69-20,925

ROWLAND, Howard Ray, 1929-

A STUDY OF THE CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION WITH EMPHASIS ON MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF THE CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION WITH EMPHASIS ON MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Howard Ray Rowland

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION WITH EMPHASIS ON MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Howard Ray Rowland

The purposes of this study were: to define the campus ombudsman, to review the circumstances leading to his appearance on the academic scene, to describe his activities, and to analyze the effects of his activities. Campus ombudsmen at six institutions of higher education were interviewed: University of California at Berkeley, Columbia University, University of Detroit, Michigan State University, San Diego State College and San Jose State College. Students who consulted the campus ombudsman at Michigan State University during the 1968 fall term were surveyed.

Three simultaneous developments led to the appointment of campus ombudsmen at fourteen or more colleges and universities in the United States by the end of 1968. One was the increasing dominance of large-scale formal organizations in modern society,

accentuating the asymmetry in size and power between the individual and the organization. Another was rapid enrollment growth at institutions of higher education, expanding many of them into complex, quasi-bureaucratic organizations. By the mid-1960's, students had begun to react against individual neglect and abuse within the impersonal organization. The third development was the spread of the ombudsman concept in civil government.

Of Scandinavian origin, the civil ombudsman is an independent, high-level officer who receives complaints, makes inquiries and recommends appropriate action. His remedial weapons are persuasion, criticism and publicity. He cannot reverse administrative action.

The campus ombudsman, modeled primarily on the Danish civil ombudsman, is defined as an independent faculty member who receives complaints, mainly from students, at a college or university. He makes inquiries and recommends appropriate action. His remedial weapons are persuasion and criticism. He cannot reverse administrative or academic action. His chief responsibility is to help resolve individual student grievances. His secondary responsibility is to seek procedural changes to reduce grievances. His objective is to improve rather than replace the existing system.

Both the civil ombudsman and campus ombudsman are auxiliary to, not replacements for, existing functionaries.

The method of selection and the person selected were found to be crucial in the establishment of the campus ombudsman position. He may be selected by any power group or combination of power groups at his institution. The manner of selection usually is consistent with the institution's power emphasis.

Institutions with campus ombudsmen range in size from large universities to small colleges. At Michigan State University, all class ranks and student age groups were represented by students who consulted that institution's ombudsman. On a proportional basis, upperclassmen, male students and married students were more inclined to consult the ombudsman while underclassmen, female students and single students were less inclined. Students from certain colleges--particularly Arts and Letters and University College--were "over represented" in the ombudsman's office while students from other colleges--particularly Education and Natural Science--were "under represented."

Four differences distinguish the campus ombudsman from the chief student affairs officer. The ombudsman has no staff, considers student academic as well as non-academic problems, is not involved in student disciplinary matters, and has more investigatory authority.

Two-thirds of the 218 surveyed students who consulted the Michigan State University ombudsman indicated that he helped relieve

student frustration and hostility. Nearly half of the respondents considered the problems they took to the ombudsman "completely solved" while one-third replied "not solved at all." None thought the functions of the ombudsman should be discontinued, although one-third recommended changes. Nearly three-fourths of the surveyed students would have consulted the ombudsman even if his records were open for public inspection. Thirteen of 207 respondents claimed to have experienced "unpleasant treatment" by anyone involved in their complaint after consulting the ombudsman. Nearly all surveyed students would return to the ombudsman with other problems and recommend him to other students.

Traits selected by surveyed students as most important for a campus ombudsman to have were, in descending order: knowledge of campus operations and regulations, understanding, effectiveness, authority and accessibility. A non-teaching faculty member (administrator) was their first choice for an ombudsman. The preferred method of filling the position was selection by administration, faculty and students. A term of office extending beyond two years was highly favored.

A campus ombudsman model proposed by the author included these features:

Long-time, highly-respected, well-paid faculty member relieved of teaching duties; selected by a committee representing

students, faculty and administration; appointed for renewable two-year term by institution's governing board; private office separate from main administration building easily accessible to students; receptive to individual student grievances concerning the institution, both academic and non-academic; uses reasoned persuasion to bring about expeditious redress of genuine grievances; detects patterns of grievances and works for changes to end them; has access to nearly all campus files; keeps written confidential records; makes periodic reports; appeals to organizational superiors or chief administrative officer when rebuffed; has no power to take disciplinary action, reverse decisions or circumvent regulations.

The author concluded that even when performing effectively, the campus ombudsman cannot ward off major student confrontations of a political nature challenging the organizational structure of the institution. Like the civil ombudsman, the position requires an organizational structure which is relatively stable, supported and trusted by most of the people within it most of the time. It is intended to make a system of government function as designed rather than to restructure the system.

PREFACE

In the best of worlds, there would be no need for an Ombudsman, for all public servants and all faculty members and employees of universities would be doing their jobs perfectly. Until that world arrives, however, trouble-shooters, whether called Ombudsmen or not, will be needed.

James Rust, Ombudsman

Michigan State University

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people helped the author conduct this study. Only a few are acknowledged here. Nonetheless, sincere appreciation is extended to all those who, somewhere along the way, opened a door, answered a letter, or offered a word of encouragement.

Among those entitled to special recognition are:

Dr. Van Johnson, a kind and dedicated adviser who adjusted his busy schedule to fit mine;

Dr. Edward Blackman, Dr. Richard Featherstone and Dr. Donald Olmsted, each of whom offered excellent suggestions and professional guidance;

Dr. James Rust and his secretary, Mrs. Helen Groh, whose trust and cooperation exceeded the author's expectations;

Rev. J. Benton White, Dr. George Leitmann, Dr. Nelson Norman, Dr. Irving DeKoff and Thomas Davis, who patiently answered unending questions;

Dr. Stanley Anderson, who generously provided an unpublished manuscript for resource material;

My wife, June, and daughters, Runay and Rhonda, who realized how much it meant to me and made the necessary sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

During the past century, American institutions of higher education have been characterized by rapid growth and increasing complexity. In 1869, about 52,000 students were enrolled for degrees in the nation's colleges and universities. This figure represented only 1.1 per cent of the population between 18 and 24 years old.[1] But a major change was afoot. The Morrill Act of 1862, providing federal support for land-grant colleges, had begun to make state institutions accessible to middle-class midwestern youth far removed from elite eastern academies. The egalitarian spirit of the frontier, with its emphasis on advanced practical learning as the avenue to opportunity, was transforming higher education.

By 1900, the number of students enrolled for degrees had risen five times to nearly a quarter of a million. Ten years later

---

[1] Edward J. Bloustein, "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges," Liberal Education, LIV (October, 1968), 351.

the total reached 355,000. When World War I ended, the figure approached half a million. It doubled again by 1929, more than doubled once more by the end of World War II, and again since then.[1] The 1960 figure surpassed 3,600,000, accounting for 14.2 per cent of the 18-24 year olds. In 1965, the total was 5,920,000.[2]

Today there are an estimated 6,700,000 students enrolled in some 2,400 institutions of higher education in the United States. Thus, the most spectacular increase of all was in the 1960's, when colleges and universities counted nearly twice as many students at the end of the decade as at its beginning. This addition of more than three million students duplicates in one decade the total enrollment growth in higher education during the three centuries since Harvard was founded.[3]

Building frantically to meet such unprecedented demands, universities have expanded to "multiversities," teachers colleges

---

[1]Martin Meyerson, "The Ethos of the American College Student: Beyond the Protests," in The Contemporary University: U.S.A., ed. by Robert S. Morison (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), p. 268.

[2]Sidney G. Tickton, "The Magnitude of American Higher Education in 1980," in Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education, ed. by Alvin C. Eurich (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968), p. 14.

[3]Clark Kerr, "The Frantic Race to Remain Contemporary," in Colleges at the Crossroads, ed. by William P. Lineberry (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1966), p. 27.

to state colleges and universities, and private colleges to semi-public universities. Once a week, on the average, a new public institution of higher education, usually a two-year college, opens its doors.[1]

Never in history have so many young people continued their education beyond the secondary school as in contemporary America. Called upon to educate previously unimagined numbers of students, higher education is no longer limited to a social, economic, or intellectual elite. Campuses accommodate students from all segments of society with a vast range of attitudes and competencies.[2] One or more members of most American families have had some college or university education. One of every twenty-eight persons in the nation is taking college coursework, including extension courses. By contrast, in 1869 it was one in every 740.[3] In some parts of the nation today, more than half the high school graduates enter college without delay.

Two major factors contribute to the continuing surge in enrollments: the "baby boom" following World War II and the

---

[1]Indications are that by 1970 the nation will have 1,000 two-year colleges enrolling more than two million students.

[2]Meyerson, "The Ethos of the American College Student," p. 268.

[3]W. Max Wise, They Come for the Best of Reasons (Washington: American Council on Education, 1958), pp. 5-6.

increasing necessity of a college education to attain positions of power and prestige in American society. During the fourteen-year period, 1946-59, a total of fifty-five million children were born in this country, in contrast to only thirty-six million during the preceding fourteen-year period. The 1970 census may reveal as many as eight million more college-age persons in the nation than in 1960, comprising perhaps twelve per cent of the total population.[1]

In today's sophisticated, technological society, the amount and quality of a person's education have a crucial impact on his opportunities for all levels of occupational achievement. This, in turn, determines whether he will be able to maintain or advance his social-class position. As Vener has summarized the situation: "Colleges and universities have become the gateway through which career-oriented youth must pass to reach the high-level jobs which assure them of membership in at least the upper middle class."[2]

Tickton has predicted twelve million American college and university students by 1980, an increase of 103 per cent over 1965.

---

[1]John Fred Thaden, "The Changing College Student Population," in The College Student, by Wilbur B. Brookover et al. (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967), p. 20.

[2]Arthur M. Vener, "College Education and Vocational Career," in Brookover et al., The College Student, p. 103.

Most of this growth will be in public, rather than private, institutions.[1]

Thaden has warned that "the number of potential applicants for college admission for the next fifteen to twenty years will be astronomical in comparison with the past."[2] This incredibly rapid expansion, Nason has commented, "is one of the brute facts of academic life at the present time, and its impact on higher education is in many respects brutal."[3]

Bulging enrollments, particularly since the mid-1940's, have made the sprawling university with 10,000 to 50,000 students more representative of the academic scene than the collegial institution. No reversal of this trend is indicated in Mayhew's prediction that by the end of the century the average American college will have 20,000 students.[4]

With institutional growth comes increasing complexity. In this respect, colleges and universities mirror the problems of the

---

[1]Tickton, "The Magnitude of American Higher Education in 1980," p. 14.

[2]Thaden, "The Changing College Student Population," p. 35.

[3]John W. Nason, "American Higher Education in 1980--Some Basic Issues," in Eurich, ed., Campus 1980, p. 397.

[4]Lewis B. Mayhew, ed., Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1967), p. 463.

larger society. For size demands different and more impersonal forms of organization which, as Mayhew has pointed out, "often evoke a negative response in students and faculty alike."[1] The massive educational institution is one manifestation of the dominance of large-scale formal organizations throughout the nation, a movement Williams has identified as "the most obvious single trend in the social structures of the twentieth century."[2]

A growing concern in American higher education is the plight of the individual student on the large and impersonal campus. Although students in groups are exerting considerable influence on administrative action through effective organization, students as individuals complain of neglect, abuse and manipulation. Personal anxieties and frustrations generated within the educational institution often lead to withdrawal from the institution or disruptive protest against it.

A common complaint raised by college and university students concerns a cluster of issues often referred to as lack of

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Robin M. Williams, Jr., "American Society in Transition: Trends and Emerging Developments in Social and Cultural Systems," in Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends, ed. by James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964), p. 24.

access to the administration. The student who has a complaint, a problem or a suggestion, or who is charged with some offense, often does not know where to go to make himself heard. The scope and variety of student problems that arise cannot be anticipated by the institution. Furthermore, the diffusion of administrative responsibility required in a quasi-bureaucratic system tends to segment student services. Thus, the student with a grievance is constrained by ignorance about procedures and an inherent elusiveness in the procedures themselves. His frustration is often akin to that of the citizen trying to "fight city hall."[1]

The analogy between the grievance of a student against his university and the grievance of a citizen against his government partially explains why during the 1960's hard-pressed educational institutions, seeking ways to compensate for the bureaucratic imbalance between student and organization, became interested in the ombudsman.

Although new to higher education, the ombudsman is well-established in civil government, having emerged as a parliamentary political institution 160 years ago in Sweden. Recognizing the need for a protector of the people, which is one meaning of the term, the

---

[1]Samuel Gorovitz, ed., Freedom and Order in the University (Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1967), p. 20.

1809 Swedish constitution provided for a "Justitieombudsman" to see that citizens were not deprived of their rights and liberties. Since then, similar positions have been instituted in the other three Scandinavian countries and recently in New Zealand and Great Britain. Other large nations, including Canada and the United States, are considering ways of fitting the ombudsman into their governmental structures.[1]

On a smaller scale, the state of Hawaii and two Canadian provinces--Alberta and New Brunswick--have passed ombudsman legislation. Ombudsman bills have been introduced in nearly all American state and Canadian provincial legislatures. Such a position is being tried experimentally in Buffalo and Nassau County, New York, and San Diego, California. A number of other American cities are considering the merits of the ombudsman concept.[2]

The first campus ombudsman was appointed in 1966 at Eastern Montana College. By the end of 1968, at least fourteen

---

[1]Donald C. Rowat, "The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea," in Ombudsmen for American Government?, ed. by Stanley V. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), pp. 7-36.

[2]Hing Yong Cheng, "The Emergence and Spread of the Ombudsman Institution," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXXVII (May, 1968), 20-30. Also, William H. Angus and Milton Kaplan, "The Ombudsman and Local Government," in Anderson, ed., Ombudsmen for American Government?, pp. 101-35.

colleges and universities had faculty members serving as ombudsmen, including such large and influential institutions as the University of California at Berkeley, Columbia University and Michigan State University. Several institutions had faculty-student ombudsman committees or student ombudsmen. Others were in various stages of appointing faculty ombudsmen. Some fifty colleges and universities from all areas of the country were represented at the first national meeting on the ombudsman in higher education October 24-25, 1968, in Detroit, Michigan.

Thus, a new position--the campus ombudsman--is emerging in American higher education. Indications are that during the next few years a substantial number of colleges and universities will establish the office of ombudsman, even though the role involved is ambiguous because the position has not been fully defined or systematically studied. Persons presently serving as campus ombudsmen do not have identical role perceptions. Inquiries they receive reveal much interest in the campus ombudsman but little understanding of his activities. Even the scant amount of literature on the subject gives evidence of divergent thinking. In short, there is a pressing need for more information. This study was conducted to provide such information, as is indicated in the statement of the problem and related objectives.

Statement of the Problem

The problem on which this study is based is four-fold: (1) to define the campus ombudsman, (2) to review the circumstances leading to his appearance on the academic scene, (3) to describe his activities, and (4) to analyze the effects of his activities.

Objectives

Because the study is primarily exploratory in nature, research questions rather than hypotheses were used as a guide in collecting and analyzing data. As objectives to be pursued, the following questions were formulated:

1. What are the characteristics of the campus ombudsman?
2. How is the campus ombudsman selected?
3. To whom is the campus ombudsman responsible?
4. What are the similarities and dissimilarities among various campus ombudsmen?
5. What conditions and events have brought campus ombudsmen into existence on American college and university campuses?
6. How prevalent is the ombudsman in American higher education?
7. What kinds of grievances do students bring to the campus ombudsman?
8. What are the characteristics of students who consult the campus ombudsman?

9. What are the similarities and dissimilarities of the campus ombudsman and the civil ombudsman?

10. What are the similarities and dissimilarities of the campus ombudsman and other college and university functionaries?

11. How does the campus ombudsman assess his effectiveness?

12. How do students who consult the campus ombudsman assess his effectiveness?

13. Do students who consult the campus ombudsman experience retaliation from those involved in their grievances?

14. Is confidentiality important to students who consult the campus ombudsman?

15. Can a model be developed for campus ombudsmen to follow, with modifications to meet the specific needs of their institutions?

Definition of Terms

Before moving to procedures followed to pursue the objectives listed above, it is necessary to define several terms to be used throughout the remainder of the study. Since one part of the problem is to devise a comprehensive definition of the term "campus ombudsman," the description given here is a preliminary definition used as a guide in conducting the study. A more complete definition appears in Chapter V. The following definitions have been adopted:

Civil Ombudsman. -- An independent, high-level officer in civil government who receives complaints, who pursues inquiries

into the matters involved, and who makes recommendations for suitable action. He may also investigate on his own motion. He makes periodic public reports. His remedial weapons are persuasion, criticism and publicity. He cannot as a matter of law reverse administrative action.[1]

Campus Ombudsman. -- An independent faculty member who receives complaints, primarily from students, at a college or university, who pursues inquiries into the matters involved, and who makes recommendations for suitable action. He makes periodic reports. His remedial weapons are persuasion, criticism and, at his discretion, publicity. He cannot as a matter of policy reverse administrative or academic action.

Student Ombudsman. -- A student at a college or university who performs essentially the same functions as those performed by a campus ombudsman.

Role. -- The set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be.[2]

---

[1] The Ombudsman, Report of the Thirty-second American Assembly, October 26-29, 1967 (New York: Columbia University, undated), p. 6.

[2] Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 29.

Role Perception. -- The manner in which an individual views a position he fills. This concept is aptly described by Kahn and his associates:

> Each person . . . has a conception of his office and a set of attitudes and beliefs about what he should and should not do while in that position. He has some awareness of what behavior will fulfill his responsibilities, lead to the accomplishment of the organizational objectives, or further his own interests. He may even have had a part in determining the formal responsibilities of his office.[1]

Role Conflict. -- Exposure of an individual to incompatible behavioral expectations in a given position.[2]

Activities. -- Specific actions or pursuits; overt behaviors that are apparent and evident to the senses.

"Establishment." -- The aggregate of individuals who hold the primary positions of power, authority and decision-making in an organization.

"Multiversity." -- Term coined by Clark Kerr to describe a complex institution of higher education and research which is not

---

[1]Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. D. Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 18.

