suggested homogeneity of process, then the case study approach to a single piece of legislation may be a valuable and useable method of clarifying and describing the intricacies of the policy-making process.

Policy knowledge. Although the interviewees were selected because of the likelihood that they had a detailed knowledge of the policy process, it was difficult not to be impressed with the amount and depth of knowledge which all respondents displayed in respect to specific educational issues. It was apparent that the actors interviewed had gained considerable insights into issues currently or recently before the state legislators. However, it was equally
apparent that, in most cases respondents had not formulated a long range view nor subscribed to any but the most general future goals for the education system. Again, if it were possible to determine the source of most information and the reason for concern with immediacy and lack of concern with long range perspectives significant advances in understanding the policy system could be achieved. (The need to face electors every few years is normally advanced as the reason for legislators' short range view. However, this does not explain why lobby groups and administrators seem just as committed to short term solutions to problems.)

Congruity of views. The summaries of views from the three primary policy groups, interest groups, legislative actors and administrators, indicated a high degree of congruity of perception within each group. Despite differences in aims within such groups as the Ohio Education Association and the Ohio School Boards Association, Republicans and Democrats, rural and urban representatives etc., members of each group had virtually the same perception of the policy process and how to influence it. It would be interesting to discover whether close association of individuals is responsible for this similarity of perception and whether the adoption of conventional views of policy-making effect a group or individual's ability to find novel ways of influencing policy.
General implications of the study

This study was not designed to enable the researcher to test hypotheses or offer a detailed description of a process. It has, however, produced some evidence that the processes applied have some value which could be applied in other situations.

The macro approach. As observed in chapter 2 most studies of policy-making in education have either concentrated on a single phase of the process or on a single issue. Discussions which have attempted to view the policy process as a whole have tended to be theoretical and have used post facto examples as illustrations. These facts imply that generally researchers have considered the policy process as too complex and intricate to attempt a complete overview. Even a large scale project such as the "Educational Governance Project" described by Campbell and Mazzoni concentrated on specific issues and specific actors. While one must agree that to describe and define a policy system is probably a life's work and, because such a system is dynamic and changing, a task which never ends, it appears from this study that it is possible to identify key aspects of the structure by the use of a rather simple procedure.

The collection of perceptions from important actors in the policy process and from other persons who had been close observers of the process, enabled the identification of several key structural "bottle-necks" and suggested areas where advantageous changes
could be considered. Thus, if one is willing to disregard the natural desire to describe everything, and use Etzioni's mixed scanning approach to identify important points of stress within a system, it appears to be more feasible to deal with a whole system than has sometimes been suspected. Such a macro-systems approach has one significant advantage. The practice of examining a single phase no doubt reveals a great deal of information which can be used to re-design the phase, but the tendency then is to undertake such a re-design with little or no consideration for the impact this change will have on the remainder of the system. The macro approach has the advantage of forcing the researcher to view the system as a whole and consider the impact of changing one structure on the functioning of the other structures.

It is felt, then, that one of the major implications of this study is that the methodology used is of some benefit as a planning tool. That is, if key elements of the policy-making process are identified through interviews of important policy actors, a partial representation of the policy structure can be made. If this representation is compared with a theoretically ideal model some suggestions for reform and adaptation of the policy system can be generated.

**Generalizability**

The findings reported in this study, that is the description of the K-12 educational policy-making system, and the recommendations
for possible structural changes to enable more effective participation and long range planning, are obviously specific in both time and environment. They apply only to Ohio at the end of the decade of the 1970's. However, because the theoretical framework employed is general and depends only upon the acceptance of participatory democracy as a desirable form of government, one can believe that at least the method is generalizable. That is, if a similar interview study were conducted in relation to K-12 educational policy-making in other states of the United States of America or of similar systems in other countries which maintain democratic styles of government, then similar models could be constructed and similar policy planning could take place.

Whether such a process would have a great a likelihood of producing some useable results in policy areas other than K-12 education is more difficult to assess.

Application of findings. Although it has been possible to make suggestions for changes to the structure in the policy-making system for K-12 education in Ohio, the implementation of the theoretically derived system may be much more difficult. It is impossible in this situation to offer probable short-run benefits to participants who have become conditioned to expecting immediate "pay-offs". Similarly, any change to an operating system can threaten participants and cause resistance. The opposition expressed by several respondents to the idea of increasing legislative research staff,
because it was felt that such staff would buffer the policy-makers from contact with interest groups, is an example of this resistance to change through fear of diminished influence. One can imagine that similar resistance to the establishment of distinct policy units, as suggested in the model, would arise.