[2]Neil Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 246.

an academic community but rather several communities with varied, even conflicting, interests.[1]

The next step is to describe the procedure used to gather information needed to pursue the objectives of the study.

Procedure

Using methods recommended by Angell and Freedman, a system of classification and analysis of written materials was employed to convert widely scattered information about civil and campus ombudsmen into organized data.[2] Materials studied in this manner included correspondence, copies of official documents, written records and reports, unpublished papers and speeches, minutes of meetings, other memoranda, books, bibliographies, and articles in periodicals and newspapers.

Although a number of colleges and universities were included in the collection of data, the focus was on six institutions which have full-time or part-time campus ombudsmen. Selected for their large size, functional diversity and geographical

---

[1] Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 18-19.

[2] Robert C. Angell and Ronald Freedman, "The Use of Documents, Records, Census Materials, and Indices," in Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, ed. by Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), pp. 300-23.

distribution, the institutions whose ombudsmen were interviewed are: (1) University of California at Berkeley, (2) Michigan State University, two major public universities; (3) Columbia University, (4) University of Detroit, two major private universities, the former without religious affiliation and the latter a Roman Catholic (Jesuit) institution; and (5) San Diego State College, (6) San Jose State College, two public institutions in the same (California State College) system.

Tape-recorded interviews with these six campus ombudsmen, transcribed into more than 100 typewritten pages, provided much of the data summarized in Chapter III and Appendix C. As Good has pointed out, the face-to-face interview offers advantages over the mailed questionnaire.[1] A semi-structured schedule of questions as suggested by Maccoby and Maccoby provided responses that could be compared and contrasted.[2]

Because the population of campus ombudsmen is so small and no accurate roster is available, nothing could have been gained

---

[1]Carter V. Good, Essentials of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 229.

[2]Eleanor E.. Maccoby and Nathan Maccoby, "The Interview: A Tool of Social Science," in Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. by Gardner Lindzey (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), I, 449-87.

by attempting to use random sampling. Non-random selection was considered more advantageous because it allowed concentration on those institutions which have taken the lead in utilizing campus ombudsmen. Although no statistical inferences can be made from such interview findings, carefully considered generalizations are not invalid.[1]

The main emphasis in the study, as indicated by the title, was on Michigan State University, where students who have consulted the campus ombudsman were surveyed. This institution was chosen for student assessment because its campus ombudsman has been in office longer than any other ombudsman at a major university. Furthermore, he deals with a wide range of student grievances and records the names of all who visit him. A total of 525 students consulted the ombudsman during the 1967-68 academic year, followed by 305 during the 1968 fall term. Any attempt to take a random sample from all 830 students would have been complicated by the fact that many of those students had changed residence or were no longer enrolled by December 31, 1968. Such an approach probably would have resulted in a low response and a biased sample. Also, the questionnaire which was developed required the student to

---

[1]David R. Krathwohl, How to Prepare a Research Proposal (Syracuse, N.Y.: By the Author, Syracuse University, 1966), p. 32.

recall his visit to the ombudsman in considerable detail. It is likely that questionnaires returned by students whose visits had occurred several months earlier would have contained numerous errors of recollection.

To lessen these anticipated problems of non-response and poor recall, the survey was concentrated on the most recent time period long enough to cover a wide range of student grievances--the 1968 fall term. Again, random sampling was deemed inappropriate because of the small population involved. Consequently, a decision was made to sample with certainty and thus eliminate sampling error, recognizing, of course, that errors attributable to non-sampling factors (e.g., non-response) would not be eliminated. Questionnaires were sent to all 305 fall term students for whom addresses were available, followed by another mailing to non-respondents after two weeks. Efforts to obtain a high level of response were enhanced by the campus ombudsman's willingness to include in both mailings a letter urging cooperation and assuring anonymity. Of the 288 questionnaires sent, 218 were returned for a 75.6 per cent response.[1] Findings are reported in Chapter IV. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix F.

---

[1]Questionnaires could not be sent to seventeen of the original 305 students because current addresses were unavailable.

Since the campus ombudsman is obligated to keep his files confidential, at no time did the researcher learn the names of students involved in the survey except for those who voluntarily identified themselves for possible follow-up interviews. Also, the ombudsman was unable to link names with questionnaire responses because returns went to the researcher and remain in his possession. This procedure was explained in the questionnaire so that respondents would not be hesitant to assess the ombudsman candidly and completely. Data obtained were processed by computer.

Before reporting and analyzing the information gathered in succeeding chapters, it is important to specify some of the limitations imposed by the procedure adopted.

Limitations

As with all research endeavors, this study has definite limitations. No attempt was made to obtain detailed information on all campus ombudsmen or to report developments in the area under investigation which occurred after December 31, 1968. Also, student reaction to the campus ombudsman was not assessed anywhere except at Michigan State University. Finally, no systematic attempt was made to determine attitudes held by faculty and administrators concerning the campus ombudsman at any institution.

Because of the restricted samples used for the study, interpretation of the findings must be kept in proper perspective. It is to be expected that similar studies involving other institutions of higher education might yield contradictory results. Therefore, it is not claimed that the data obtained present a conclusive or comprehensive analysis of universal institutional practice and student response regarding the campus ombudsman.

Nevertheless, information presented in the following chapters may be useful in the adaptation of the ombudsman concept to other college and university campuses since student problems and organizational structures bear a degree of similarity from institution to institution. To some extent, therefore, the findings of this study may have broad application, modified to meet local circumstances and individual preferences.

Overview

The campus ombudsman has been identified as a new position which American colleges and universities have adapted from civil government to help the individual student cope with the complex institution. A need for further information is established as the basis for this exploratory study. To prepare a foundation for the ensuing chapters, the problem to be examined has been identified,

terms defined, objectives stated, procedure described and limitations recognized.

The second chapter is a review of professional and research literature regarding the development of the ombudsman concept both in civil government and in higher education. References to selected literature concerning relationships between the organization and the individual and between the university and the student also are included. The chapter closes with a summary of the ombudsman concept in theory and practice.

Information obtained from interviews and correspondence with campus ombudsmen is presented in the third chapter and Appendix C. Data collected in a survey of students who have consulted a campus ombudsman are analyzed in the fourth chapter. The study is concluded in the fifth and final chapter, where research questions are reconsidered, findings summarized and recommendations made.

Before turning to specific inquiries regarding the campus ombudsman, an adequate understanding of the historical and sociological development of the ombudsman concept is necessary. Therefore, pertinent literature is reviewed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In the previous chapter the campus ombudsman was identified as an emerging position in American higher education somewhat analogous to the ombudsman in civil government. Both developments were seen as attempts to ameliorate personal problems in the impersonal organization. It was pointed out, however, that there is as yet no general understanding or agreement regarding the role of the campus ombudsman even though a number of institutions have established the position and others are moving in that direction. The need for more information was cited as the main purpose of the study.

In order to assimilate existing information, related literature is reviewed in this chapter. Surveyed in the first section are selected references to the organization and the individual. In the second section recent literature concerning the university and the student is considered. Written materials dealing with the ombudsman in civil government and the ombudsman in higher education are

examined in the third and fourth sections. The final section is a summary of the ombudsman concept in theory and practice as reported in the literature.

The Organization and the Individual

Modern civilization depends on bureaucratically-structured organizations as the most rational and efficient form of social grouping known. By coordinating diverse individual activities, society attains predetermined objectives. It also continually evaluates organizational functions and makes adjustments. Although organizations are ancient in origin, modern industrial nations have more and larger organizations than any previous social systems.[1]

During the past forty years behavioral scientists have produced a considerable amount of literature on organizations. Among the recognized authorities in the field is Etzioni, who has epitomized the all-pervading influence of organizational activity in this statement:

> We are born in organizations, educated by organizations, and most of us spend much of our lives working for organizations. We spend much of our leisure time paying, playing, and praying in organizations. Most of us will die in an organization, and when the time comes for burial, the largest organization of all--the state--must grant official permission.[2]

---

[1] Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

Some contemporary observers, such as Crozier and Downs,[1] regard the bureaucratic organization as generally beneficial to the individual, but they are in the minority. Much of the literature has emphasized its detriments. Merton, for example, has cited the stress on depersonalized relationships as a fundamental cause of individual frustration:

> Since functionaries minimize personal relations and resort to categorization, the peculiarities of individual cases are often ignored. . . . Stereotyped behavior is not adapted to the exigencies of individual problems.[2]

Another source of conflict between the organization and the individual is the tendency of bureaucrats to adopt a domineering attitude associated with vested authority. The underlying dilemma, as Merton has described it, is that bureaucracy "is a secondary group structure designed to carry on certain activities which cannot be satisfactorily performed on the basis of primary group criteria."[3]

Argyris has discovered a lack of congruency between the needs of "healthy" individuals and the demands of the formal organization. Although his focus is on employees rather than clients, both

---

[1]Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964) and Anthony Downs, Inside Bureaucracy (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967).

[2]Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: Free Press, 1957), p. 202.

[3]Ibid., pp. 204-5.

are affected by the dysfunctions he has identified.[1] Coleman also has pointed out that the linkage between the large organization and the individual inevitably creates difficulties. He recently wrote:

> The principal problems that arise with this form of relation are due to the asymmetry in size between the individual and the organization, and the asymmetry in power that stems from the size disparity. Ordinarily the organization can mobilize far more resources to further its interests than can the individual to further his. It has enormous economies of scale, since it is involved in similar relations with many individuals.[2]

Like Coleman, Kahn and his associates have noted a substantial relationship between stress and organizational size. Their studies led to this revelation:

> The curve of stress begins to rise as we turn from tiny organizations to those of 50 to 100 persons, and the rising curve continues until we encounter the organizational giants. Only for organizations of more than 5000 persons does the curve of stress level off--perhaps because an organization so large represents some kind of psychological infinity and further increases are unfelt.[3]

Dimock, too, has concluded that size is the most prolific source of difficulty among all the variables influencing institutional management. His analysis of the problem is widely accepted:

---

[1]Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper & Row, 1957).

[2]James Coleman, unpublished paper written for the Commission on Tests, College Entrance Examination Board, 1968.

[3]Kahn et al., Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, p. 394.

> Size increases the influence of every factor in administration that contributes to bureaucratic excesses. . . . Standard practices are invited and then retained after their usefulness is over because few people are in a position to see the whole picture. . . . But precise rules are difficult to avoid when size contributes to impersonality and men hesitate to place trust in people whom they do not know well.[1]

Dimock is in agreement with Argyris that "pathological behavior" in a bureaucracy can be traced to the imbalance between the role of the individual and that of the group in administration. People react to this imbalance by becoming self-centered, avoiding responsibility and exerting their power in petty ways. The common factor in all three types of behavior "is the loss of personal identification and self-fulfillment."[2]

"Maladies" to which bureaucrats in governmental organizations are susceptible have been diagnosed by Robson as:

> Excessive sense of self-importance, indifference to the feelings or convenience of others, obsessive adherence to established practice regardless of resulting hardship, persistent addiction to formality, and astigmatic inability to perceive the totality of government because of preoccupation with one of its parts.[3]

---

[1]Marshall E. Dimock, Administrative Vitality (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), p. 92.

[2]Ibid., p. 104.

[3]William A. Robson, The Governors and the Governed (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), p. 17.

During a recent Senate subcommittee hearing, a witness contended that "the very structure of our modern society, its countless agencies and bureaus, has become a major ingredient in the production of unhappiness and unrest." He continued:

> Social scientists have known for years that increasing organizational complexity encourages the growth of bureaucracy. In most instances, there is a direct relationship between a bureaucratic structure and feelings of isolation and social impotence. Moreover, as we continue to advance technologically with our amazing computers and their coldly objective operations, most individuals have no choice except to become passive recipients of a decisionmaking process which is beyond comprehension. . . .[1]

These observations parallel those of Bennis, who has argued that bureaucracy "is hopelessly out of joint with contemporary realities. . . ." His criticisms of bureaucracy include its emphasis on conformity, inadequate juridical process, restricted communication, and sluggishness to adjust to new conditions. The effectiveness of bureaucracy, he has written, "should be evaluated on human as well as economic criteria."[2]

---

[1] Statement by Dick Williams, Research Assistant, Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, in U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Regional Ombudsman Proposal, Hearings, before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968, p. 160.

[2] Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 4, 6, 9.

In his appraisal of contemporary organizations, Gardner has deplored the "almost inevitable movement of an organization toward elaborateness, rigidity and massiveness and away from simplicity, flexibility and manageable size. . . ."[1] He has expressed particular concern with the bureaucratic communication system and its effect on decision-making:

> As organizations . . . become larger and more complex, the men at the top . . . depend less and less on firsthand experience, more and more on heavily "processed" data. Before reaching them, the raw data--what actually goes on "out there" --have been sampled, screened, condensed, compiled, coded, expressed in statistical form, spun into generalizations and crystallized into recommendations.[2]

What is filtered out is emotion, feeling, sentiment and mood. Thus, the picture of reality at the top levels of organizations is sometimes seriously distorted. "We suffer the consequences when we run head on into situations that cannot be understood except in terms of those elements that have been filtered out," he has warned.[3] In concluding his assessment, Gardner wrote:

> It is ridiculous that the institutions man designs for his own benefit should work to his disadvantage. We can never eliminate the conflict between man and his institutions . . . but we

---

[1]John W. Gardner, Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 80.

[2]Ibid., p. 78.

[3]Ibid., p. 79.

can insist that one of the aims of any organization be the development of the individuals who make it up.[1]

The University and the Student

Among the large-scale organizations which are being studied to determine their effect on the individual are American colleges and universities, particularly during their past decade of spectacular growth and increasing turmoil. It is curious, however, that only in recent years has the American institution of higher education as an organization subjected itself to the same kind of intensive research that has been applied to other organizations.[2] McConnell declared in 1963 that "so little research has been done on how colleges and universities are organized and administered that . . . the field has not been touched."[3] Since then a trickle of literature based on empirical studies has begun to appear, although the resulting identification of specific problems has been somewhat

---

[1] Ibid., p. 65.

[2] John C. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), p. 187.

[3] T. R. McConnell, "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration," in The Study of Academic Administration (Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), p. 113.

overshadowed by still unanswered questions regarding organizational structure and goals.[1]

Any attempt to study the relationship between the institution of higher education and the individual student is complicated by the fact that authorities disagree on the nature of the organization. For example, Millett[2] and, to some extent, Corson[3] cling to the organic model of a unified academic community while, at the other extreme, Kerr has described the mechanistic "multiversity" as the pragmatic reality. Unlike an organism, whose parts are inextricably bound together, Kerr's "inconsistent institution" has many parts which can be added and subtracted with little effect on the whole. It is, he said, "held together by administrative rules and powered by money."[4]

---

[1]McConnell has declared that a conceptual framework does not exist for formulating a coherent set of hypotheses for investigating organization and administration in higher education. Ibid.

[2]John D. Millett, The Academic Community (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962).

[3]Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities.

[4]Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 20.

Barzun and Boulding have likened the university to a corporation,[1] Clark to a federation,[2] and Moran to a holding company.[3] Henderson, by contrast, has defined it as a distinctive professional organization.[4] Mortimer Kadish is among those who consider the university to be a political institution made up of special interest groups.[5] Parsons has drawn an analogy between special interest groups in the academic institution and the separation of powers in governmental affairs:

> Faculties have a role somewhere between the functions of the judicial and legislative branches of government, participating in both. . . . Students and alumni play a role in some respects parallel to those of constituencies in relation to political office-holders. But the "judicial" role of the faculty substantially modifies the "pure democracy" of the constituency type of relationship.[6]

---

[1]Jacques Barzun, The American University (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 3; Kenneth E. Boulding, The Organizational Revolution (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p. 51.

[2]Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," in The Study of Academic Administration, p. 51.

[3]William E. Moran, "The Study of University Organizations," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIX (March, 1968), 150-51.

[4]Algo D. Henderson, "The Desired Influence," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (June, 1967), 304.

[5]Mortimer R. Kadish, quoted in Gorovitz, ed., Freedom and Order in the University, p. 168.

[6]Talcott Parsons, "The Academic System: A Sociologist's View," The Public Interest, XIII (Fall, 1968), 185.

Rourke and Brooks have identified university administration as a cabinet system of government.[1]

Stroup has declared that colleges are bureaucratic social organizations, blending authority with specialization.[2] His position is supported by the findings of Ayers and Russel, who, after studying the organizational structure of 608 American institutions of higher education, concluded that the most prevalent system is one that follows the bureaucratic pattern of hierarchy of authority and division of responsibility.[3] Presthus[4] also has noted the dominance of bureaucratic patterns in most large institutions of higher education and Pinner[5] has expressed concern with the tendency of universities to imitate business and government practices. Certainly

---

[1] Francis E. Rourke and Glenn E. Brooks, The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), p. 111.

[2] Herbert Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education (New York: Free Press, 1966), p. 98.

[3] U.S., Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education, by Archie R. Ayers and John H. Russel, Bulletin No. 9 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962).

[4] Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 241.

[5] Frank Pinner, "The Crisis of the State Universities: Analysis and Remedies," in Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 959.

Blau's four basic characteristics of bureaucratic organization--specialization, a hierarchy of authority, a system of rules, and impersonality--all are found in the large university.[1] Rourke and Brooks have joined Stoke in regarding this development as an inevitable result of increased enrollments and functions.[2] Hutchins has stated that bureaucracy holds the university together.[3]

Williams has pointed out, however, that the existence of a bureaucracy within a university does not necessarily mean that the organization is totally bureaucratic. It also has characteristics of a professional organization not associated with bureaucracies, such as widely-dispersed decision-making and limited hierarchical authority. He has described the university organization in the United States as embodying a continuous struggle between the centralized-bureaucratic system and the diffused-collegial system.

---

[1] Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 19. Also see Beardsley Ruml, Memo to a College Trustee (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 55-56.

[2] Rourke and Brooks, The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education, p. 5; Harold W. Stoke, The American College President (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), p. 152.

[3] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Issues," in The University in America (Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1967), p. 6.

Thus, the university may be considered as quasi-bureaucratic rather than "purely" bureaucratic.[1]

Nevertheless, the bureaucratic specialization required in a large organization creates special problems in a university. According to Folger, staff specialists tend to usurp what faculty members and students regard as their policy-making privileges. As the institution expands, these specialists become more essential and exert more authority.[2] Folger's findings are supported by Boland's study of 130 colleges and universities, which confirmed his hypothesis that as size increases organizational specialization also increases.[3]

This sampling of the literature seems to indicate a shortage of research and a surplus of opinion regarding the organizational structure of American colleges and universities.[4] The ambiguity resulting from these conflicting concepts is reflected in related

---

[1]Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), pp. 316-18.

[2]John K. Folger, "Urban Sprawl in the Academic Community," in Mayhew, ed., Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades, p. 184.

[3]Walter Reed Boland, "American Institutions of Higher Education: A Study of Size and Organization" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966).

[4]As recently as 1966 Sanford emphasized the need for scientific study of the structure and functioning of colleges as institutions. The American College, pp. 24-25.

literature pertaining to the association between the individual student and the academic institution. That portion of the literature will now be considered.

Since the end of World War II, all elements of the university --trustees, faculty, administration and students--have been searching for a definition of their rights and responsibilities within the organization. Faculty members have attempted to build new concepts of their place in policy-making decisions. Trustees and administrators have found it increasingly difficult to balance competing objectives in managing the complex institution. Students have argued for a more influential role in the educational process, demanding more attention on the one hand and more freedom on the other.[1] It is these student demands and their manifestations that have attracted the greatest amount of attention in the recent literature of higher education.

Scores of books and articles on the "condition" of the American college student have appeared since the 1964 Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley--the first prolonged student rebellion on a major university campus. That disruption touched off a wide variety of student protests on college

---

[1]Otis A. Singletary and Robert B. Yegge, "Introduction," Denver Law Journal, XLV (Special, 1968), 497.

campuses across the nation, a pattern which continues to expand and intensify. It also led to the forced withdrawal of Clark Kerr as president of that institution shortly after he had warned in a lecture at Harvard University of "an incipient revolt of undergraduate students." In his remarks, later printed and widely disseminated, Kerr made other prophetic observations:

> The students find themselves under a blanket of impersonal rules for admissions, for scholarships, for examinations, for degrees. It is interesting to watch how a faculty intent on few rules for itself can fashion such a plethora of them for the students. The students also want to be treated as distinct individuals.
>
> If the faculty looks on itself as a guild, the undergraduate students are coming to look upon themselves more as a "class"; some may even feel like a "lumpen proletariat." Lack of faculty concern for teaching, endless rules and requirements, and impersonality are the inciting causes.[1]

The Berkeley campus demonstrations underscored Kerr's concern that the large state universities were most vulnerable to charges of neglect of students. "The multiversity is a confusing place for the student," he declared. "He has problems of establishing his identity and sense of security within it."[2]

Mario Savio, the leader of the Berkeley revolt, found the "depersonalized, unresponsive bureaucracy" of the university symptomatic of what may emerge as the nation's greatest problem.

---

[1]Kerr, The Uses of the University, pp. 103-4.

[2]Ibid., p. 42.

"Here we find it impossible usually to meet with anyone but secretaries," he wrote. "Beyond that, we find functionaries who cannot make policy but can only hide behind rules."[1] This theme has reappeared in subsequent writings on the contemporary university student and received renewed emphasis in a 1968 report by the Committee on the Student in Higher Education:

> . . . American students. . . . are enmeshed from kindergarten to the grave in the complex, specialized, bureaucratic, and impersonal institutions of American life. Whether we like it or not, we all--students and teachers alike--live in the most advanced technological nation in the world; and in such a society, as in its educational institutions, individuals tend to feel lost and to look for new ways to assert their individuality and justify their lives.[2]

The failure of faculty and administrators to recognize these psychological needs was regarded by the committee as a major source of student frustration:

> The procedures and style of the university or college are calculated to prevent students from creating problems for the institution by expressing their own individuality within it. As a result, faculty and administrators do all they can in their dealings with students to standardize procedures and depersonalize contacts. . . .

---

[1]Mario Savio, "An End to History," Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, by Hal Draper (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965), p. 179.

[2]The Student in Higher Education (New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1968), p. 18. Also see Paul Woodring, The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 10, 234.

> Those agents of the institution with whom the students are in most frequent contact--secretaries, clerks, tellers in the bursar's office, and campus police--are frequently people who, perhaps with very good reason, do not particularly like young people and are quite successful at generating a reciprocal dislike of themselves.[1]

The report went on to suggest that much student unrest might be traced to "authoritarian police, rude clerks, hostile and unfriendly secretaries, and testy tellers."[2]

Rudolph has asserted that college students constitute the most neglected, least understood element on the American academic scene. He recently wrote:

> . . . students knew how to use a college as an instrument of their maturation. The university has become a less wieldy instrument for that purpose, often a most disappointing instrument. Students have strangely always had to insist that they are human beings. . . . Today neglect takes on new forms: neglect has become a function of size and of a shift in professorial commitment rather than of administrative absent-mindedness or blindness. . . .
>
> . . . today's student would actually prefer a happy blend of freedom and guided concern. . . . Whether the contemporary university can create that combination . . . is perhaps its greatest challenge.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 39-40.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

[3] Frederick Rudolph, "Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition," The College and the Student, ed. by Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 57-58.

A term commonly used by dissatisfied students to describe the university is "factory," denoting a cold and impersonal setting in which students, like assembly line products, lose their individuality.[1] A parallel also has been drawn between the university and the prison, with the single important exception that the student is relatively free to leave. In both institutions the major occupants are governed by regulations they had no share in making and generally have no involvement in enforcing.[2] Barzun has suggested that the student may fairly be regarded as a victim of the college he attends:

> A victim, according to one simple definition, is one who has something inflicted upon him without choice and that he must endure. It would be too simple a rejoinder to student grievances to say that they do not have to endure their woes; they can stay away. They do undergo compulsion without choice and it comes from society, which makes a bachelor's degree indispensable for business and the professions, these being at the same time the recognized means of making one's way. College students are caught in the mandarin system. Therefore they do have to endure bad teaching, a petrified curriculum, and other marks of neglect where these obtain. To that extent they are victims entitled to redress.[3]

Although he would consider these views as extreme, Howe has maintained that the "usual attitude toward students in the American

---

[1] David Gottlieb, "College Climates and Student Subcultures," in Brookover et al., The College Student, p. 82. Also Education at Berkeley: Report of the Select Committee on Education (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), pp. 15-16.

[2] The Student in Higher Education, p. 39.

[3] Barzun, The American University, pp. 73-74.

university is that they constitute a mixture of necessary consumer and irksome dependent. They pay their money (or receive their fellowships) and must then submit to whatever disciplines and routines the university proposes. . . ."[1] He has advocated a reconsideration of the relationship between the university and the student, "the terms of which were originally set under radically different conditions."[2]

Thus, the recurring theme in the literature is that, from the student's point of view, the university is a highly formalized, impersonal and rule-managed enterprise, an "organized, bureaucratized system that is controlled from without, that is primarily responsive to external pressures, . . . and that is mightily committed to the going system."[3] As with other bureaucracies, in the university the student is regarded as a customer who does not hold as important, intrinsic or permanent a relationship to the hierarchy and its continuance as does the employee.[4] The student is

---

[1]Irving Howe, "Beyond Berkeley," in Revolution at Berkeley, ed. by Michael V. Miller and Susan Gilmore (New York: Dial Press, 1965), p. xix.

[2]Ibid., p. xviii.

[3]Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, p. 152; Paul Potter, "Student Discontent and Campus Reform," in Mayhew, ed., Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades, p. 257.

[4]Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, pp. 85-86.

suspicious of administrators and entrenched faculty members who, when in doubt, will "use vague laws or regulations to err on the side of the established organization against the interests of individuals . . . pressing for change."[1] When the student is treated unfairly, he is not familiar enough with how the institution works to know what to do or where to turn.[2] Even when the institution attempts to personalize relations with students, the outcome is usually another bureau or formalized procedure.[3] Since the institution has become too big, too complex, too much involved with the task of running itself to give much attention to the student, his own education appears to be the least important of all its functions. For him, education becomes a "system" to be "beaten" at every opportunity.[4] The very mechanisms designed by the institution to expedite,

---

[1]Terry F. Lunsford, "Who Are Members of the University Community?" Denver Law Journal, XLV (Special, 1968), 553.

[2]Nicholas von Hoffman, The Multiversity (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 180.

[3]G. Lester Anderson, "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," in The Study of Academic Administration, p. 18.

[4]"Is Protest the Only Solution?" in The American Student and His College, ed. by Esther Lloyd-Jones and Herman A. Estrin (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), p. 339.

equalize and protect his interests turn out to be irritating and dehumanizing.[1]

The student's resentment against institutional "processing" has been aptly described by Meyerson:

> At Berkeley, one of the student dramatizations of complaints was the IBM card on which was printed, "Do not fold, spindle or mutilate," and which was worn as a badge. Students, resenting lines and forms, resenting impersonality and the frictions of a large student body, resenting rules and restrictions, resented the feeling that they were as manipulated and undistinguishable as an IBM card. Objecting to what they regarded as the machine character of universities, the students . . . wished to smash the machine.[2]

Kauffman has suggested that students who regard themselves as faceless, anonymous human beings "are not the best hope for our society."[3] Wilson has added: "We must not only sympathize with the student's desire to make a human or personal connection with his college, we must also vigorously assist him in making such a connection."[4] The institution's failure to make that

---

[1]Kate Mueller, quoted by Lloyd-Jones, "What Are College Students Made of?" ibid., p. 42.

[2]Meyerson, "The Ethos of the American College Student: Beyond the Protests," pp. 278-79.

[3]Kauffman, "The Student in Higher Education," in Dennis and Kauffman, eds., The College and the Student, pp. 144-45.

[4]Logan Wilson, "Is the Student Becoming the 'Forgotten Man'?" in Dennis and Kauffman, eds., The College and the Student, p. 60. Also see von Hoffman, The Multiversity, p. xix.

connection has been cited by a fact-finding commission as one of the prime reasons for the student disturbances in the spring of 1968 at Columbia University.[1] Sanford Kadish has observed "more semi-formalized ways of students' expressing judgment and preferences and gripes" on the Berkeley campus since the 1964 demonstrations.[2] Stroup has suggested four avenues toward the kind of institutional response desired by students--decentralization, informality, personal decision-making and communication.[3] Koile has pointed out that considerable research evidence from business, medicine and education supports "the rather simple notion that people tend to act and to become more mature, to assume greater responsibility, and generally to function better when they are treated with respect, with dignity, and as mature persons of worth. . . ."[4]

Some observers who have argued for changing student-institutional relationships contend that the contemporary student is significantly different from his predecessors. In an informal survey,

---

[1] Crisis at Columbia (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), pp. 34-35.

[2] Sanford H. Kadish, quoted in Gorovitz, Freedom and Order in the University, p. 152.

[3] Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, pp. 176-77.

[4] Earl Koile, "The Student Nobody Knows," in Lloyd-Jones and Estrin, eds., The American Student and His College, p. 25.

deans of student affairs characterized today's students as brighter and more sophisticated, cosmopolitan, informal and experienced than those of previous generations. They also were described as more idealistic, introspective, critical and insistent on involvement in decisions affecting their lives.[1]

In attempting to enhance their status within the university, students are turning more to legalistic definitions of their rights, perhaps in direct proportion to their perception that they have been ignored or rejected by the institution. Kauffman has suggested that students "will demand a relationship, even if it must be legally prescribed."[2] A recent study by McClellan seemed to support his hypothesis that non-legal norms, which have long governed specific relationships between public universities and students, have been and are being replaced by legal norms.[3] The Joint Statement on

---

[1]Reported by the editors of the Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Bulletin No. 2 (April, 1967), p. 11. For similar assessments of contemporary college students, see Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, "The New Student Power and Needed Educational Reforms," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (April, 1966), 398; also, Kenneth Keniston, "The Faces in the Lecture Room," in Morison, ed., The Contemporary University: U.S.A., pp. 315-49.

[2]Kauffman, "The Student in Higher Education," p. 145.

[3]Stephen Douglas McClellan, "An Analysis of How the Role of Law Has Affected Specific Relationships Between Public Universities and Their Students: Legal Guidelines for Administrative Decision-Making" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967).

Rights and Freedoms of Students adopted in 1967 by the U. S. National Student Association and subsequently endorsed by major faculty and administrative associations is a manifestation of this trend.[1]

Beaney has maintained that it would be a "disastrous mistake" if student claims were to be casually dismissed simply because the law presently provides no compulsion to act differently.[2] Yegge has added that regardless of differences of opinion over whether the law should be involved in academic matters, the fact of ultimate legal redress exists. This fact influences student-institutional relations.[3]

After analyzing recent court decisions affecting students, Chambers has concluded that the conventional legal doctrine that the relationship between the student and his college is almost wholly contractual--a transaction involving purchase and sale of educational services between two parties--is no longer viable. He has detected a decided shift in favor of the student:

> The more modern view is that the beginning of the relationship is no longer simply the inception of a contract, because it has

---

[1] Administrator's Handbook: Understanding the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students (Chicago: College and University Business, undated).

[2] William M. Beaney, "Students, Higher Education, and the Law," Denver Law Journal, XLV (Special, 1968), 513.

[3] Robert B. Yegge, "Emerging Legal Rights for Students," ibid., p. 78.

> become less a voluntary agreement than "an act of submission" (in the words of one judge) because the projected service is so indispensable to the student that he is largely at the mercy of the other party. This means that the traditional rules of the law of contracts play a decreasing role, and are in great part supplanted by new notions which take into account the mutual obligations of the individual and of society--and of citizen and state. . . .[1]

This concept is not a return to the outmoded doctrine of in loco parentis--under which the college acts in place of the parent --but more closely resembles a fiduciary responsibility on the part of the institution. As described by Williamson, this relationship compels the institution to act for the benefit of the student on matters relevant to the relationship between them.[2] Williamson has issued a warning, however, that increased emphasis on legal rights cannot circumvent the fact that a "dual citizenship" applies to the student in higher education:

> We seem to teach our students that there is but one kind of citizenship and that is the form of citizenship existing in our political democracy. To be sure, students are citizens and as such, are entitled to all the rights of the Constitution, both federal and state, and other rights as defined by statutes and by court decisions. They do not lose these citizenship rights when they enroll in a university. But . . . we face some very puzzling modifications. . . .

---

[1] M..M. Chambers, The Colleges and the Courts, 1962-1966 (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1967), introduction.

[2] E. G. Williamson, "Do Students Have Academic Freedom?" in Lloyd-Jones and Estrin, eds., The American Student and His College, p. 315.

> . . . an academic institution is not a form of political democracy. . . .
>
> . . . the student is admitted to a state-chartered educational corporation, the academic institution. It is not a democracy, it is a corporation, of a peculiar character, with the defined mission of instructing youth. . . .
>
> Membership in this kind of a corporate enterprise does not negate the student's civic and state rights. But we face some interesting questions that have not entirely been clarified as to what modification one type of right imposes upon another as he exercises both types of rights. . . .[1]

Williamson's definition of the academic institution as an educational corporation--disputed by many as too narrow and legalistic--brings to full circle this review of the literature concerning the relationship of the university to the student. The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn is that the student's rights and the institution's responsibilities are unsettled and are in the process of change. Much of the attendant confusion seems to stem from disagreement over the organizational structure and goals of the university. Although pertinent literature has proliferated in recent years, much of it is subjective and prescriptive. Objective findings based on empirical research are lacking.

This is the scene upon which the campus ombudsman concept has made its appearance in American higher education. The origin of the concept, however, also must be traced through another

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 309-10.

stream of literature--that which deals with the ombudsman in civil government. The review will now be turned in that direction.

Civil Ombudsman

A decade ago literature concerning the ombudsman in civil government was practically non-existent in the United States. Today it is extensive and increasing rapidly. The first English-language book in the field was Utley's Occasion for Ombudsman, published in London.[1] Two basic references published in this country are The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, edited by Rowat,[2] and Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries by Gellhorn.[3] Gellhorn also has written When Americans Complain: Governmental Grievance Procedures, which makes a case for ombudsmen-critics of public administration in the United States.[4] A work by Sawer entitled Ombudsmen has been published in

---

[1]T. E. Utley, Occasion for Ombudsman (London: C. Johnson, 1961).

[2]Donald C. Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1965).

[3]Walter Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966).

[4]Gellhorn, When Americans Complain: Governmental Grievance Procedures (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966).

Melbourne.[1] The most recent volume is Ombudsmen for American Government? edited by Anderson for the American Assembly.[2] Earlier he had written a monograph called Canadian Ombudsman Proposals.[3] Other related works include The Citizen and the Administration: The Redress of Grievances edited by Whyatt,[4] The Governors and the Governed by Robson, and The Control of Police Discretion: The Danish Experience by Aaron.[5]

Supplementing these books are two U.S. government documents reporting Congressional ombudsman hearings, an unpublished study by Sandberg,[6] and numerous articles in professional journals, popular magazines and newspapers. Of particular interest are issues

---

[1]Geoffrey Sawer, Ombudsmen (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1964).

[2]Stanley V. Anderson, ed., Ombudsmen for American Government? (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968).

[3]Anderson, Canadian Ombudsman Proposals (Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1966).

[4]Sir John Whyatt, ed., The Citizen and the Administration: The Redress of Grievances (London: Justice--British Section of the International Commission of Jurists, 1961).

[5]Thomas J. Aaron, The Control of Police Discretion: The Danish Experience (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966).

[6]Carl H. Sandberg, "Ombudsman: The Redress of Citizens' Grievances" (unpublished honors paper, Ohio University, 1968).

of journals devoted wholly or partially to articles on the ombudsman. Everything listed above was produced during the 1960's.

In reviewing the literature, the development of the civil ombudsman concept will be traced, first in other countries and then in the United States. Similarities and differences in ombudsman activities will be noted.