Perhaps the only way of convincing present participants in the K-12 educational policy-making system of the desirability of change would be to indicate that the proposed structure provides as many or more opportunities for interaction as does the present system. In addition it can be pointed out that a restructured policy system would have a long term capability which it does not at present possess and that the model seeks to provide new and clearly defined roles for the State Department of Education and the State School Board. Both of these groups were criticized to some extent by a number of the respondents who felt that the contributions of both school board members and some sections of the state department were either minimal or certainly less than they should be. It is probable that the changes suggested for the State School Board would require legislative action and thus, the state legislators would have to be "sold" on this idea. The immediately apparent advantage of the suggested system for legislators is that it would provide some overall policy guidelines and so remove some of the "heat" from individual legislators which is generated every time a new crisis develops in the schools.
The second change, reorganization of the State Department of Education, could probably be accomplished administratively by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. However, such a reorganization no doubt would incur some cost. No attempt has been made to analyze the costs of implementation although there is a reasonable chance that a considerable proportion of the staff suggested could be available by re-allocating the roles of the current staff of the State Department of Education, thus keeping implementation costs within reasonable limits.

The problems which may prevent the implementation of a restructured policy system and suggestions for overcoming the resistance to change are referred to by Lasswell when he discusses promotional activities.\textsuperscript{11} He claims that the crucial element is obtaining support from the "social environment". Thus, if the modifications can be explained to society at large and advantages in, predictability, long term goal achievement and opportunities for participation demonstrated, it may be possible to begin implementation of the proposed system.

Suggestions for Further Research

This project was essentially exploratory research. Its aims were the description of a policy process and the theoretical designation of a modified policy system. Thus, it is to be expected that virtually everything suggested should be the basis for further research. Such research is needed to determine whether the constructs
developed from the examination of a single policy system and an individual interpretation of some existing theories, have any validity in a theoretical way in other environments at other times and whether they can be applied in the real world.

The discussion here is confined to further suggestions for the analysis of and theorizing about K-12 educational policy-making systems. Some possible areas for future research which could determine whether the findings here are applicable in other situations are listed below.

1. An examination of K-12 educational policy-making systems in other environments and other periods by using an unstructured interview technique to determine whether:
   a. similar "bottle-necks" occur in the system,
   b. the same congruity of perception exists between actors in various groups of the policy-making structure,
   c. the theoretical constructs used in this study are applicable (particularly in systems outside of the United States of America),
   d. the interview technique used can consistently produce useable and manageable data.

2. Some quantitative studies to determine the relative importance of factual data and political considerations as determinants of policy. Such a suggestion implies a very complex piece of research because, initially, it would require the
researcher to devise some method of quantitatively assessing how much factual data and how much political considerations affected each policy-maker's decision. If this problem could be solved, the researcher would then be faced with the problem of monitoring the information available to each policy-maker and determining whether it was actually accepted, understood and used. Despite these difficulties, it seems that such a project is important to the understanding of the policy process and that given time, resources and creative approaches, some progress could be made towards discovering how policy-makers react to these two important considerations.

3. Some studies to determine whether educational policy-making which involves broad societal representation, particularly through such mechanisms as Lasswell's decision seminar as described in this study, is more likely to produce acceptable policies than policy-making which is controlled by currently existing elites.

Limitations

Some discussion on the limitations in scope, the limitations in the methodology and the limitations of the descriptive findings of this study have been referred to previously. However, it is necessary to underscore some other general limitations of the models suggested in chapter 6.
Each of the three models, the representation of the policy-making system currently operating in Ohio, the theoretical ideal model and the suggested future model for Ohio, are all only partial models. In each case the political processes internal to the state and the operation of the state legislature have been the only considerations. The impact of court decisions, both state and federal, and the impact of federal legislation have been largely ignored. Similarly, no real consideration has been given to non-legislative policy-making; it is recognized that a substantial amount of policy is made by administrative action. The models, then should be regarded as depicting only those aspects of policy-making which are enacted in the state legislature.

Similarly, the perceptions used in this study were confined entirely to the groups who were intimately involved in and deeply interested in the processes of policy-making for K-12 education. No attempt was made to solicit opinions from district level administrators, school administrators, teachers or parents except in so far as their representative lobby groups spoke for them. It is possible that different perceptions of the process could be gained from interviewing such individuals.