Sweden

According to Sandberg, the world's oldest agency devoted exclusively to helping citizens who have been abused or neglected by public officials is the Swedish office of ombudsman, or Justitie-ombudsman (abbreviated "J.O.").[1] Established under Sweden's constitution of 1809, the office has roots reaching back to ancient Scandinavia. Anderson has reported that the first ombudsman, known as "umbodsmadr," was a mediator between feuding families in the primitive Icelandic legal system.[2] The modern form of this agent's name consists of three syllables: "om," meaning about; "bud," meaning message; and "man," meaning man or person. Thus, the literal translation is "a man with a message about

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Anderson, "An Ombudsman for the U.S.?" Center Diary: 14, published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif. (September-October, 1966), p. 19.

something."[1] Another meaning of the term preferred by Rosenthal and others is, simply, "one who represents someone."[2] Other appellations, as evidenced in book and article titles, include agent, representative, grievance man, public protector and citizen's defender. The literature is generally consistent in using the Anglicized form of spelling ombudsman. In verbal usage, the first syllable is usually accented and the last two syllables are pronounced to rhyme with "woodsman."

Much has been written about Sweden's ombudsman since the modern concept of the office originated in that country. Accounts by Alfred Bexelius, the current title holder, and studies by such authorities as Gellhorn and Rosenthal have been widely disseminated. From these standard references, a few basic facts and principles will be noted.

Unlike his predecessor, the chancellor of justice (an office established by King Charles XII in 1713), the Swedish ombudsman

---

[1] Farnsworth Fowle, "Two Ombudsmen Report on Roles--Civic Control Described by Swede and New Zealander," New York Times, February 20, 1966, quoted in U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Ombudsman Hearings, before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966, p. 380.

[2] Albert H. Rosenthal, "The Ombudsman--Swedish 'Grievance Man,'" Public Administration Review, XXIV (December, 1964), 227.

represents Parliament rather than the king in supervising government officials. This change was made in the 1809 constitution because the chancellor had not been regarded as independent enough from the government to provide sufficient protection of citizens' rights. Bexelius has maintained that the position was created against the wishes of the existing government.[1]

The ombudsman must be a person of known legal ability and outstanding integrity chosen by Parliament to serve a four-year term. His salary is equal to that of a Supreme Court judge. The present ombudsman is a former judge.[2]

The ombudsman conducts regular inspections of government institutions, makes investigations on his own volition, and hears complaints from any citizen. He decides what cases he will pursue and what action should be taken. Often the action is a reminder or a reprimand rather than legal prosecution.[3] The ombudsman rejects complaints which, in his judgment, are unwarranted. According to Gellhorn, he finds no fault in about 90 per cent of the cases about which a complaint has been made.[4] He has

---

[1]Alfred Bexelius, "The Ombudsman for Civil Affairs," in Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, p. 24.

[2]Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, pp. 202-3.

[3]Ibid., p. 206.

[4]Ibid., p. 250.

access to all government documents and can request additional information from all officials. Although he gives no orders, he may initiate public prosecution, even against judges. He cannot change but can publicly criticize administrative and judicial decisions. He submits an annual report to Parliament. Bexelius has indicated that neither Parliament nor the administration exerts political pressure on him.[1]

During the nineteenth century his efforts were directed chiefly at courts, police and prisons. Gradually, however, civil service administration has become his main concern. The number of complaints per year--about 100 fifty years ago--was 550 in 1956 and 1,550 in 1966.[2] His effects have not been spectacular; yet he has had considerable influence on the way in which public officials perform their duties. Bexelius has made this capsule evaluation of the office:

> The mere existence of an Ombudsman, independent of the bureaucracy, to which anybody may carry his complaints, will act to sharpen the attention of the authorities in dealing with

---

[1] Bexelius, "The Ombudsman's Office and Other Means for Protecting Citizens' Rights in Sweden," International Social Science Journal, XVIII (No. 2), 249.

[2] Ibid., "The Origin, Nature, and Functions of the Civil and Military Ombudsman in Sweden," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXXVII (May, 1968), 15.

cases and to counteract tendencies toward abuse of power and arbitrary decisions.[1]

Finland

Expansion of the ombudsman concept began in 1919, when Finland's new constitution borrowed from Sweden the idea of a public watchman against official mistakes. Since Finland's system of government had long resembled Sweden's, Anderson has indicated that the only surprising aspect of the adoption is that it took so long.[2] Although the Finnish ombudsman closely parallels his Swedish counterpart in powers and duties, he has not sprung quickly to the defense of basic civil rights. According to Gellhorn, his potential in dealing with problems of Little Man and Big Government has not been fully explored.[3]

Denmark

Strongly influenced by the Swedish model, the office of ombudsman was incorporated into Denmark's constitution of 1953. Stephan Hurwitz, the first Danish ombudsman, began his duties two

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," American Scandinavian Review, LII (December, 1964), 403-4.

[3] Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, p. 89.

years later. It is Gellhorn's opinion that the former professor of criminal law at the University of Copenhagen probably has done more than any other person to popularize the ombudsman. His excellent relations with the public press and his extensive lecture tours have been instrumental in spreading the Scandinavian idea to other parts of the world.[1]

Despite their many similarities, the Danish ombudsman has less legal authority than the ombudsmen of Sweden and Finland. The judiciary is excluded from the purview of his office, limiting his jurisdiction solely to administration. Furthermore, he cannot act as a prosecutor.[2] These limitations have been retained by other governments which have subsequently adopted the ombudsman concept. Thus, it is the modified Danish model rather than the Swedish prototype which has been exported from Scandinavia.

During the five years ending in 1964, the Danish ombudsman investigated only 856 cases, constituting less than 15 per cent of the matters registered at his office. Gellhorn has attributed the increasing proportion of dismissals partially to the ombudsman's

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[2] Ibid., pp. 12-13. The ombudsman may order the public prosecutor to investigate further or to commence a criminal proceeding against an erring official, but he never has.

"sharpened awareness of what he can feasibly do."[1] Professor Hurwitz has made an effort to personalize his office, providing an answer with an explanation for every complaint received, no matter how far-fetched. Lacking the authority of a prosecutor, he has relied largely on persuasion backed by reasoning to accomplish his goals. According to Aaron, his right of public criticism, which he cautiously exercises, has proved to be a formidable weapon.[2] Consequently, the very existence of his office discourages bureaucratic behavior that frustrates the public.[3] Initial objection to the office by civil servants has dissipated.

A Copenhagen jurist, I. M. Pedersen, has concluded that the Danish ombudsman's office has proved to be an extremely useful institution, supplementing the control without hampering the efficiency or independence of the administration.[4]

Norway

As in other Scandinavian countries, Norway's appointment of an ombudsman was not preceded by revelations of gross

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[2] Aaron, The Control of Police Discretion, p. 40.

[3] James Egan, "Ombudsman," Holiday, November, 1966, p. 32.

[4] I. M. Pedersen, "Denmark's Ombudsman," in Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, p. 94.

inefficiency or malfeasance in public office. According to Storing, the government's administrative agencies were effectively carrying out their responsibilities "but there were some evidences of the normal diseases of bureaucratization such as undue delays, a great deal of paper work, red tape, etc."[1] Thus, the office of ombudsman was added in 1962 to bridge the developing gulf between administrators and citizens. Os has pointed out that the commission which recommended the position emphasized the importance of filling it with the right person--a well-paid, highly-qualified lawyer possessing such insight and authority that his opinions would be heeded.[2] The first ombudsman was Andreas Schei, a member of the Supreme Court at the time of his election.

Anderson has noted that Norway's ombudsman differs from other Scandinavian ombudsmen in that his office has no jurisdiction over local government officials.[3] Also, he does not routinely inspect agencies and institutions and he cannot direct that a civil servant be

---

[1]James A. Storing, "The Norwegian Ombudsman for Civil Affairs: The First Three Years, 1963-66," Western Political Quarterly, XXI (June, 1968), 305.

[2]Audvar Os, "The Ombudsman for Civil Affairs," in Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, p. 95.

[3]Anderson, "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration," Public Affairs Report, VI (April, 1965), 3.

prosecuted or subjected to a disciplinary proceeding. One other difference is apparent to Gellhorn: Norwegian newspapers have paid little attention to the office.[1] Wiskari has reported that in 1965 Schei received 952 complaints, resulting in 344 investigations and 123 corrective actions.[2]

New Zealand

The first national legislature outside Scandinavia to pass a civil ombudsman act was that of New Zealand. Northey and Orr have suggested that the decision was made because the government had become convinced that existing means available to the citizen for gaining redress for administrative injuries were inadequate.[3] Gellhorn, on the other hand, has maintained that the ombudsman was created "not to clean up a mess, but rather, simply to provide insurance against future messes."[4]

---

[1] Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, pp. 176, 188-89.

[2] Werner Wiskari, "Norway's Experience: How an Ombudsman Operates," New York Times, November 20, 1966, IV, p. 3.

[3] J. F. Northey, "New Zealand's Parliamentary Commissioner," in Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, p. 127; G. S. Orr, Report on Administrative Justice in New Zealand (Wellington: R. E. Owen, 1964), p. 7.

[4] Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, p. 103.

New Zealand's office of ombudsman, established in 1962, closely resembles Denmark's with minor differences, such as the ombudsman's appointment by the governor-general upon recommendation of the legislature and the requirement of a modest filing fee from complainants. Also, the law specifies no particular qualifications for the ombudsman.[1] The first appointee was Sir Guy Powles, a distinguished lawyer and administrator who was previously his country's ambassador to India.[2] While acknowledging the considerable influence of Scandinavian experience, Powles has insisted that New Zealand fashioned an ombudsman to meet its own needs.[3] For instance, his instructions from the legislature were not simply to see that the law is carried out but to see that right is done. He begins each annual report with this reminder: "You've told me to see that we do right."[4]

---

[1]Northey, "New Zealand's Parliamentary Commissioner," p. 133; David P. O'Neill, "The New Zealand Ombudsman," America, CXII (January 30, 1965), 166; Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, p. 104.

[2]O'Neill, "The New Zealand Ombudsman," p. 168.

[3]Sir Guy Powles, "Aspects of the Search for Administrative Justice with Particular Reference to the New Zealand Ombudsman," Canadian Public Administration, IX (June, 1966), 143-44.

[4]Hallock Hoffman, "An Ombudsman for the U.S.?" Center Diary: 14, p. 25.

Powles recently indicated how he intends to pursue that policy:

> . . . the Ombudsman must carve and tread his own path, being careful to maintain his independence of both the executive and the judiciary, so as to be able to build a tradition of strong and impartial criticism of administration on the one hand and of helpfulness to citizens on the other.[1]

Great Britain

When Sir Edmund Compton began serving as parliamentary commissioner in 1967, Great Britain became the first large nation to attempt the adaptation of the ombudsman concept to its governmental structure. Unlike his Scandinavian counterparts, and to a greater degree than in New Zealand, the British ombudsman is an appointee of the head of state. Yet he is expected to be an independent officer of Parliament. Compton, England's former comptroller and auditor-general, has restricted investigatory powers and no authority to conduct prosecutions. He receives complaints only through members of Parliament. His final report on each case is made to the M.P. who referred it to him and it is that official who decides how the findings shall be communicated to the complainant and the press.[2]

---

[1] Powles, "Aspects of the Search for Administrative Justice," p. 157.

[2] Geoffrey Marshall, "The British Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXXVII (May, 1968), 94.

Limited as it is, the British version of ombudsman machinery represents a significant departure from legal tradition in that country, according to Marshall. The Parliamentary Commissioner Act goes beyond the control of maladministration in a narrow sense by providing for a review of allegedly unjust or unreasonable decisions by officials. Moreover, it relates to injustice caused by maladministration in central government departments, an area not adequately covered by previous legislation.[1] Still, as Rowat has emphasized, it is a far cry from the New Zealand legislation which allows the ombudsman to review a decision if he thinks it is simply "wrong." Furthermore, the British commissioner's jurisdiction does not include four of that nation's most complained-about agencies--the police, local government, courts and nationalized industries.[2]

In selecting his staff members, Compton has insisted on objectivity in their efforts to improve civil administration:

> I don't want crusaders. This is an exercise in fairness. I want objectivity. I am keen this should work out fair to all parties. People are apt to think that the only thing that matters is fairness to the person complaining.
>
> I shall have the reputation of 400,000 people in my hands --if that's how many civil servants there are. Even if we are

---

[1] Ibid., p. 87.

[2] Rowat, "Recent Developments in Ombudsmanship," Canadian Public Administration, X (March, 1967), 41-42.

> unearthing faults in the system, it always boils down in the end to an action that someone has done. . . . an operation whose exercise is to detect and if possible remedy flaws in justice must itself be just.[1]

In his first nine months of office, the British ombudsman received 1,069 complaints; only 2 per cent of those disposed of were found to be valid.[2]

Canada and Other Nations

All except one of Canada's ten provincial legislatures have been considering ombudsman schemes since 1965. Two provinces--Alberta and New Brunswick--have passed ombudsman legislation, both in 1967. For their ombudsmen, Alberta chose the retiring head of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and New Brunswick selected a former university president. Ombudsman proposals also have been discussed in the federal Parliament and by city governments.[3]

In 1965, Guyana and Mauritius included in their new constitutions ombudsman machinery modeled on the New Zealand

---

[1]"Profile: Sir Edmund Compton, The New Ombudsman," Sunday Times (London), April 2, 1967, p. 11.

[2]Sandberg, "Ombudsman: The Redress of Citizens' Grievances," p. 45.

[3]Anderson, Canadian Ombudsman Proposals; Cheng, "The Emergence and Spread of the Ombudsman Institution," p. 25; Rowat, "Recent Developments in Ombudsmanship," pp. 38-40; Rowat, "The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea," in Anderson, ed., Ombudsmen for American Government?, p. 23.

system.[1] According to Rowat, other nations which have given attention to the concept in recent years include Australia, Israel, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, West Germany and India.[2]

United States

Ombudsman literature proliferated in the United States during the 1960's even though Congress did not enact ombudsman legislation. Since 1963, bills have been introduced repeatedly in Congress and in nearly all state legislatures but only one state--Hawaii--has created the position. Nearly two years after its 1967 action the legislature of Hawaii still had not filled the post.[3]

Congressman Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin first proposed an ombudsman-like administrative counsel to Congress and, more recently, Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri has offered his own bills for the creation of an administrative ombudsman.[4] Long's schemes to test the federal ombudsman idea in the District of

---

[1] Rowat, "The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea," pp. 22-23.

[2] Ibid., pp. 7, 22-23, 26-30.

[3] Anderson, ed., Ombudsmen for American Government?, p. 137.

[4] Ibid.

Columbia (1966) and the state of Missouri (1968) have not gained Congressional support. Reuss announced in 1967 that he had appointed an ombudsman to handle complaints from his district in an attempt to prove that the system can work nationally.[1] The published proceedings of two Congressional ombudsman hearings are valuable reference works.[2]

No American municipality has an ombudsman which fits the Danish model, although various plans have been proposed and a few attempted.[3] Three described by Angus and Kaplan will be mentioned here.[4]

Widely publicized in 1966 was the appointment of an acting "public protector" for the 1.4 million residents of metropolitan

---

[1] New York Times, February 5, 1967, p. 67.

[2] Long's regional ombudsman proposal would have provided, as a pilot project, an attorney appointed by the President to deal with complaints from Missouri residents regarding federal matters. U.S., Congress, Senate, Regional Ombudsman Proposal, Hearings, pp. 1-4.

[3] Since 1966, a political debate has been raging over the feasibility of an ombudsman system for the nation's largest municipality, New York City. Proposals and counter-proposals have been reported in the New York Times, which has taken an editorial position favoring the concept.

[4] Angus and Kaplan, "The Ombudsman and Local Government," pp. 101-35.

Nassau County in the state of New York.[1] A former judge was chosen by the county executive to fill the vacant office of commissioner of accounts by performing as an ombudsman. He was instructed to receive and investigate complaints from the public concerning any department or agency of the county, or of the towns, cities, incorporated villages or special districts within it. The position was regarded as the first of its kind in the United States. The appointee was given the power of subpoena but no direct enforcement authority. Emphasis was placed on his "power of exposure." During his first eighteen months in office he considered more than 500 complaints. He continued to serve as de facto ombudsman even after Nassau County voters overwhelmingly rejected a 1967 proposal that would have established the post on a permanent basis.[2]

In 1966, the City of Buffalo, New York, agreed to cooperate with the Law School of the State University of New York at Buffalo in a local government ombudsman project. Its objective was to experiment with the application of the ombudsman concept to a large urban setting in North America. After one professor processed a few grievances, the project was expanded to a seminar involving

---

[1]Roy R. Silver, "Nickerson Names a Public Protector," New York Times, June 1, 1966, p. 1.

[2]Agis Salpukas, "'Ombudsman' on L.I. Finds Defeat Has Given Him More Power," New York Times, December 3, 1967, p. 59.

senior law students. The area of complaints was enlarged to include Erie County. A grant by the Office of Economic Opportunity permitted a one-year, full-scale operation in 1967-68.[1]

In a reorganization of the city manager's office in 1967, the San Diego, California, city council agreed to the creation of an assistant with the title of "citizens assistance officer." The assistant receives and investigates complaints and makes recommendations to both the manager and the council.[2]

These and other ombudsman-like experiments in the United States have received so much publicity that other cities are applying the term to inapplicable positions. Recent articles in the American City, for example, inaccurately identified municipal complaint and public relations officers as ombudsmen.[3] Gellhorn has pointed out that even New York City's commissioner of investigation is not an ombudsman, despite some similarities in powers and duties. "The main difference between the Commissioner and an ombudsman--a difference so basic as to end their parallelism--is that the

---

[1] Angus and Kaplan, "The Ombudsman and Local Government," pp. 121-31. Angus coordinated the Buffalo ombudsman project.

[2] Ibid., p. 120.

[3] "Savannah's 'Ombudsman,'" American City, June, 1968, p. 70. Also E. H. Potthoff, "An 'Ombudsman,' U.S. Style," American City, July, 1968, pp. 152, 154-55.

Commissioner is the mayor's man and an ombudsman is his own man," he has written.[1]

In 1967, the American Assembly added impetus to the Ombudsman movement by urging enactment of laws "to create the special office required to handle citizens' complaints--the Ombudsman."[2] Its 1968 publication supporting the institution included an observation by Gwyn that ombudsman advocates come from most parts of the American political spectrum, "ranging from Mr. William F. Buckley and the American Bar Association Journal to the United Automobile Workers and Mr. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP."[3] He also found no evidence of organized opposition. So widespread has the legislative discussion become that the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is considering a model law.[4] In recent years, articles on the ombudsman have appeared in professional journals in the fields of law, political science, social

---

[1]Gellhorn, When Americans Complain, p. 166. Anderson also has warned against the dangers of diluting the word through popularization and misappropriation. See Ombudsmen for American Government?, p. 2.

[2]The Ombudsman, American Assembly, p. 8.

[3]William B. Gwyn, "Transferring the Ombudsman," in Anderson, ed., Ombudsmen for American Government?, p. 67.

[4]Gellhorn, "The Ombudsman's Relevance to American Municipal Affairs," American Bar Association Journal, LIV (February, 1968), 134.

science and public administration and in such popular general circulation magazines as Life, Reader's Digest, Time, Newsweek, Holiday, and The New Yorker.

Similarities and Differences

Through references to selected literature, the development of the concept of the ombudsman in civil government has been traced from its ancient Icelandic origin to its various contemporary forms. The literature reveals that the power and performance of civil ombudsmen vary from country to country, but all have common characteristics.

For the most part, ombudsmen are eminent jurists who investigate citizens' complaints against government officials at little or no charge. Although these administrative critics are usually agents of the legislature, they are only generally answerable to it. They have no restrictive ties with the executive. No ombudsman may inquire into the work of his legislative body. Their access to officials and official papers is virtually unlimited, permitting them to review administrative actions thoroughly. One result is that ombudsmen defend officials as well as citizens; indeed, most complaints are dismissed as unfounded. Their dual goal is to help individuals redress their grievances involving public administration and to

strengthen public administration through investigation, suggestion, support, criticism and, in some cases, prosecution.[1]

Gellhorn has noted that, with few exceptions, ombudsmen are chosen or reappointed by each new legislature. They make regular reports to the body which appointed them. Their salary is generally set at a high level and they are permitted to choose their own assistants. Some can question the actions of cabinet members; some can review acts of local government officials; some can criticize the courts and the police. Others may not have such broad powers. There is a tendency for ombudsmen to limit themselves to matters not elsewhere reviewable. Complaints usually must be written and signed. However, in most countries the ombudsman has authority to act without first receiving a complaint. Periodic inspections of government institutions are not stressed in any country except Sweden. Ombudsmen conduct informal inquiries rather than formal hearings. They often seek negotiated settlements. All are diligent in explaining their judgments and rely heavily on public opinion for support. However, their relationships with the public

---

[1]"The People's Watchdog," Time, December 2, 1966, p. 58. Cheng has maintained that a significant development in the institution of the ombudsman is the shift of its main purpose away from attention to the complaints of individual citizens and toward the promotion of better public administration affecting all citizens. Other authorities have not acknowledged this trend. See "The Emergence and Spread of the Ombudsman Institution," p. 23.

press vary considerably.[1] Compared to the courts, the ombudsman's method of handling appeals against administrative decisions is direct, informal, speedy and inexpensive.[2]

All civil ombudsmen have had previous experience in public service and all seem to regard their ombudsman assignment as the culmination of a career rather than as a career-building opportunity. No ombudsman has ever been removed from office before his term expired. Whereas Swedish ombudsmen were once primarily concerned with the courts and law enforcement, modern day ombudsmen are primarily concerned with civil service administration. Although there has been initial resistance in some countries, civil servants generally do not resent the ombudsman. The ombudsman is not a social architect; he cannot and does not attempt to make sweeping changes in governmental structure. Most of the ombudsman's cases are trivial rather than earth-shaking. However, Anderson has reminded critics that "even petty grievances are important to the persons holding them."[3]

One of the strongest early arguments against the ombudsman was that the governmental and legal systems in Sweden and

---

[1]Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others, pp. 422-38.

[2]Rowat, "The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea," p. 9.

[3]Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," p. 409.

Finland were so distinct that the plan would not fit conditions in other countries. That argument was exploded when Denmark and Norway successfully transferred the institution. Anderson has pointed out that New Zealand and Great Britain have grafted the plan onto their common-law, parliamentary system of government. Thus, governments have both adopted and adapted the concept to fit their particular needs. Such demonstrations of flexibility help account for the surge of interest in the ombudsman throughout the world.[1]

In addition to the general body of literature on the ombudsman in civil government, a relatively small quantity of written materials has been produced on applications of the ombudsman concept to other social organizations. The review will now be turned to literature concerning the adaptation of the ombudsman plan to American institutions of higher education.

Campus Ombudsman

No references to the campus or university ombudsman were discovered in the literature of American higher education

---

[1]Rowat, "The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea," pp. 22-23. Rowat has warned, however, that the greatest dangers to the success of the scheme are that it might be discredited by being adopted in an unnecessarily truncated form, or in a manner that may subject it to too much partisan pressure. See "Ombudsmen for North America," Public Administration Review, XXIV (December, 1964), 233.

prior to 1966. In January of that year, Franz Schneider, a retired faculty member at the University of California at Berkeley, issued a booklet which carried this statement on the first page:

> . . . to assure thoughtful consideration to every one in this MULTIVERSITY, there should be created the Office of OMBUDSMAN of the Scandinavian persuasion. The existence of such an office would be clear and convincing evidence that the busy men on top are deeply concerned that order and justice prevail in their domain. [1]

Professor Schneider's brief ombudsman suggestion was combined with arguments favoring student evaluation of professors at large universities and a dean of instruction for improving faculty performance at small colleges--innovations he had been advocating for a number of years. The dean of instruction position Schneider described in earlier writings included a few features now associated with campus ombudsmen. This slight resemblance, however, appears to be coincidental.

Before 1966 ended, the campus ombudsman idea received a boost from Anderson, who described such a position in a report issued by the Berkeley Institute of Governmental Studies. The political science professor suggested that a tenured faculty member with a reputation for receptiveness to student complaints would be

---

[1] Franz Schneider, Yes! and No! Needed: A Dean of Instruction and a Student-Faculty Reaction Sheet (Berkeley, Calif.: By the Author, January, 1966), p. 1.

most effective. As viewed by Anderson, the campus ombudsman could investigate both poor teaching and unfair administration, reporting his findings to the persons concerned and, at his discretion, to their superiors. The importance of independence from all campus power groups was emphasized.[1]

Two professional journals published campus ombudsman articles in 1967. In one, Schlossberg proposed a "legal philosopher" assigned to the president's staff to investigate students' complaints and make recommendations for redress.[2] In the other, Mundinger established a theoretical basis for the position and made a number of practical suggestions for implementation.[3] He envisioned the ombudsman as a person of academic ability and integrity, receptive to complaints from any person in the university and empowered to investigate cases of alleged inequity or maladministration. Students, faculty and administrators all would be involved in his selection. The office he described follows the Scandinavian model with modifications.

---

[1]Anderson, "Ombudsman Proposals: Stimulus to Inquiry," Public Affairs Report, VII (December, 1966), 3.

[2]Nancy K. Schlossberg, "An Ombudsman for Students," NASPA--Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, V (July, 1967), 32-33.

[3]Donald C. Mundinger, "The University Ombudsman," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (December, 1967), 493-99.

Also in 1967, Gorovitz introduced a book entitled Freedom and Order in the University by recommending the appointment of campus ombudsmen:

> . . . The university could appoint an "ombudsman" charged with the sole responsibility of championing the cause of student complaints and suggestions. He might be hired by a committee of the faculty senate, and should have no superior in the administration, nor any voice in the formation of rules and policies. But he should be thoroughly informed about the university's policies, precedents, vaguenesses, channels of communication, procedures for change, and loci of authority and responsibility--in short, he should know the workings of the university as few others do, and as students almost never can, and he should make available that knowledge for the championing of student interests.
>
> An academic ombudsman could be of great help to students, especially to the student who lacks the confidence and aggressiveness to take up the cudgels on his own. The ombudsman would not be a buffer between student and administration, nor a liaison, but a non-judgmental pilot who would guide each student's efforts through the most effective channels. This system could also be a help to the administration, cutting down on ill-directed assaults not to spare the deans, but to focus complaint and suggestion most appropriately.[1]

Barzun also endorsed the campus ombudsman idea in his book, The American University, published in 1968:

> The campus . . . needs a new outlet for grievances, the Ombudsman of the Swedish welfare state. Transplanted to the campus under any other name, he would perform functions that no large institution can afford any longer to overlook. . . . A student's time is precious and his patience thin. Worse, if he has suffered injustice from a rule or a clerk, he should have redress. Experience will determine how the benevolent Om

---

[1]Gorovitz, ed., Freedom and Order in the University, p. 20.

> should go to work, with what staff and under what conditions. The one danger is that his office should become a second administration duplicating and interfering with the separate offices. His best role would be educational--teaching by example what we neglect throughout modern life: why a large institution has to act as it does, and how to get from an institution what one is entitled to. [1]

The authors of a third book, also published in 1968, were not enthusiastic about benefits to be gained from a campus ombudsman. Entitled The Culture of the University: Governance and Education, the volume embodies the majority report of the 1967 Study Commission on University Governance at the University of California at Berkeley. Commenting on the Academic Senate's intention to appoint an ombudsman to handle students' complaints regarding academic matters, the report made this evaluation:

> There is no doubt that the Senate needs an information office to guide students with academic grievances to the committee having jurisdiction over the particular subject matter. It is, however, hardly necessary to create an ombudsman to serve this relatively simple secretarial function. Beyond this, the Commission is skeptical about the value of this approach. In its original Swedish conception, the ombudsman is a watchdog appointed by and responsible only to the legislative body to supervise administrative functions and recommend improvements. The current concept of this institution is for a much watered-down version in which both the essential independence of the official from the agency he watches and most of his power and prestige are lost or compromised. As a result, the institution becomes little more than a formality, harmless at best and at worst a diversion from the underlying necessity for reform of governmental or administrative structures. If the

---

[1] Barzun, The American University, p. 267.

> Berkeley Senate committee system is properly organized, coordinated, and functioning, only an information office is required; if it is not, an official with much more power or prestige than that presently conferred on the Senate ombudsman will be required to accomplish anything of significance.[1]

At least eight articles on the campus ombudsman appeared in professional journals and popular magazines during 1968. Flack[2] and Sparzo[3] regarded the campus ombudsman as an innovation offering remedies for student unrest. Blaustein speculated that most men chosen for campus ombudsman posts would be law teachers.[4] Sandler, Kirk and Hallberg discussed problems involved

---

[1]Caleb Foote, Henry Mayer, and Associates, The Culture of the University: Governance and Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), pp. 107-8. The commission's majority report has been criticized as reflecting "many illusions." See Nathan Glazer, "'Student Power' in Berkeley," The Public Interest, XIII (Fall, 1968), 15-17. Anderson has suggested that the commission was primarily concerned with the fact that complaints arising from the regulation of student political activity were explicitly excluded from the ombudsman's jurisdiction. Stanley V. Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers: American Experience and Proposals," (book manuscript, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, undated), p. V11.

[2]Michael J. Flack, "Innovation and the University in Crisis: Three Proposals," Educational Record, XLIX (Summer, 1968), 348.

[3]Frank J. Sparzo, "Facing the Issues of Student Unrest," School & Society, XCVI (October 26, 1968), 359.

[4]Albert P. Blaustein, "Creating the University Ombudsman," Journal of Legal Education, XXI (December, 1968), 191.

in method of selection and offered several alternatives.[1] Buccieri suggested that initial campus ombudsman operations were establishing a precedent for other institutions of higher education.[2] Eddy reviewed and evaluated campus ombudsman developments and suggested the formation of a national ombudsman association.[3] The editors of Nation, despite some misgivings, generally supported the campus ombudsman movement in an editorial.[4] The activities of Michigan State University's ombudsman were described by Pollack in Parade magazine.[5] A number of newspaper articles on the subject also were published.

A collection of unpublished speeches and discussion notes has been assembled from tape recordings of sessions conducted

---

[1]Ake Sandler, Henry P. Kirk, and Edmond C. Hallberg, "An Ombudsman for the University," Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (March, 1968), 114-15.

[2]Claudia H. Buccieri, "Ombudsman: New Troubleshooter on Campus," College and University Business, XLIV (March, 1968), 52-55.

[3]John Paul Eddy, "Campus Ombudsman in American Higher Education," Kappa Delta Pi Record, December, 1968, pp. 33-35.

[4]"The Campus Ombudsman," Nation, CCVII (December 9, 1968), 611-12.

[5]Jack H. Pollack, "O-M-B-U-D-S-M-A-N! The New College Hero," Parade, March 17, 1968, pp. 16-18.

during the first meeting on the ombudsman in higher education October 24-25, 1968, in Detroit, Michigan.[1]

Anderson has analyzed published and unpublished materials on the campus ombudsman for a chapter in a forthcoming book. His manuscript concludes with this summary:

> The operation of a campus Ombudsman office presupposes a reasonably efficient administration, with its own channels of communication to students and faculty. . . . An Ombudsman is not a substitute for the judicial process (where this is appropriate), although he can investigate complaints of unfair procedure. Nor is he a court of appeals to review the substance of the decisions of disciplinary tribunals.
>
> Campus Ombudsmen are not major participants in the political process of University governance, although an Ombudsman may facilitate the consideration of major issues by weeding out minor irritants. Finally, a campus Ombudsman is not a super-administrator, second-guessing officers-of-the-line. In deciding whether or not to criticize, the Ombudsman does not ask "Is this how I would have done it?" Instead, he asks "Was this decision reasonable?"
>
> Administration in American universities needs responsible, external, impartial critics, like the Ombudsman at Michigan State. Keeping the limitations expressed in the preceding paragraphs in mind, there is little to lose, and much to gain for the individual student in rectifying or resolving grievances, for the administration in doing a good job and getting credit for it, and for the public in avoiding unseemly controversy in the groves of academe. The method of persuasion is eminently appropriate in places of learning.[2]

An unpublished paper by White, the first ombudsman at San Jose State College, examines the campus ombudsman both in theory

---

[1]Meeting was co-sponsored by Higher Education Executive Associates and the University of Detroit. Recordings were made and transcribed by the author.

[2]Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers," p. V7.

and practice and makes an evaluation based largely on the author's experience. His thesis is that campus ministers should be considered for campus ombudsman appointments.[1]

This review of the literature indicates that a considerable amount of information concerning the campus ombudsman has been written and published in a short period of time. The amount is insignificant compared with literature on the civil ombudsman, but the latter concept has been in existence far longer.

To complete this portion of the study, generalizations derived from civil and campus ombudsmen literature will now be summarized.

Conclusion

Technically, the ombudsman concept cannot be described as a new social invention because it has been in existence for hundreds of years and was formalized as a system in 1809. However, its transformation in recent times into an institution whose primary function is to supervise bureaucratic governmental administration, and its use exclusively for this purpose in Denmark, Norway, New

---

[1]J. Benton White, "The Ombudsman in Higher Education" (unpublished thesis, Graduate Division, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, 1968).

Zealand, Great Britain and elsewhere, has given the concept a new dimension and character.[1]

If freedom is to have any meaning, it is imperative that an individual who feels wronged by the very agencies established to help him should be able to appeal quickly, easily, and without cost to a politically independent and impartial office. The office of ombudsman is intended to serve that purpose without displacing existing remedial agencies, such as the courts.[2] It also appears that once his office is in operation and his activities generally known, an ombudsman tends to prevent many potential grievances from materializing.[3] The psychological value of the office rests in the individual's knowledge that he is not helpless before the large impersonal administrative machinery of government.[4]

Anderson has attributed the worldwide upsurge of interest in the ombudsman idea to this capacity to mitigate against the evils of bureaucracy:

---

[1]Rowat, ed., The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender, p. 292.

[2]John M. Capozzola, "An American Ombudsman: Problems and Prospects," Western Political Quarterly, XXI (June, 1968), 290.

[3]Anderson, "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration," p. 4.

[4]Rosenthal, "The Ombudsman--Swedish 'Grievance Man,'" p. 230.

> An enormous bureaucracy seems to be an inescapable concomitant of modern industrialized mass society. In remedying the marginal defects of public administration, the . . . Ombudsman has proved to be effective, non-disruptive, inexpensive, and cumulative to pre-existing safeguards.[1]

Davis has appraised the fundamental idea behind the ombudsman institution as "thoroughly sound":

> The idea rests heavily upon the cardinal principle of check which has played such an important role in the historical development of protections against unfair governmental action. The check is all the more effective because it is made by an officer with a different focus from that of the administrator whose action is criticized, and by one who has a much broader perspective.[2]

According to Anderson, the genius of the ombudsman concept is that the holder of the office has full authority to investigate and pass judgment, but no power to enforce. He has written: "The effectiveness of the Ombudsman lies in the respect in which he is held, and in the general acceptance of the reasonableness of his views."[3] In short, the only sanction which the ombudsman can impose is censure.[4]

---

[1]Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," p. 409.

[2]Kenneth C. Davis, "Ombudsmen in America: Officers to Criticize Administrative Action," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (June, 1961), 1075.

[3]Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," p. 408.

[4]Henry S. Reuss and Anderson, "The Ombudsman: Tribune of the People," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXIII (January, 1966), p. 46.

From these general statements and the preceding review of literature pertaining both to the civil and campus ombudsman, at least fourteen generalizations can be made. They are listed below as a concluding summation of existing information on the ombudsman in theory and practice:[1]

1. Wherever the ombudsman has been a success, he has been working in a relatively stable system of government which is supported and trusted by most of the people most of the time.

2. A high proportion of the complaints brought to the ombudsman are out of his jurisdiction or are deemed by him to be unfounded.

3. If his grievance is genuine, a complainant often can be helped by the ombudsman.

4. The ombudsman does not deal with many of the things that irritate and frustrate some citizens, such as policy decisions.

5. The ombudsman is not a general supervisor of public servants or public services.

6. Wherever an ombudsman has been active, citizens' confidence in public employees has been enhanced.

7. The ombudsman can improve public administration by informing officials of unsatisfactory performance by subordinates which might otherwise never be called to their attention.

8. The ombudsman brings about procedural review within the administrative agency.

---

[1]Some of these points are paraphrased from Gellhorn, "The Ombudsman's Relevance to American Municipal Affairs," pp. 134-40.