Finally, a decision was made to look at possible structural/organizational changes which could increase the effectiveness of the policy-making system. Making such a decision is defensible in terms of making the research feasible but it does not alter the
fact that it is likely to result in "tunnel vision". That is, the researcher is likely to see only structural solutions when other solutions may be preferable. (Personal development seminars for policy-makers for example.) There is then, no contention that what is presented in this dissertation is the only solution or even the best solution to problems revealed by the study. The suggested model offers only one possible approach to the question of providing the most reasonable, thoughtful and creative solutions to problems which confront K-12 education.

**Conclusion**

At the beginning of this study four specific questions were asked which, it was hoped, would be answered in the course of the investigation. The questions were:

- How is state-level policy for K-12 education currently made in Ohio?
- What specific strengths and weaknesses of the process can be observed or implied?
- What changes in policy-making procedures, particularly in initiation, intelligence, enactment, preparation for implementation, implementation and oversight, can be suggested in the light of theories of public policy-making?
- Can these suggestions be encapsulated in the beginnings of a theory of meta-policy-making for K-12 education at the state level?
The first and third of these questions relating to present and possible future policy-making models in Ohio were addressed in the models presented in chapter 6. Similarly, some strengths and weaknesses of the current system - the strength of real concern and knowledge - the weaknesses of State Department and State School Board contributions - the problem of unclear role definition in the various phases and the tendency of the legislature to assume roles for which it is not equipped - the lack of an overall set of policy goals and the consuming concern with immediate problem solving - have been discussed and at least partial answers to the questions supplied.

The fourth question, concerning whether the findings can be used to form the beginnings of a theory, must be answered negatively. The data are based on subjective perspectives and the theoretical perceptions are the result of the researcher's own philosophies and biases. In addition, the study concentrates upon one policy setting over a short time span. Thus, any claim of having begun the development of a general theory for state level policy-making for K-12 education before the study has been replicated and the suggested model implemented to test whether its practical performance matches the theoretical advantages ascribed to it, would be presumptive.

In all, one can only agree with Anderson that education policy-making must be in the public interest and that,
The public interest is diverse in nature and must be searched for in various ways. While it probably cannot be converted into a precise set of guidelines to inform the action of decision-makers, neither can it fairly be described as merely a myth. It directs our attention beyond the more immediate toward broader, more universal interests. It directs our attention toward unorganized and unarticulated interests that otherwise may be ignored in both the development and evaluation of policy.12
Notes


3. Statements of modern democratic theory include:
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Appendix A

Guidelines for interview questions

I  Introduction:

As part of my dissertation for the Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration at Ohio State I am investigating some aspects of procedures used to make educational policy at the state level in Ohio. I am particularly interested in five aspects of the policy-making process. Namely:

- who initiates policy: that is, which individuals or groups first place an issue into the political arena so that it can be translated into an educational policy?
- what methods are used to collect facts and opinions concerning a policy area before a decision is made?
- once a policy has been formulated, what steps are taken to prepare for its implementation?
- how is the process of policy implementation carried out - who has the responsibility - who actually puts it into effect?
- what procedures are used by policy-makers to ensure that policy, once made, is implemented in the way it was intended? (legislative oversight.)

II  Initiation

1. Can you name some individuals, groups, or sections of the community who, in your opinion, have been particularly influential or active in initiating educational policy-making
at the state level? (If a number of groups are identified the respondent will be asked to give an approximate ranking in order of importance. An attempt will also be made to distinguish importance in terms of frequency with which individuals/groups are involved and importance in terms of the over-all impact of policies initiated.)

2. Which areas of educational policy-making at the state level have been most important (in terms of their overall impact on schools and the community) in Ohio over the last 3-5 years? Can you briefly explain why you feel these are most important?

3. Can you rate each of the following on a scale of importance (I not important - 5 very important) each of the following as sources of initiation for educational policy in Ohio?
   Governor
   Education Committees - House
   - Senate
   State Controlling Board
   State Superintendent
   State Board of Education
   Individual members of the legislature
   O.E.A.
   B.A.S.A.
O.S.E.A.
P.T.A.
League of Women Voters
Other educational interest groups
Other community interest groups
Individual citizens

III Policy Research

1. Can you explain how a policy, once initiated, is researched: that is, how facts relating to the issue, opinions about its likely acceptance and possible implications of its enactment are gathered?

2. Do you believe that, in general, policy-makers have adequate information available to assist them in making decisions? Can you explain the reasons for your opinion?

3. Do the amount of research and/or information the nature of research " " " the source of research " " " have, in your opinion, an impact on the likelihood that a policy initiative will be enacted as a policy? Can you explain why this is so?

4. Can you rate each of the following on a scale of importance (1 not important - 5 very important) each of the following as generators of policy research?
   - staff of education committees
- interns associated with individual members
- state department of education
- lobbyists (enumerate separate lobbyists)
- others (list)

IV Preparation for implementation

1. Once a policy decision has been made what steps are taken to prepare - those who must carry out the task of implementation
   - those who will be directly affected by the new policy
   - the broader public who will be indirectly affected for the process of implementation?

2. Can you cite any recent examples of specific "preparation for implementation" procedures? (For example: seminars, workshops, special training sessions, publicity campaigns, explanatory meetings etc.)
   Would you care to comment upon the effectiveness of any of these instances?

3. In your experience, how well have the following been involved in the "preparation for implementation stage?" (Use scale 1-5: 1 very rarely, 2 occasionally, 3 about half of the time, 4 usually, 5 almost always.)
   - legislators and their professional staff
- state department of education staff
- district level administrators
- school level administrators
- teachers
- parents
- others you believe to be important (list)

V Implementation

1. Which persons - or groups - most usually have the responsibility of implementing state educational policy in Ohio? Can you describe a recent example of how a state policy was implemented?

2. What steps have been taken to ensure implementation of policies in Ohio in the last 3-5 years?

3. If possible, could you give a brief account of what you consider to be a successful recent implementation and a less than successful implementation? Can you account in any way for the differences?

VI Oversight

1. How, in Ohio, do policy-makers ensure that policy is being implemented and applied as they intended it? (Explore whether policy-makers deliberately "follow through" or whether they assume that oversight takes place. Try to discover which individuals or groups assume an oversight
function and whether they ultimately report to legislators and/or prime initiators.)

2. Does the "oversight" given to policy vary relative to the policy area in question? (For example, is oversight of financial policy more stringently exercised than oversight of policy for the education of handicapped children?) If so, how and why?

VII General

1. Could you briefly indicate what you believe to be the major strengths and weaknesses of state level educational policy-making in Ohio?

2. If you could change the policy-making system in this state what changes would you make?

3. Can you recount any instances when, policy initiatives were ignored by the legislature after being suggested or when policies were enacted but not effectively implemented?
Appendix B

List of Persons Interviewed

This list of persons interviewed includes those who answered the interview guide questions, those who reacted to the investigator's initial perceptions and those who provided information through short less formal contacts. As the number of formal respondents was small and anonymity was guaranteed, no attempt has been made to distinguish the various types of responses which these persons provided.

Martha Agler State School Board
Irene Bandy State Department of Education
Bob Boggs Chairman House Education Committee
Carla Edlefson Ohio State University Faculty and Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools
Novice Fawcett President Emeritus, Ohio State University
Bob Hebert Legislative Services Commission
Roger Lulow State Department of Education
Oliver O'Casek President, Senate
Carol Pierce Legislative Aide
Marc Roberto Chairman, Senate Education Committee
W. Ben Rose Ranking Republican, House Education Committee
Ruth Schildhouse State School Board
Sandy Schwartz Ohio Education Association
Peggy Siegel Lobbyist, Cleveland City Schools, formerly of The Academy for Contemporary Problems
Paul Spade  Ohio School Boards Association
Paul Taylor  Buckeye Association of School Administrators
Franklin Walter  State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Millie Waterman  Ohio Parent Teacher Association
Craig Zimpher  Governor's Aide

In addition the following groups were represented in the responses given but the respondents requested that their names not be recorded.

State Department of Education (2)
League of Women Voters
Ohio Public Schools Employees Association
Legislative Aides (2)

Information of a general nature was also provided by telephone by respondents from the following organizations who did not identify themselves.

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce
Appendix C

Tabulation of interview responses

This appendix contains tables which summarize the responses to those questions in the interview guide which required respondents to provide numerical rankings. (Questions II, 3; III, 4; IV, 3.) In each table the first column indicates the number of respondents who made a numerical ranking for the particular policy actor indicated. The second column indicates the lowest and the highest numerical value allocated to that actor by the respondents and the third column represents the sum of all the numerical values allocated. The "average weight" depicted in column four, is calculated by dividing the total by the total number of respondents to that section of the interview guide.
Table C1

Ranking of importance as initiators
(All respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Responses*</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committees House</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Controlling Board</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Legislators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Assoc. of School Administra-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C1 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Service Employees Assoc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Board</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Teacher Assoc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Review Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Elementary Principals Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Secondary Principals Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Summit Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Farm Bureau</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Rule Review Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generators</th>
<th># of Responses*</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Review Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc Legislative Committees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative aides and interns</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Services Commission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of Education Committees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public School Employees Assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assoc. for the Advancement of Colored People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total responses: 3
Table C3