9. The ombudsman attempts to strike a balance between standardized procedures showing no favoritism and unyielding bureaucratic rigidity.

10. The ombudsman does not function as a trial court.

11. The ombudsman does not supercede other officials; he sees to it that others do their jobs completely and justly.

12. The ombudsman brings grievance machinery within reach of persons not likely to seek other means of redress.

13. The ombudsman system does not exclude citizens from other means of redress.

14. Much of the ombudsman's power and effectiveness stem from his personal prestige and persuasiveness.

CHAPTER III

THE CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN: A GENERAL EVALUATION

The literature reviewed in the previous chapter revealed that the ombudsman in American higher education is an innovation associated with student-institutional problems and the long-established civil ombudsman concept. The study will now be directed toward a general evaluation of the campus ombudsman. Various approaches to the office adopted by fourteen institutions will be examined in the first section. Developments at institutions in various stages of establishing the position are considered in the second section. Self-evaluations by selected campus ombudsmen are reported in the third section, combined with tables in Appendix C. Conclusions drawn from these findings make up the final portion of this section.

Several factors have impeded attempts to obtain general information regarding the ombudsman in American higher education. One is the autonomy of both public and private institutions, enabling them to adopt innovations without reporting such actions to centralized

agencies.[1] Another is the large number and wide dispersion of colleges and universities. A third factor is the absence of any formal association of campus ombudsmen. Still another is the tendency of some administrators and faculty members not to answer mailed inquiries. Finally, the innovation is spreading so rapidly in different forms that the only constant in the overall pattern is change. This month's total number of campus ombudsmen, for example, is almost certain to be different from last month's and next month's.

Despite these obstacles, a concerted effort was made to survey and evaluate the campus ombudsman situation as of December 31, 1968. Although the findings reported in this chapter are not all inclusive, they are accurate to the extent that they assimilate information obtained from a number of reliable sources.[2]

---

[1]Among the agencies which could provide no information about campus ombudsmen were: Bureau of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education; American Association of Junior Colleges; Clearing House for Junior College Information; and American Association for Higher Education. Information obtained from the United States National Student Association was helpful but fragmentary.

[2]No claim is made that this survey covers all American colleges and universities with campus ombudsmen prior to 1969. Rather, the objective is to describe and evaluate the role at a wide range of institutions, particularly those which appear to have been imitated by others. A survey of sixty selected western universities in the summer of 1968 indicated that seven of the fifty-three institutions which responded had ombudsmen. They were: California State College at Los Angeles, San Fernando Valley State College (since

Before proceeding with survey findings, it is appropriate to point out again that this study is restricted to a definition of campus ombudsman which excludes students serving in that capacity. Consequently, a number of institutions with student ombudsmen are not included in subsequent sections. Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that the first attempt to adapt the ombudsman concept to an institution of higher education in North America appears to have taken place in 1965 through student initiative at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver.[1] Most student ombudsmen have been appointed by student governments. However, at some institutions, such as the University of Chicago and the University of Texas (College of Arts and Sciences), the appointments have been made by top-level administrators.[2] Other institutions with student ombudsmen include the University of Kentucky, Florida State University, University of Minnesota and Johnson State College in Vermont. Student

---

discontinued), Sonoma State College, University of California at Irvine, Scripps College, University of Denver and Stanford University. See UCLA Daily Bruin, February 25, 1969, p. 3. Although some of these are omitted in this study, other western institutions not covered in the 1968 survey are included.

[1]Anderson, "Ombudsman Proposals: Stimulus to Inquiry," p. 3.

[2]James W. Brann, "The Campus Ombudsman: College Students' Defender," Chronicle of Higher Education, III (November 11, 1968), 4. Also see New York Times, October 9, 1968, p. 47.

ombudsmen also have been appointed by student governments at some institutions with campus ombudsmen. Usually, coordination of efforts is attempted.

Institutions with Ombudsmen

American colleges and universities with campus ombudsmen vary in size from "multiversities," such as the University of California at Berkeley and Michigan State University, to small community colleges, such as Macomb County Community College in Michigan. For the purpose of this analysis, however, fourteen institutions known to have had full-time or part-time ombudsmen prior to 1969 will be categorized not by size but by scope of office. The three main divisions into which they are organized alphabetically are: for students only, for students and others, and for faculty only. Although the third designation does not fit the preliminary definition of campus ombudsman presented in Chapter I, the single institution to which it applies is included for the purpose of comparison.

For Students Only

At seven colleges and universities the campus ombudsman receives complaints from students only. Grievances from other sources are directed elsewhere. Salient features of the ombudsman position on each of these campuses will be described.

University of California at Berkeley[1]

Before George Leitmann was appointed ombudsman by the Academic Senate in 1968, Berkeley already had a "student advocate" appointed by the Associated Students and a complaint officer appointed by the administration. The latter position was filled by the associate dean of students, who was designated to act "as an 'Ombudsman,' hearing student complaints and trying to rectify them."[2]

Leitmann's half-time position, independent of both the Associated Students and the administration, is a one-member committee of the Academic Senate. The only complaints he considers are those regarding decisions which affect a student's academic status. He will not hear complaints arising from the regulation of student political activity. In complaints arising from disciplinary proceedings, he will not review the substance of the case, but may review the procedures.[3]

---

[1]More detailed information about campus ombudsmen at Berkeley and five other institutions appears in the third section of this chapter and in Appendix C. The others are Columbia University, University of Detroit, Michigan State University, San Diego State College and San Jose State College.

[2]Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers," pp. V3-4.

[3]George Leitmann, private interview held during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

Eastern Montana College

George Gloege, professor of chemistry, became the first campus ombudsman in the United States with his appointment to that post at Eastern Montana College on October 7, 1966. The selection was made by President Stanley Heywood, who promised the faculty that "the administration will in no way dictate the manner in which he carries out his responsibilities."[1] Heywood also established these "minimum ground rules":

1. Students who have exhausted all channels for redress of grievances may appeal to the Ombudsman. . . .

2. . . . the Ombudsman may decide to investigate or not investigate the case.

3. The Ombudsman has the independent right to investigate when there isn't a complaint.

4. Information provided to the Ombudsman . . . may be considered privileged. . . .

5. The final report to the President of any investigation will be made available consistent with reasonable safeguards for personal information.[2]

To these guidelines, Heywood added:

> I am sure that students will understand that this is not a vehicle for protest of a decision that is not favorable to them

---

[1]Heywood first announced his intention to appoint a campus ombudsman in his inaugural address on May 15, 1966, pp. 10-11.

[2]"Announcement I - Ombudsman," Info from the Office of the President, Eastern Montana College, October 7, 1966, p. 2.

> nor is it intended to bypass any procedure now in operation. . . . It is my intention to accept the recommendations of the Ombudsman and to make all possible changes in the light of his recommendations.
>
> . . . it is my hope that the Ombudsman will never need to be used, because that could denote that students are already receiving reasonable consideration in all facets of our campus life.[1]

Gloege, whose teaching load was not reduced to allow time for his ombudsman activities, reported two years after his appointment that he had had "very little business." His first case involved the dean of students and his second complaint came from a graduate student at odds with his committee. Most of his contacts have been informal referrals made by telephone. A form he developed for complaints entitled "Preliminary Report to the Ombudsman" requires a detailed description of the grievance and a chronological account of previous appeals. Few students have elected to use it.[2]

Michigan State University

James Rust, the ombudsman at Michigan State University, has served longer as campus ombudsman at a major university than any other individual. His appointment by the university president in 1967 was for a two-year term, after which either may terminate

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] George Gloege, private interview held during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1968.

the arrangement. Students and faculty were involved in his nomination. The office was recommended by a Faculty Committee on Student Affairs in a report approved early in 1967 by the Academic Council, Academic Senate and Board of Trustees.[1] The recommendation included these provisions:

> The President shall appoint from the senior faculty a high prestige official with the title of Ombudsman. The sensitive and confidential nature of the Ombudsman's work dictates that he conduct his operations with dignity and integrity. He shall respect the privacy of all persons who solicit his assistance and protect them against retribution. His functions shall include the following charges:
>
> He shall establish simple, orderly procedures for receiving requests, complaints and grievances of students.
>
> He shall assist students in accomplishing the expeditious settlement of their problems. He may advise a student that the student's request, complaint or grievance lacks merit, or that the student should seek his remedy before another duly constituted body or officer of the University; or the Ombudsman (if he deems it appropriate) may assist the student in obtaining an informal settlement of the student's problem.
>
> In the performance of his duties the Ombudsman shall have broad investigatory powers and direct and ready access to all University officials from the President down.
>
> When the Ombudsman deems it necessary he shall report directly to the President valid complaints for which no remedy has been

---

[1] One incident which precipitated the committee's study of academic freedom on the campus was the so-called "Schiff Case." A former student, Paul Schiff, charged that in 1965 the university refused to readmit him because of his political activity. A federal court ruled that Schiff had been denied due process. James Rust, private interview held at Michigan State University, December 12, 1968.

found. He shall also report any recommendations he wishes to make regarding such complaints.

He shall make periodic reports to the President regarding the operation of the Ombudsman's office.[1]

Although his services are exclusively for students, Rust has indicated that occasionally student complaints are conveyed to him by their parents.

Prior to his appointment, Rust had been a long-time English professor and assistant dean of the College of Arts and Letters. A separate office facility was established for his ombudsman activities and he was relieved of teaching assignments, except that he elected to continue teaching one course a year.

Stanley Anderson, an authority on the ombudsman institution, has praised the Michigan State arrangement for its independence. He has called attention to careful consensus in the nomination process, prestige of the office holder, sweeping investigatory power ascribed to the position and sole reliance on reasoned persuasion. He added: "Independence is reinforced by successful operation. The additional function of information, counselling and referral seems to fit in well with the Ombudsman job."[2]

---

[1] Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, A Report of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs to the Academic Council, February 7, 1967, pp. 31-32.

[2] Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers," pp. V6-7.

New York University
(College of Education)

By faculty election, Herbert London became ombudsman for the College of Education at New York University during the 1968-69 academic year. London was authorized to examine any complaint brought to him by a student or group of students of his college. He also was empowered "to call for a review of any decision of any official or committee, or of the faculty, that is related to the complaint, and to appeal to higher authority when the possibility exists, but he shall not be authorized to alter said decision by his own action alone."[1]

San Diego State College

The appointment of Nelson Norman as San Diego State College's first ombudsman was made in 1968 by the president of the institution in response to a recommendation by the student body president and other student leaders. Except for an annual off-campus teaching stint which he wanted to continue, the assignment is a full-time responsibility for Norman, who is a professor of

---

[1] "Professor Herbert I. London Elected New Ombudsman," Newsletter, Graduate Students Organization, School of Education, New York University, January, 1969, p. 1. In 1967, the New York University Senate had proposed the election of ombudsmen in each of the institution's fifteen schools. See "Ombudsman Is Urged by N.Y.U. Advisory Board," New York Times, November 19, 1967, p. 116.

history. Objectives of the office are modeled on those established at Michigan State. In his first few weeks of operation, Norman received more complaints about grades than any other problem. He investigates nearly all grievances brought to him and seeks quick solutions. His style of operation is to spend much of his time making face-to-face contacts outside his office, which is located in the student union. He submits reports both to the college president and the student body president.[1]

University of South Carolina

The first ombudsman at the University of South Carolina was appointed by the institution's president in 1968 after consultation with student leaders. Chosen to fill the position was Hubert Noland, an engineering professor. The idea had been proposed earlier by a successful candidate for student body president. Noland's powers and duties are nearly identical to those prescribed for the Michigan State ombudsman. The student government has named a "student ombudsman committee" to work with the campus ombudsman.[2]

---

[1]Nelson Norman, private interview held during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

[2]Carl Stepp, "Noland Appointed First Ombudsman," Gamecock, campus newspaper at University of South Carolina, October 29, 1968, p. 1.

West Valley College

In 1968, the Board of Trustees of West Valley College, a two-year junior college in Campbell, California, established an office of ombudsman "to define the rights of students and act as the liaison between students and the administration and/or faculty." The board acted on a recommendation by the college's chief administrator.[1]

For Students and Others

The campus ombudsman considers complaints from other persons in addition to students at six institutions of higher education. However, the scope of his activities varies from campus to campus. These variations are noted in the following descriptions.

University of California at Irvine

The ombudsman role is one component of a four-part position at Irvine which bears the title of "Assistant Student Affairs Vice-Chancellor for Co-Curricular Learning." According to Jack Little, the first person to fill the position, the other components are counselor-at-large, research and development in student life,

---

[1]Item in CJCA News (California Junior College Association), January, 1969.

and co-curricular learning.[1] He was appointed to the post in 1967 by the vice chancellor for student affairs. His academic preparation and professional experience are in clinical psychology.

Little has estimated that he spends 40 per cent of his time performing as a campus ombudsman. He has described his activities in that capacity as: "Maintaining continuous informal relationships with campus personnel, particularly students, so that their areas of dissatisfaction . . . can gain recognition, and so that they can be helped to an effective course of remedial personal counseling and/or social action." To his job description he has added this note: "The functions of this office are to be performed with full confidentiality of communication and on a consultative or 'staff' rather than 'line' basis, i.e. with absolutely no direct authority."[2]

In a memorandum to colleagues in the Irvine student affairs office, Little has further elaborated on his ombudsman role:

> As Ombudsman, I become a sort of student's advocate, in the sense that students can come to me for help with issues that concern them, for example, when they feel that their rights as human beings and as citizens of the community have been violated. In my role as ombudsman, the university will tolerate my setting up investigatory machinery and taking other steps

---

[1] Letter from Jack F. Little, ombudsman at University of California, Irvine, February 24, 1969.

[2] Little, "Job Description Card," University of California Personnel Office, February 15, 1968.

> for obtaining redress of indicated grievances, without my needing to expose the grieving party who thus has the benefit of "privilege communication."
> . . . so far three kinds of problems have been called to my attention. 1) Civil rights violations. . . . 2) Criminal issues or civil actions. . . . 3) What might be called "psychological violations". . . . although the "letter of the law" is being respected, the spirit is of non-cooperation. . . .
> "Solutions" for these three types of problems probably will differ. . . .[1]

Little has indicated that he considers the first two kinds of problems out of his purview since other avenues exist for dealing with them. He has proceeded cautiously with problems in the third category, which he recognizes to be a "very sensitive" area. In his ombudsman role he has discovered that Irvine students "were only vaguely aware of some of the opportunities afforded them" for solving personal problems. Consequently, he has conducted a campaign to keep students better informed regarding available campus services.[2]

Although the Irvine campus ombudsman offers assistance to all personnel in the institution, it appears that most of his efforts are directed toward students.

---

[1]Memorandum to Student Affairs Staff, University of California at Irvine, August 3, 1967, p. 2.

[2]Ibid.

Columbia University

The appointment of Irving DeKoff as "a kind of ombudsman for students" at Columbia University in 1968 made him the first full-time administrator assigned exclusively to university-wide student affairs at that institution.[1] Recommended a year earlier by a Committee on Student Life, the position was filled during the most serious student protest ever experienced at Columbia. DeKoff was selected by President Grayson Kirk, who resigned shortly thereafter under pressure from dissident students and faculty.

The original title--director of student interests--was subsequently changed to director for student interests to place more emphasis on the position's ombudsman-like features. DeKoff has stated that faculty and administrators as well as students may seek his assistance.

When the new position was first announced, a spokesman for the radical Strike Coordinating Committee rejected it as "the equivalent of establishing a company union." He added: "Students must be represented, not on a consultative basis, but as policy makers."[2]

---

[1] Sylvan Fox, "Columbia Names an Official to Be Ombudsman for the Students," New York Times, May 29, 1968, p. 24.

[2] Ibid. DeKoff elaborated on the circumstances surrounding his appointment in a private interview held during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

University of Detroit

Thomas Davis, part-time ombudsman at the University of Detroit, receives complaints from faculty, administrators, non-academic employees and off-campus persons as well as students. However, most of his efforts are directed toward the redress of student grievances. Davis is the only campus ombudsman to be appointed by an institution's student government without faculty or administrative involvement. The 1968 action was subsequently acknowledged by the university president.

The extent of Davis' authority and his tenure in this new role are not clearly established. Davis has indicated that he can be removed as ombudsman at any time by the student government president, but not by the university president. His other titles are dean of freshmen studies and director of the counseling center. His access to official records is associated with his deanship rather than his role as ombudsman. His academic discipline is mathematics.[1]

Macomb County Community College

In 1968, Administrative Dean Walter Bradley was appointed ombudsman at Macomb County Community College in Warren,

---

[1]Thomas Davis, private interview held at University of Detroit, December 11, 1968.

Michigan, by the institution's acting president. Bradley hears and investigates complaints "from persons within and outside the institution." Acting as a mediator, he makes recommendations for solutions of problems brought to him.

In accepting the appointment, Bradley stated that "growing organizations such as ours can become quite impersonal." He added: "Hopefully, the good offices of Ombudsman will be able to satisfy some of the concerns of the staff, the students and the community."[1] In proposing the office, Bradley recommended that the campus ombudsman be "independent, impartial, and professional with a reasonable degree of accountability." He suggested that the position "be tried for one or two years, results evaluated, and a determination made regarding either a change or continuance of the officer."[2]

There is no evidence of faculty or student involvement in Bradley's appointment. The question of an administrative dean's ability to be independent and impartial regarding grievances involving his institution apparently was not raised by the appointing officer.

---

[1]News release, Office of Public Information, Macomb County Community College, Warren, Mich., April 11, 1968.

[2]Walter E. Bradley, "An Ombudsman for Macomb," Macomb County Community College, Warren, Mich., February 20, 1968.

San Jose State College

J. Benton White, a campus minister, was appointed ombudsman at San Jose State College by its president in 1967 during a week of black student demonstrations against the institution. The position was created as a direct response to objections raised by black students regarding discriminatory racial practices on the campus and in the surrounding community. Primary areas of concern were student housing, fraternities and sororities, and curricular and co-curricular programs. Thus, the ombudsman's role definition was originally limited to the problems of student minority groups.[1] It later was expanded to include all students as well as faculty, administrators, non-academic employees and off-campus persons.