Rankings of Importance as Initiators of Policy by Representatives of Educational Interest Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Times Mentioned *</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Educational Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Controlling Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parent Teacher Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Legislators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Service Employees Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Farm Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator</th>
<th># of Times Mentioned *</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of education committees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative aides and interns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Service Employees Assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAACP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 3
Table C5

Rankings of Importance as Initiators of Policy by Legislators and Legislative Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Times Mentioned *</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Legislators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Service Employees Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Elementary Principals' Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Secondary Principals' Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Summit Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C5 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Times Mentioned *</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Controlling Board</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Farm Bureau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although six individuals were interviewed in this group only four provided rankings.
Table C6

Rankings of Importance of Generators of Policy Research by Legislative Actors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator</th>
<th># of Times Mentioned *</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Review Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ad hoc&quot; committees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative aides and interns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Services Commission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 5
Table C7

Rankings of Importance as Initiators of Policy by State Level Administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Controlling Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Review Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual legislators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Service Employees Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Teacher Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C7 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Rule Review Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 5
Table C3

Rankings of Importance as Policy Implementors (including preparation for implementation) by State Level Administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementor</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Educational Assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Principals Associations (Elementary and Secondary)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total respondents: 4
# Appendix D

Classification by Laws Specifically Relating to K-12 Education Enacted by the Congress of the State of Ohio. 1977-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Classification(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>S248</td>
<td>Board members, compensation and mileage allowance</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S384</td>
<td>Borrowing money, special authority</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJR 22</td>
<td>Busing, joint select study committee</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H834</td>
<td>Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>S(a), T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H210</td>
<td>Clerk Incapacitation</td>
<td>S(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 51</td>
<td>Closing - energy emergency</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S156</td>
<td>Closing - hazardous conditions</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H780</td>
<td>Deaf and blind schools, pay rates for instructors</td>
<td>S(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H438</td>
<td>Emergency tax levy</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S182</td>
<td>Financial assistance from townships</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S221</td>
<td>Foundation payments adjustments</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H834</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H373</td>
<td>Leave of absence - Teachers' Retirement System</td>
<td>S(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H666</td>
<td>Merit scholarship program</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H834</td>
<td>Pupil transportation funding</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title</td>
<td>Classification(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>H176</td>
<td>Social services program</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>H1285</td>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S495</td>
<td>Auxiliary personnel-unemployment compensation</td>
<td>S(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1062</td>
<td>Clamity days - additional</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H419</td>
<td>Curriculum to contain energy conservation information</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1364</td>
<td>Disadvantaged pupil subsidies</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S425</td>
<td>Driver training for the handicapped</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S493</td>
<td>Emergency advancement fund</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H220</td>
<td>Employees retirement system</td>
<td>S(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 55</td>
<td>Employees retirement system</td>
<td>S(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H960</td>
<td>Food sold on school premises</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S418</td>
<td>Transportation of non residents</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S460</td>
<td>Mineral leases</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S282</td>
<td>Pupil immunization</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H811</td>
<td>Pupil residence requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S359</td>
<td>Teacher salary schedule determination</td>
<td>S(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>H565</td>
<td>Appropriations for Dayton Vocational Education</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11, only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S186</td>
<td>Athletic programs. Self Insurance Plan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H204</td>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>A,T,C,E,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Year No.</td>
<td>Short Title</td>
<td>Classification(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 59</td>
<td>Fiscal accountability</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>law violations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H225</td>
<td>liabilities of officers and employees</td>
<td>A, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H225</td>
<td>Non public remedial services</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H420</td>
<td>Superintendents travel expenses</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 18</td>
<td>Tornado Shelter Areas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 32</td>
<td>School Zones Establishment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to classifications:**

- **A** = administrative procedures
- **C** = general curriculum requirements
- **E** = programs for handicapped or disadvantaged
- **F** = Fiscal legislation
- **M** = Miscellaneous
- **P** = Pupil related/non instructional procedures
- **S(a)** = salaries and conditions of non certificated employees
- **S(t)** = salaries and conditions of certificated employees
- **T** = transportation
### Summary

Total laws considered 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number by classification</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(t)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total classifications 45 100
Appendix E

The Decision Seminar

Introduction

1. Both large bureaucratic organizations and small voluntary associations must face the challenge of developing effective problem-solving routines. The Decision Seminar is one strategy that leadership can invoke to meet this challenge.

2. From a perspective that is shaped by the current level of understanding about group-based problem-solving, the requirements of effective problem-solving include ways and means for blending wisdom and science, for balancing free association and intellectual discipline, for expanding and refining information, and for building a problem-solving culture that balances "permanent" with "transient" membership, thereby remaining open to new participants and to fresh ideas while retaining a capacity for cumulative learning that refines, clarifies, and simplifies.

3. The Decision Seminar is designed to serve these characteristics of effective problem-solving by addressing three principal enabling requirements in the design of a problem-solving setting:

   a) The Decision Seminar demands a contextual approach to problem solving. A contextual approach permits movement
between part and whole and back and forth among past, present and future.

b) The Decision Seminar requires continuity in the approach to group problem solving. Continuity is sought with respect to the participants in the process, in ideas, in the location of problem-solving activities, and in the application of whatever problem-solving analysis procedures are adopted by the group.

c) The Decision Seminar requires the initial specification of the objectives or purpose of the problem-solving activity in a way that allows for revision while promoting consensus.

Permanent Core Group

4. The Decision Seminar is operated on a plan which requires a permanent core membership to ensure continuity of the enterprise and the building of a problem-solving culture. Members are expected to participate in discussions, develop and present special reports, assist in agenda construction, and critically evaluate the Seminar itself.

5. The number of participants should generally not exceed 15.

Permanent Location

6. The Decision Seminar requires a permanent room-location -- a chart and map room -- which becomes the physical symbol
for conscious, directed, and continuing problem-solving activity.

7. The chart and map room is the setting in which people and information are integrated for the purpose of rational thinking with the opportunity, in fact, the inducement, to speculate and project into the future using information-data displays and the Seminar's analysis procedures.

Audio/Visual Aids

8. Bar graphs, trend lines, three-dimensional models, films, audio and video recordings are examples of aids to thought and understanding emphasized in the Decision Seminar.

9. Audio and visual information reminders and representations allow participants to extend their view into the past, present and future as they examine problems in a contextual framework.

10. The Decision Seminar's permanent location and audio-visual aids permit a focus of attention upon the whole of the context with vividness and precision for the purpose of examining relationships and processes in the context.

11. The use of technology in an appropriate and coordinated fashion allows Seminar participants easy and ready visual access to important reminders of information and records from previous discussions.
12. The storage-recall capacity of the chart and map room is intended to stimulate memory and recall, imagination, and creative thinking in assessing and developing alternative futures.

Outside Experts

13. Decision Seminar participants are encouraged to examine a wide range of policy during the on-going life of the Seminar. Thus participants are required to relate to one another and to data/information displays and reports as policies are created, examined, reviewed, and eventually refined or eliminated.

14. The Decision Seminar is intended to have an open-system, information-demand format and encourage the use of staff witnesses or experts as well as any who might best serve the Seminar from "outside" the group.

15. The Seminar in effect becomes a setting for learning.

16. Accordingly, the Decision Seminar is designed as an open system that is highly responsive to the information demands of its participants. In addition to standard sources, the Decision Seminar encourages the use of staff expertise and "outside" experts and witnesses. The Decision Seminar culture -- which is a product of the core membership, the permanent location, the use of continually revised information displays -- particularly facilitates the entry of
non-members. The chart and map room serves quickly to "brief" the non-member and the Seminar culture provides effective criteria for members to assess their testimonies in context.

17. The Decision Seminar thus serves as a setting for disciplined and cumulative learning.

Record-keeping

18. The agenda for Decision Seminar sessions provides participants with a structure for the focus of attention; that is, the agenda is a procedural guide for addressing content. Thus an agenda might specify examination of institutional goals for the past five years; next, specify that current goals be examined with an overall purpose of developing, selecting, and prioritizing future objectives.

19. The minutes or selections for each session of the Decision Seminar are developed from audio tapes which are then transcribed. The selections are an important continuity device linking agenda items to participants and what they said.

20. The agenda and the selections represent the input-output structures which guide the cybernetic flow of dialogue. They also provide criteria for the design of new research and for the identification and recovery of existing information. Thus the focus on the past, present, and future
dimensions of problems and the strategies designed to solve them is constrained and disciplined by a cumulative record of micro issues and their provisional resolution.

Research

21. With an open information response system, the Decision Seminar is a learning environment for participants. They are encouraged to bring knowledge, ideas, skills, and direction to the Seminar. Included in this is a participant responsibility for data-gathering and research.

22. The demand for information and data in the Decision Seminar is a constant and the quality of inputs into it will affect the process itself and the outcomes.

23. Thus, data and information introduced by Seminar participants will be accepted, revised, or rejected through a process of inquiry undertaken by the core group. The process is open and no one is exempt. Maps and charts which become a part of the permanent setting of the Seminar are therefore considered valid/reasonable for the Seminar's reference and use.