White's activities during the 1967-68 academic year included receiving and responding to complaints brought to him by individuals and organizations, conducting investigations, and serving as a liaison between the college and the community. He was responsible directly to the president. His job description listed "inquiry, negotiation and persuasion" as his primary source of power. To this was added: "In the event of impasse, the Ombudsman will call upon the President

---

[1] "Position Resume of Ombudsman at San Jose State College," Office of the Executive Vice President, San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif., May 3, 1968.

for executive action."[1] Despite his executive appointment, White attempted to use the Danish office of ombudsman as his model.[2]

White's success in establishing rapport with black students was somewhat counteracted by his inability to gain the confidence of dissident Mexican-American students, who staged a protest demonstration during the college's 1968 commencement ceremonies. For the 1968-69 academic year, Ralph Poblano, a Mexican-American, was appointed campus ombudsman while White continued to serve on a one-fourth time basis as associate ombudsman.[3]

White has cited twelve institutional policy changes partially attributable to his investigations and recommendations during the 1967-68 academic year. Among them are: non-discriminatory policies for student publications, organizations, job placement and housing; an improved student withdrawal procedure; creation of a new Academic Council committee on minority curriculum; establishment of priorities in the use of work-study funds; increased power to an academic committee to overrule a professor's decision

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] White, "The Ombudsman in Practice," unpublished speech delivered during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968, p. 2.

[3] White, private interview held during meeting on the ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

on a student's grade; increased efforts to recruit faculty from ethnic minorities; and establishment of a Mexican-American Affairs Committee.[1]

State University of New York at Stony Brook

At only one institution of higher education has the office of campus ombudsman been discontinued after more than a year of trial. The abandonment occurred at the State University of New York at Stony Brook in 1968 after seventeen months of operation. Stony Brook is one of four university centers in the sixty-campus network of the State University of New York. The institution is in the midst of a fifty-million-dollar expansion program.

In March of 1967, President John Toll responded to a faculty suggestion by appointing three campus ombudsmen to represent him "in investigating any suggestions or complaints . . . by members of the faculty, staff, or student body. . . ."[2] Chosen for the positions were professors from three disciplines: Homer

---

[1] "Institutional Policy Changes at San Jose State College Coming Out of Recommendations or Investigations," undated, received from White in November, 1968.

[2] John S. Toll, "Announcement of Selection of Ombudsmen and Other Key Appointments," memorandum to members of the university community of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, March 29, 1967.

Goldberg, English; Theodore Goldfarb, chemistry; and Robert Weinberg, physics. No reduction was made in their other faculty responsibilities.[1] In announcing the appointments, Toll outlined their roles in general terms:

> It is often much easier to recognize problems than to solve them. The Ombudsmen will not be required to undertake any problem unless they believe it is an important matter in which their efforts may bring fruitful results. The mandate of each Ombudsman is broad, and any member of the University Community can approach any of them with suggestions. . . . I hereby request all members of the University to cooperate with the three Ombudsmen and to supply them with any information or assistance that they may need in their task, and to endeavor to carry out their suggestions whenever possible.[2]

In response to complaints and suggestions, the ombudsmen made a number of policy recommendations affecting the university in such areas as governance, traffic, parking, mail service, student advising and relations with building contractors. For the 1967-68 academic year, the number of ombudsmen was reduced to two, and the president urged that normal channels be "given a fair chance to respond" before complainants resorted to extraordinary ones.[3]

---

[1] Goldfarb has estimated that he spent twenty to twenty-five hours a week performing as an ombudsman. "University Ombudsman Kept Busy at Stony Brook," New York Times, December 10, 1967, p. 146.

[2] Toll, "Announcement of Selection of Ombudsmen."

[3] Toll, "1966-67 Report of the Ombudsmen," memorandum to members of the university community of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, November 10, 1967.

Late in 1967, the editor of the campus newspaper credited the president with appointing ombudsmen whom students considered independent of the administration. "But I haven't seen any real success," he added, "and I suspect this may turn into just another pacifier."[1]

According to Anderson, the Stony Brook ombudsmen "acted partly as officers of information and referral, partly as Ombudsmen investigating grievances, and partly as idea men for ameliorating the inconveniences of working on a campus under construction. . . . the Ombudsmen should be given more independence than they derive from their present service at the pleasure of the President."[2]

The terms of the remaining two ombudsmen expired at the beginning of the 1968-69 academic year. They were neither reappointed nor replaced. In October of 1968, the university suspended classes for three days to enable students, faculty and administrators to participate in an "intensive self-study" and to discuss the institution's future. The "talk-in" was planned partly in response to growing student discontent with existing policies. No

---

[1]"University Ombudsman Kept Busy at Stony Brook," New York Times, December 10, 1967, p. 146.

[2]Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers," pp. V5-6.

recommendation for reviving the ombudsman system emerged from this discussion.[1]

In answer to an inquiry about his university's ombudsman experiment, Toll wrote:

> The three Ombudsmen who were appointed originally have completed their term of office and no replacements are being appointed pending a re-evaluation of their role. Since more fundamental issues of the university governance are presently at issue on this campus, it is premature for decisions on the future of the institution of Ombudsman here.[2]

Weinberg has stated that the office was discontinued because of a difference of opinion as to whether the ombudsman should be responsible to the president or to the faculty and students.[3]

For Faculty Only

Kent State University is the only institution of higher education included in this study which has established an ombudsman-like position restricted to faculty grievances. Called "Dean for Faculty Counsel (Ombudsman)," the role was assumed in the fall of

---

[1] Bryce Nelson, "Student Power: Demands for Change at Stony Brook's 'Talk-In,'" Science, CLXII (November 1, 1968), 545-48.

[2] Letter from Toll, president of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, March 10, 1969.

[3] Barbara Parness, "Ombudsmen Perform No Miracles," Michigan State News, campus newspaper at Michigan State University, January 6, 1969, p. 17.

1968 by Harold Kitner, a political science professor. Kitner's appointment by the university president followed a recommendation by the Faculty Senate that such an office be instituted. The recommendation was based on a study of the ombudsman concept and its potential application to the university which the president had commissioned Kitner to conduct in 1967.

In explaining the position to faculty members, the president expressed the hope that the office would be both corrective and preventive, and that "it might be so successful as to work itself out of existence. . . ." The office was described as "a center for continuous sensitivity towards the whole range of procedure which affects the professional role of the individual faculty member, and also . . . a place where he may turn if the faculty member believes that he is being treated unjustly."[1] The ombudsman also serves as an expediter of ideas that might not be heard because of the lack of appropriate channels.

Three safeguards are maintained to reduce the ombudsman's work load: he considers no grievance until all avenues of due process have been exhausted, he may reject a grievance he

---

[1]"Dean for Faculty Counsel (Ombudsman)," special bulletin issued by Office of the President, Kent State University, January 8, 1969, p. 5.

feels is unjustified, and he attempts settlement of differences through communication and conciliation before making recommendations to the president.[1]

Summary

This portion of the general evaluation of the ombudsman in American higher education has revealed that at all institutions but one the office was established exclusively or primarily to assist students with problems arising from their institutional relationships. Student pressure is evident in the establishment of some of the positions. Although the activities of the various campus ombudsmen are diverse, their roles are broadly patterned on Scandinavian civil ombudsman models, particularly Denmark's. Eleven of the fourteen positions described were filled by administrative appointments, comparable to executive appointments in civil government, rather than by faculty senate or student government appointments, comparable to legislative appointments. However, in most cases there is evidence of faculty and student involvement in the nomination or selection process. Few campus ombudsmen have had professional training or experience in student personnel work. Only one of the institutions discontinued the office after experimenting with it.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

The campus ombudsman concept has been adapted to the governmental structures of a wide range of institutions--public and private, large and small, urban and non-urban, old and new, liberal and conservative. Indeed, by the end of 1968, campus ombudsmen could be found at both ends of the higher education spectrum--the community college and the "multiversity."

Thus, flexibility appears to be one of the most remarkable characteristics of the campus ombudsman concept. In a few instances, however, the role appears to have been altered so much to satisfy institutional or individual preferences that few of the features traditionally associated with the ombudsman remain intact beyond the name.

Institutions Considering Ombudsmen

At least sixteen American colleges and universities were considering the possibility of adding a campus ombudsman prior to 1969. At some institutions, implementation seemed imminent; at others, the idea had not advanced beyond the awareness and interest stages.[1] Widespread publicity regarding campus ombudsman

---

[1] Rogers has divided the diffusion of innovation process into five stages: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial and adoption (or rejection). See Everett M. Rogers, "The Communication of Innovations in a Complex Institution," Educational Record, XLIX (Winter, 1968), 72.

appointments at such institutions as Berkeley and Michigan State has been influential. As Meyerson has observed:

> Boards of trustees, administrators, and faculties at many institutions note and often emulate the developments at the pace-setting colleges and universities. Although there may be no formal system to American higher education, there is a tendency toward the mean . . . , resulting in more institutional similarities. . . .[1]

Evans also has emphasized the importance of the nature of information sources in the diffusion of innovations in higher education.[2]

Developments at institutions considering ombudsmen will now be surveyed.

Description

University of California at Los Angeles

In June of 1968, the chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles established a University Policies Commission made up of students, faculty and administrators. He stated that its first order of business should be to consider the qualifications and responsibilities of a campus ombudsman, a position which he approved in principle.[3]

---

[1]Meyerson, "The Ethos of the American College Student," pp. 270-71.

[2]Richard I. Evans, Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 31.

[3]The campus ombudsman idea already had been endorsed by two university-wide committees. See Anderson, "Ombudsman

City College of the State University of New York

A body of students, faculty and administrators known as the Committee of Seventeen proposed the appointment of an ombudsman among other institutional reforms in a report issued in October of 1968 at City College of the State University of New York. Culminating two years of study, the recommendations included an ombudsman "to insure equitable treatment for students or faculty members in specific cases and to help administrators improve their procedures."[1]

Fresno State College

The ombudsman committee at Fresno State College circulated to college and university placement offices late in 1968 an announcement seeking applications for that institution's newly-created ombudsman position. The major responsibility of the office holder was described as follows: "To provide students, faculty, and administrators an avenue whereby they may better utilize existing procedures and express their concerns about any aspect of the college community." Applicants were assured that the ombudsman would be "responsible equally to students, faculty, and administration."

Papers," p. V11. The University Policies Commission subsequently proposed the appointment of an ombudsman by the chancellor on its recommendations. See UCLA Daily Bruin, February 25, 1969, p. 2.

[1]John Kifner, "Reforms Planned at City College," New York Times, October 9, 1968, p. 47.

Familiarity with the Fresno campus and "a concern for justice" were listed among necessary qualifications.[1]

George Washington University

In December of 1968, the vice president for student affairs at George Washington University presented a proposal to the president for adding an ombudsman at that institution. It was recommended that the position be filled on a full-time basis by a faculty member who was popular with students. He was to be selected by committee but would report to the president. His duties were to be identical to those of the Michigan State ombudsman.[2]

University of Hawaii

Establishment of an office of ombudsman is included in a proposal for a university and student code at the University of Hawaii, according to Acting President Robert Hiatt. Both the Faculty Senate and the Associated Students are considering the plan.[3]

---

[1] Announcement of Position: Ombudsman, Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif., December 26, 1968.

[2] Ombudsman report from David G. Speck to William P. Smith, George Washington University, December 19, 1968. According to a letter from Speck dated January 24, 1969, Smith submitted the report to the university president.

[3] Letter from Acting President Robert W. Hiatt, University of Hawaii, February 25, 1969.

University of Missouri at Columbia

In April of 1968, an ad hoc committee made a number of recommendations for increased graduate faculty participation in academic government at the University of Missouri at Columbia. One called for an office of ombudsman to deal with problems which graduate faculty and students are unable to solve through regular channels. The proposal added that: "The Ombudsman shall be a member of the Graduate Faculty at large, elected by the Senate from a slate presented by the Executive Committee."[1] The committee's report was accepted by the Graduate Faculty and implementation has begun. A committee designated to establish the office will submit a list of nominees to the executive committee of the Graduate Senate, which will make the final selection.[2]

University of Nevada

The University of Nevada Chapter of the American Association of University Professors has discussed the possibility of

---

[1]"Graduate Faculty Participation in Academic Government," Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Faculty Organization and Participation in Government and of the Committee on Planning and Policy of the Graduate Council, University of Missouri at Columbia, April 18, 1968, p. 19.

[2]Letter from John M. Franz, chairman, Graduate Faculty Senate Committee on Problems and Procedure, University of Missouri at Columbia, January 24, 1969.

establishing an office of ombudsman at that institution. A workshop on the subject was scheduled early in 1969.[1]

San Francisco State College

An ombudsman selection committee has submitted a list of nominees to the acting president of San Francisco State College. No action was taken prior to 1969.[2]

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

A plan for an experimental "Student Information and Complaint Office (Ombudsman)" has been submitted to the administration of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The proposal calls for an office to resolve student complaints "arising out of the functioning of the university bureaucracy." However, it expressly rules out non-specific grievances, disputes about grades, disciplinary matters, and appeals to reverse decisions. It recommends the appointment of a four-man ombudsman panel of tenured teaching

---

[1] The AAUP chapter subsequently recommended to the university president that a campus ombudsman be appointed. Professor Emeritus Charlton Laird was named to the post by the Board of Regents in March of 1969. See "Ombudsman Begins New Job," University of Nevada Sagebrush, March 11, 1969, p. 3.

[2] Letter from Nancy McDermid, member of ombudsman selection committee at San Francisco State College, February 18, 1969.

faculty members, assisted by a full-time student personnel worker.[1]

Stanford University

In the spring of 1968, the Stanford University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors set up a four-man ombudsman board "to act on its own and to inspire the administration to replace the AAUP Ombudsman with a regular University Ombudsman."[2] Apparently the administration was not inspired. Several months later one of the president's aides stated that "nothing definite has been done, and I know of nothing beyond the discussion stage."[3]

Other Institutions

Prior to 1969, campus ombudsman proposals also were under consideration at the University of Massachusetts, North Texas State University, Oakland University (affiliated with Michigan

---

[1]"A Proposal for a Student Information and Complaint Office (Ombudsman) for Southern Illinois University," unsigned, undated. Provided by George McClure, Department of Philosophy, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

[2]Anderson, "Ombudsman Papers," p. V11.

[3]Letter from Frederic O. Glover, executive assistant to the president, Stanford University, February 19, 1969.

State University), Princeton University, Wayne State University and Western Michigan University. Student groups were providing much of the impetus.[1]

It is curious that the ombudsman concept has not gained acceptance at Valparaiso University, where the man who has developed a widely-adopted rationale for the position--Donald Mundinger--serves as vice president for academic affairs. He has indicated that Valparaiso could use an ombudsman but he has been unable to persuade his colleagues of the utility of such an office.[2]

At Rutgers University, Earle Clifford, dean of student affairs, has effectively blocked efforts to establish an office of ombudsman despite its advocacy by Albert Blaustein, a law professor. In a 1968 speech, Clifford called the concept a "gimmick"

---

[1]Information obtained through correspondence with persons at institutions listed. Other institutions considered but rejected ombudsman proposals prior to 1969. Western institutions which took such action gave one or more of these reasons: lack of demonstrated need; negative student and administrative reaction; existing good rapport among students, faculty and administration; and deans already performing the functions. See UCLA Daily Bruin, February 25, 1969, p. 3.

[2]Letter from Donald C. Mundinger, vice president for academic affairs, Valparaiso University, February 20, 1969.

which no institution needs if properly organized. Blaustein has responded to Clifford's objections by letter.[1]

Summary

At least sixteen colleges and universities were moving toward the appointment of campus ombudsmen prior to 1969. Although their objectives were similar, methods of implementation varied considerably. Involvement of students as well as faculty and administration in ombudsman planning was almost universal. The influence of campus ombudsman developments at other institutions was evident.

Selected Ombudsmen: Similarities and Dissimilarities

To obtain more detailed information on the campus ombudsman, persons serving in that capacity at six institutions of higher education were chosen for personal interviews in the fall of 1968. Selections were made on the basis of institutional size and diversity. The interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix B.

The ombudsmen interviewed and their institutions are: George Leitmann, University of California at Berkeley; Irving

---

[1] Clifford's speech, "Second Thoughts on the Ombudsman in Higher Education," was presented in Detroit, Mich., on October 25, 1968. Blaustein's letter to Clifford is dated November 19, 1968.

DeKoff, Columbia University; Thomas Davis, University of Detroit; James Rust, Michigan State University; Nelson Norman, San Diego State College; and J. Benton White, San Jose State College.

To facilitate comparisons much of the self-evaluation data elicited from these interviews are summarized in tables in Appendix C. Other pertinent facts were presented earlier in this chapter. Additional perspective has been gained through correspondence with the six ombudsmen and access to their reports, writings and speeches. In assimilating and analyzing this information, a few generalized observations have been made regarding similarities and dissimilarities in the characteristics, activities and attitudes of the interviewed ombudsmen. Those findings will now be presented.

Characteristics

Similarities

All six ombudsmen have spent a considerable length of time at their institutions, ranging from seven to twenty-one years. All but one have had college teaching experience. None is beginning a career; one is nearing retirement. None has had legal training or professional preparation in student personnel work. However, all but one have had experience in counseling students. Four of the six have doctoral degrees, and the same holds true for tenure,

Dissimilarities

The six ombudsmen represent six diverse career fields. Their academic rank ranges from assistant professor to full professor. Three have been deans or assistant deans and three have not. One is an ordained minister.

Activities

Similarities

All six ombudsmen were appointed no earlier than September of 1967 and none were asked to serve terms extending beyond two years. All receive complaints from students and all but one receive most of their complaints from undergraduate students.[1] All but one consider non-academic as well as academic complaints. All are fiscally accountable to, and submit periodic reports with recommendations to, the officer or body which appointed them. All use face-to-face contact more than any other form of communication in conducting their activities. All have access to official files on the campus, except for classified government research and health and psychological records. Four of the six consider their own records to be confidential. All reported changes in institutional

---

[1] Leitmann reported an even division between graduate students and undergraduates.

policies and procedures as a result of their investigations and recommendations. All but one have their offices in buildings separate from the main administration building. Four of the six are considered full-time ombudsmen and have a secretary. For all six, the rate of complaints received has increased during their time in office. All but one have reservations about publicizing individual cases. All have exchanged ideas and information with other campus ombudsmen.