24. Through recognition of past events, present opportunities and constraints can be more accurately interpreted for thinking and planning for the future.

25. The Decision Seminar seeks to represent a larger reality by choosing representative pieces of information from the
"real world." The chart and map room and storage-recall technologies help participants assemble and represent the social context. The purpose is to provide the basic elements of a "planetarium" that represents the social context under study, thereby assisting participants in storing, recalling, and relating important information for use in creating realistic policy alternatives.

26. Next, we move from what are operational or supporting features of the Decision Seminar to some stage-2 effects or outcomes which should be more or less constant if the operations in the outer ring are carefully designed and managed.

27. Note, that through this step-by-step discussion it is difficult to illustrate the dynamic nature of the Decision Seminar. In other words, practically every cell is interrelated with the others with the general purpose of creating a workable problem-solving mechanism blending people with information and technology.

Problem-Solving Requirements

Contextuality: Past/Present/Future

28. Without a system of analytical procedures to guide the examination and filtering of information, information about institutions, events, and situations can be overwhelming.
Without clear indicators of purpose or relationship a particular social context may appear to the observer as a "seamless web of life."

29. Thus the "seams" in the web of life must be identified and described; that is, the elements of the past, present, and future must be explicated so that the flow of events in the social process can be understood.

Continuity and Culture Building

30. The demands of constructing and up-dating a contextual framework are met systematically through the Decision Seminar strategy.

31. The Seminar is a "continuing enterprise." As such, its life will typically extend beyond the period of membership of any of its participants. Thus, continuity is achieved in the context of continually changing membership.

32. As a continuing enterprise members of the Seminar expect to work together over a substantial period of time. This commitment to the Seminar enterprise has benefits as well as responsibilities for members.

33. Through regular meetings of the Seminar's core participants, it is possible to examine the context in detail without repeating steps unnecessarily due to rapid changes in Seminar membership.
34. In other words, the Decision Seminar attempts to develop an accurate representation, past and present, of a real setting, so that problem solving aimed at the future can occur.

35. Thus, continuity is achieved by integrating core membership, transient members, and information in a cumulative process that serves to expand and refine knowledge. Transient members and outside experts serve to keep the system open and continually subject its core participants to fresh ideas, new data, and difficult questions. On the other hand the Seminar's storage-recall technology and the participants' growing familiarity with the social context under examination serve to produce a powerful and disciplined intellectual resource with a capacity to locate new issues brought to it in a contextual frame for examination and critical assessment.

36. The Decision Seminar model is designed to structure content and blend it with procedures to maximize participant focus of attention. Thus the Seminar tends to stimulate simultaneous processes which are systematic and related:

a) participants interact with the contextual environment as represented by data displayed in the chart and map room and with each other on a continuous basis;

b) seminar members have an awareness of themselves, of each other, and of the social process under study;
c) power-status differences are de-emphasized to facilitate free and open interaction;

d) audio, visual, and three-dimensional models representing data serve to stimulate Seminar participants in storage, recall, critical judgement, and realistic imagination for decision-making;

e) Seminar activity and outcomes are recorded through the use of written records and through the development of additional audio-visual materials and displays for the Seminar room, i.e., maps, charts, recordings, and three-dimensional models; and,

f) a continuously developing, contextually-rich "cognitive map" provides a high potential for serendipitous outcomes.

**Toward a Problem-Solving Culture**

37. The last cell in the diagram is problem-solving. Problem-solving is used here to refer to the overall strategy and the analytical procedures for analysis/problem-solving that are applied by the members of the Decision Seminar.

38. The **analytic procedures** provide an investigative checklist which guides the Decision Seminar through its deliberative process on a continuing basis. Thus participants are encouraged to attend to procedures as well as to content.
39. The use of a common set of analytical procedures adds to the development of an effective problem-solving culture. Accordingly, the participants in a Decision Seminar are encouraged to use a common set of analytical symbols to address content which they may view in very different ways.

40. The common procedural language gives all members the tools of inquiry or an investigative checklist for assessing their and others' contributions to the deliberations of the Decision Seminar enterprise. The analytical tools also serve to reinforce the shared-power framework of the Seminar. Thus when points of difference arise among participants, they are more likely to be non-personal in focusing on the analytical process (including the information displays) as it relates to content.

A Problem Solving Strategy

An Analytical Sequence

41. To examine content the Decision Seminar addresses each one of the five principal elements of problem-solving which are attended to over and over again -- through time -- so that information is cumulative, serving as a disciplined, self-corrective device. The five tasks ask with regard to problems related to policy:
a) **Goal Clarification:**
What future states are to be realized as far as possible in the social process?

b) **Trend Description:**
To what extent have past and recent events approximated the preferred terminal states? What discrepancies are there?

c) **Analysis of Conditions:**
What factors have conditioned the direction and magnitude of the trends described?

d) **Projection of Developments:**
If current policies are continued, what is the probable future of goal realizations or discrepancies?

e) **Invention, Evaluation, and Selection of Alternatives:**
What intermediate objectives and associated strategies will promote movement toward the realization of preferred goals?

**A View of the Social Process**

42. Group problem-solving requires the identification, acquisition, processing, assessment, and utilization of information. The information may originate from one or more sources: from the group, from archives, from witnesses, from specially-designed studies commissioned by the group, and so on. However, the problem-solving group needs to agree on some
criteria for selecting what categories of information it will seek and use, for the problem of information overload is equal to the twin problems of insufficient or inaccessible information.

Accordingly, the Decision Seminar requires some prior agreement on a meta-image of the social process which can serve to focus the description of trends and the analysis of conditioning factors operating in the past and likely to operate in the future.

Thus the process of seeking, refining, and using information is guided by a Social Process Model that serves to identify broad classes of information thus providing a provisional solution to the "problem of selectivity" that arises in any information intensive activity. One such strategy asks Seminar members to consider seven broad classes of information as they consider the past, present, and future dimensions of a problem or issue:

In a brief form this particular model of the Social Process Model asks the Seminar participants to consider in mapping social interactions:

a) Who are the relevant participants? (Stakeholders)
b) What do they think, believe, feel about the policy/problem/issue? (Perspectives)
c) Where are they and what are the
occasions for their interaction with other stakeholders? (Situations)

d) What assets (capabilities, perspectives, values) do they hold? (Base-Values)

e) How do they and how are they likely to manage their assets? (Strategies)

f) What outcomes do they seek in terms of the distribution of values? (Outcomes)

g) What net redistribution of values is likely to be realized by the participants as a result of participating -- in their official/non-official role? (Effect)

A View of the Decision Process

46. The analysis of the stakeholders and the arenas in which they operate can be further refined. Thus, in order to develop a map of the social process that is both comprehensive and disciplined, the Decision Process itself and the role of different stakeholders in that process can be considered in terms of the decision functions that are served.

47. This represents then, a conception of the decision process that identifies seven basic decision functions. Because
each decision function has institutions that are more or less specialized to that function, it is possible to locate Stakeholder institutions which perform a specific function in the Decision Process.

A Conception of Social Values

48. Finally, the examination of Stakeholders, their Perspectives (i.e., their expectations), their Situations (i.e., the arenas for communication), their Base-Values (i.e., their assets and liabilities), their Strategies (i.e., how they manage their assets), and the Outcomes and Effects of a social process can all be described and evaluated by a set of common, if not equivalent, standards.

49. For example, Stakeholder Institutions can be characterized as power institutions (e.g., legislatures or executive branches of government) or enlightenment institutions (e.g., media, universities, or public schools). Some institutions may be characterized by a combination of values -- for example, the parochial school promotes enlightenment and rectitude.

50. Similarly, a standard and exhaustive set of values can be used to characterize a Stakeholder's assets and liabilities. Thus, an individual or institutional actor may have money (wealth) and political influence (power) and be deficient in information/knowledge (enlightenment). Others may be
knowledgeable (enlightenment) and have the confidence of their peers (respect) but lack monetary resources (wealth) and be capable of exercising only modest levels of political influence (power).

51. Thus, this set of social values is presented as an example of the way different elements in a social process can be characterized and evaluated.

52. In summary, a Decision Seminar encourages a configurative approach that requires the participants to examine a problem in terms of its past, present, and future aspects. In addition, the requirements of Contextuality encourage the participants to move back and forth between part and whole. Thus, because analyses require criteria of selectivity and because syntheses require an overall map, the participants are encouraged to adopt a provisional model of the entire Social Process. The model presented earlier serves to outline major categories to guide the selection and storage of information. The Decision Process categories and the eight categories used to characterize social values permit the participants to refine further their characterizations of the social process they are examining. The decision phase analysis routine and the base values serve as important diagnostic tools for further refinement while giving participants the capacity to develop a cumulative
and comparative knowledge base of the social process
they are examining and trying ultimately to shape.

This description of the Decision Seminar is reproduced from a
Mershon Center Briefing Paper, Number 7502-01, February, 1975,
by Larry L. Slonaker and Philip M. Burgess.

Reproduced by permission.