Dissimilarities

Four of the six ombudsmen were appointed by the president of their institution, one by the student government and one by the faculty government. There is some evidence of student and/or faculty support in three of the four presidential appointments. Three ombudsmen experienced an increase in salary and/or rank or status when they were appointed; three did not. Three ombudsmen are teaching part-time and three are not. The average number of complaints handled per week varies from fewer than six at Berkeley to twenty-seven at Michigan State. There is no agreement on how the ombudsman should proceed if a solution cannot be found for a valid complaint. Three have found student personnel workers on their campuses to be cooperative; two have not; one is uncertain.

There is much variation in the extent to which their reports are circulated.

Attitudes

Similarities

All six ombudsmen see themselves as auxiliary to, not replacements for, existing campus functionaries. All but one believe that their activities have helped alleviate student frustration and hostility. All view the chief administrator of the institution as the student's highest appeal to authority. All consider good relationships with students as a prime qualification for the position. All but one recommend a two-year maximum term of office for the campus ombudsman. Four believe their office will be in existence ten years hence; two are uncertain.

Dissimilarities

Three of the interviewed ombudsmen consider their budgets and facilities adequate; three do not. Three have experienced role conflict; three have not. Three think of themselves as a part of the "Establishment"; three do not. Three favor a professional organization of campus ombudsmen; three do not. There is also no agreement on how the office of ombudsman differs from other offices on

the campus. Rust stresses the ombudsman's greater scope and power of investigation; Leitmann emphasizes his independence; White points to his personalized concern; Davis believes the ombudsman should not be different--that is, all faculty and administrators should strive to perform as ombudsmen.

Conclusion

All six campus ombudsmen generally agree that they have a two-fold responsibility: (1) to help individuals solve their institutional problems, and (2) to seek institutional changes that will reduce individual problems. These may be characterized as palliative and preventive activities. Operational styles differ according to which portion of this responsibility takes priority in the mind of the ombudsman. Three of those interviewed--Leitmann, Norman and Rust--seem to lean toward the palliative approach. They are inclined to react to complaints as they arise and to make recommendations for repairing rather than restructuring institutional procedures.[1] The other three--Davis, DeKoff and White--regard

---

[1] Rust has maintained that so-called minor grievances can break the morale of individual students and spread this breakdown throughout a student body. He believes that more attention can be devoted to the "larger things" if somebody can be found to correct the "little things"--and that is the role of the ombudsman. Discussion notes, meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1968. The following day at the same meeting

themselves as "change agents" and their actions as catalytic in bringing about structural alterations.[1] They are more likely to seek out grievances rather than wait for individual problems to come to them. It should be noted that these are distinctions in degree, not in kind. Nonetheless, the latter "activist" emphasis is farther removed from the civil ombudsman model than the former.

Despite these differences in role perception, it is also apparent that all six ombudsmen are generally cautious in their procedures, working as quietly as possible to arrive at fair and reasonable adjustments to difficult human relations problems. Unsure of their authority and with little precedent to guide them, they are testing various persuasive approaches and evaluating

---

Leitmann said: "I'm going to confine myself to what I think I can do, namely help the individual student with his individual problem." Norman recently made this assertion: "At least two Ombudsmen we know refuse to take any direct part in confrontation proceedings. We share their belief that our role is primarily to help students solve their individual problems before they expand to group size or escalate to extra-procedural action." Nelson F. Norman, The Ombudsman: A New Bird on Campus, San Diego State College, undated, p. 11.

[1]DeKoff has suggested that a campus ombudsman may precipitate confrontation. He added: "I intend to act as a catalyst, not as somebody who pours oil on troubled waters. I'm attempting to create situations that are lying dormant and need some upheaval. . . ." Discussion notes, meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1968.

results.[1] They recognize that the success of their activities rests heavily on their own prestige, personality and persuasive power. Although they can resort to their ultimate weapon--appeal to the president--they wisely prefer to hold it in reserve until everything else has failed. They realize that too much "running to the president" will weaken rather than strengthen their semi-independent positions. Another factor which cannot be ignored is that at least four of the six are still building their careers and therefore hope to avoid costly mistakes in a role which affords them a great deal of visibility.

All six would undoubtedly agree that Anderson's warning about the civil ombudsman applies equally to them: "Among the ombudsman's worst enemies are some of his best friends: those who expect too much of him."[2]

---

[1] DeKoff has advised new campus ombudsmen not to become stylized too soon. "We all don't really know what it means yet," he declared. Discussion notes, meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1968.

[2] Anderson, Ombudsmen for American Government?, p. 155.

CHAPTER IV

THE CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN: A STUDENT EVALUATION

Characteristics, activities and attitudes of the campus ombudsman were described in the final portion of the previous chapter. Information was obtained from persons who have assumed that role at six institutions of higher education. Another dimension will now be added to the study through an analysis of a survey of students who have consulted a campus ombudsman.

Michigan State University and its ombudsman, James Rust, were selected for this phase of the investigation for several reasons. First, with an enrollment approaching 40,000, Michigan State is one of the largest universities in the nation--a "multiversity" of fifteen separate schools and colleges with diverse, even conflicting, interests.[1] Problems associated with the imbalance between the organization and the individual are prevalent on this sprawling

---

[1]Duncan Norton-Taylor, "Megaversity's Struggle with Itself," Fortune, May, 1967, pp. 161-65.

campus, which has been the scene of anti-"Establishment" demonstrations by dissident students. Secondly, Michigan State was one of the first institutions of higher education to establish an office of ombudsman. The position was supported by all primary power groups on the campus, including top administrators, trustees, and student and faculty leaders. Another reason for the selection is that Michigan State's ombudsman has been in office longer than any other ombudsman at a major university. He handles a wide variety of student complaints and keeps cumulative records. Finally, as was indicated in the previous chapter, other colleges and universities are modeling or may model their campus ombudsman operation on the Michigan State plan. [1]

A total of 525 persons consulted the Michigan State ombudsman during the 1967-68 academic year, his first year in office, followed by 305 during the 1968 fall term. For reasons given in the first chapter, the latter group was chosen for a mailed questionnaire survey conducted during the 1969 winter term. The number of questionnaires sent was reduced to 288 because six of the 305 individuals were not currently enrolled students when they consulted the ombudsman and addresses could not be obtained for eleven others. Two

---

[1] Among them are San Diego State College and George Washington University. Rust has answered requests for information about his office from scores of institutions.

weeks after the first mailing, a second copy of the questionnaire was sent to those who had not responded. Of the 288 students involved, 218 returned questionnaires for a 75.6 per cent response. Letters included in both mailings and the questionnaire are reproduced in Appendix E and Appendix F.

Before survey findings are presented, some attention is given to the institutional setting and operational procedures of the Michigan State ombudsman. In the third section, characteristics of students who consulted the ombudsman during the 1968 fall term are described. Experiences of those students in consulting the ombudsman are reviewed in the fourth section. Attitudes related to those experiences are analyzed in the fifth section. A few cases and comments are cited in the sixth section. The final section is a summary of survey findings.

Institutional Setting

Founded in 1855 as the nation's pioneer land-grant college, Michigan State University has been a part of the national movement to make higher education available to all able students.[1] During

---

[1]Much of the information in this section came from two publications: Michigan State: Profile of a University, brochure prepared by University Editor's Office, Michigan State University, undated; and Michigan State University: Catalog of Courses and Academic Programs, Michigan State University Publication, LXIII (December, 1968).

most of its history, the institution's educational and research programs were concentrated on agriculture. Although this emphasis has now spread to other fields, the university still has no law school or terminal-degree medical school.[1] In recent years, through widespread international programs, Michigan State has helped found universities and has promoted educational and agricultural improvements in a number of foreign countries.

The main campus at East Lansing has been so greatly enlarged to accommodate increasing enrollments that bus service, once a convenience, is now a necessity. Old-style classroom buildings reminiscent of the "ag school" era are still standing, although large modern laboratories and classroom-office complexes are predominant. Some 20,000 students--more than half the total enrollment--reside in university-owned living units. They comprise one of the largest campus resident populations in the world. Most of the residence halls for unmarried students are huge high-rise structures. Apartments for married students are clustered in three "villages."

Students are enrolled from every county in Michigan, every state in the nation and more than seventy-five foreign countries. As the result of a continuous recruiting campaign, one of the largest

---

[1]The College of Human Medicine presently provides a program of study which prepares students for entrance at the junior level to medical schools offering the Doctor of Medicine degree.

groups of National Merit Scholars in the nation is found at Michigan State. A recent study revealed that the institution's freshmen in 1967 were more intelligent and more ambitious educationally than the freshmen in 1958.[1]

In addition to some 1,600 teaching faculty members, the university has more than 400 research professors, nearly 300 extension workers and about 375 administrators. It is among the top twenty institutions in the United States in the number of doctoral degrees awarded annually. Michigan State is a member of the Big Ten scholastic and athletic conference.

Innovations in recent years include numerous institutional research, evaluation and development programs, living-learning centers, an Honors College, three residential liberal arts colleges, a separate small university (Oakland), and curriculum revisions.

Although the trustees and administration have traditionally exercised much of the decision-making power in the institution, more authority is being assumed by faculty and students through the Academic Council and Associated Students. A number of channels are open to students for solving problems related to the institution.

---

[1]Rebecca Nietert, "Freshmen Found Brighter Than Predecessors," Michigan State News, January 16, 1969, p. 14. This comparative study was conducted by Irvin J. Lehmann and Walker H. Hill through the Office of Evaluation Services.

Each college maintains an academic student affairs office. Academic units and residence halls have advisers. The university maintains offices for admissions, scholarships, financial aids, counseling, placement and related activities. Through the Associated Students, legal counsel is made available to students. In addition, there are student service organizations, a Health Center and a Veterans Guidance Center. The Academic Freedom Report which established the office of ombudsman also created a student-faculty judiciary to consider cases and appeals involving disciplinary action against students.[1] The campus newspaper provides a service called "Spartacuss" which answers student questions and investigates student complaints.

Operational Procedures

Although the Academic Freedom Report gives the Michigan State ombudsman "broad investigatory powers and direct and ready access to all University officials," it does not explicitly define his responsibilities or prescribe his procedures. According to John Reinoehl, chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, the responsibilities were purposely left vague because the authors felt "that the individual himself would have to make the job; to

---

[1] Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, pp. 16-19.

describe it would circumscribe it." The ombudsman, he added, was not designed to be a glorified counselor but more of a "super-academic-assistant dean."[1]

During Rust's first year as ombudsman, he frequently referred to himself not in those terms but rather as "a kind of traffic cop, telling students which people to see and what procedures to follow."[2] He later expressed regret over having used that "unfortunate metaphor"[3] and summarized his procedures in handling each complaint as one or more of the following activities: (1) advising, (2) explaining, (3) referring, (4) reviewing, and (5) taking direct action. In all cases, he tries to be a careful and interested listener.[4]

From the beginning, Rust has attempted to model his office on that of the civil ombudsman in Denmark, making necessary

---

[1]Beverly Twitchell, "Academic Freedom Report Swings Into Effect," Michigan State News, September, 1967, p. 10.

[2]"First University Ombudsman," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (November, 1967), 142.

[3]Rust, private interview held at Michigan State University, December 12, 1968.

[4]Untitled, undated mimeographed statement prepared by Rust, Michigan State University (revised in January, 1969), pp. 7-8. In a private conversation, Rust added the procedure of "taking direct action."

adjustments to fit the university situation. He has kept his procedures simple and direct, asking the student to provide only a few items of basic information in writing about himself and his complaint prior to a private consultation. A copy of the form used appears in Appendix D. During or immediately after the interview, Rust records his impressions and later indicates in writing how the problem was handled. A separate file is maintained for each student-problem. Cases are classified by type of complaint for future reference, particularly for reports to the university president. The two broad categories are "academic" and "non-academic" with several sub-divisions under each. Records and reports are kept confidential. If the resolution of a problem is prolonged, the ombudsman attempts to keep the student posted on developments. In referral cases, he asks the student to report results. Not all of the ombudsman's business comes from personal visits. He also handles complaints conveyed by telephone and letter. He does not conduct investigations on his own initiative.

In attempting to redress student grievances, Rust relies heavily on reason and persuasion applied through telephone conversations and personal calls. Occasionally, he sends memos and letters. When he cannot get cooperation from one individual, he may turn to that person's organizational superior. Ultimately, he

may take a case to the president, although he has rarely chosen this "last resort" measure.

In his first report to the president, Rust observed that stating his views on a matter to the person concerned "is the chief source of the Ombudsman's power." On the university scene, Rust has interpreted this power to mean "that the best way for an Ombudsman to operate is quietly, persuasively, behind the scenes."[1] He regards his procedures to be comparable to those of both a mediator and an advocate: "I seek explanations of the student's predicament and attempt to persuade people to help solve or clarify it," he has written.[2]

More information regarding procedures of the Michigan State ombudsman appears in Chapter III and Appendix C.

---

[1]"The Report of the University Ombudsman to the President for the School Year, 1967-68," undated, unsigned, Michigan State University, p. 2.

[2]Ibid., p. 3. Recognizing the unusual procedures required in serving effectively as a campus ombudsman, President John Hannah made this statement when he appointed Rust to the position: "The Ombudsman will be charged with responsibilities uncommon in American universities, or indeed in universities anywhere." See "MSU Appoints Dean As First Ombudsman," American School and University, October, 1967, p. 58. Hannah also has acknowledged that the ombudsman assignment "will call for the exercise of great patience, understanding, and persuasion." The President's Report of Progress, 1966-67, Michigan State University Publication, LXII (November, 1967), 6.

TABLE 1

COLLEGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN COMPARED WITH ALL STUDENTS ENROLLED AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

(1) School or college	(2) Number of students who consulted ombudsman	(3) Percentage of total students who consulted ombudsman	(4) Number of students enrolled	(5) Percentage of total university enrollment	(6) Difference between percentages (column 3 minus 5)	(7) Number of students "expected" to consult ombudsman based on college size[b]	(8) Difference between actual and "expected" number of students to consult ombudsman (column 2 minus 7)
Agriculture	19	6.4	2,603	6.5	- .1	19	0
Arts and Letters	60	20.1	4,422	11.1	+ 9.0	33	+27
Lyman Briggs	3	1.0	423	1.1	- .1	3	0
Business	21	7.0	3,900	9.8	- 2.8	29	- 8
Communication Arts	17	5.7	1,940	4.9	+ .8	15	+ 2
Education	20	6.7	6,264	15.7	- 9.0	47	-27
Engineering	10	3.3	2,380	6.0	- 2.7	18	- 8
Home Economics	6	2.0	1,478	3.7	- 1.7	11	- 5
James Madison	0	0	422	1.1	- 1.1	3	- 3
Human Medicine	1	.3	92	.2	+ .1	0	+ 1

TABLE 1--Continued

(1) School or college	(2) Number of students who consulted ombudsman	(3) Percentage of total students who consulted ombudsman	(4) Number of students enrolled	(5) Percentage of total university enrollment	(6) Difference between percentages (column 3 minus 5)	(7) Number of students "expected" to consult ombudsman based on college size[b]	(8) Difference between actual and "expected" number of students to consult ombudsman (column 2 minus 7)
Justin Morrill	9	3.0	881	2.2	+ .8	7	+ 2
Natural Science	21	7.0	4,822	12.1	- 5.1	36	-15
Social Science	50	16.7	5,441	13.6	+ 3.1	41	+ 9
Veterinary Medicine	0	0	866	2.2	- 2.2	7	- 7
University College (includes no preference and unclassified)	62	20.7	4,015	10.1	+10.6	30	+32
Total	299	99.9[c]	39,949	100.3[c]	---	299	---

[a]In credit programs on East Lansing campus.

[b]"Expected" number was computed by multiplying percentage in column 5 times 299, the total number of students who consulted the ombudsman. Obtained figure was rounded to nearest whole number.

[c]Does not total 100 because of rounding.

Student Characteristics

During the 1968 fall term, at the beginning of Rust's second year as Michigan State's ombudsman, 305 persons consulted him about a diversity of problems. Of this number, 299 were currently enrolled students, four were former students, and two were relatives of students. The college distribution of the 299 students by number and percentage is presented in Table 1. The percentages are then compared with college percentages for the total university enrollment. The final columns show that students from Arts and Letters and University College were considerably "over represented" in the ombudsman's office while students from Education and Natural Science were considerably "under represented." Applying the Pearson "Goodness-of-Fit" Test for comparing sample and population distributions to these figures yields a Chi Square of 99.3, significant at the .01 level. Thus, the hypothesis that the college distribution of students who consulted the ombudsman was the same as the college distribution of all university students is rejected.[1]

Differences also are apparent when students who consulted the campus ombudsman are separated by class rank. Among the 144

---

[1]The Pearson "Goodness-of-Fit" Test is described in William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), pp. 580-84.

TABLE 2

CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN REGARDING ACADEMIC PROBLEMS COMPARED WITH ALL STUDENTS ENROLLED AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

(1) Class rank	(2) Number of students who consulted ombudsman[b]	(3) Percentage of total students who consulted ombudsman	(4) Number of students enrolled	(5) Percentage of total university enrollment	(6) Difference between percentages (column 3 minus 5)	(7) Number of students "expected" to consult ombudsman based on class size[c]	(8) Difference between actual and "expected" number of students to consult ombudsman (column 2 minus 7)
Freshman	13	9.0	9,670	24.2	-15.2	35	-22
Sophomore	31	21.5	7,618	19.1	+ 2.4	27	+ 4
Junior	42	29.2	7,758	19.4	+ 9.8	28	+14
Senior	49	34.0	6,954	17.4	+16.6	25	+24
Graduate	7	4.9	7,668	19.2	-14.3	28	-21
Special	2	1.4	281	.7	+ .7	1	+ 1
Total	144	100.0	39,949	100.0	---	144	---

[a] In credit programs on East Lansing campus.

[b] Since the ombudsman handles problems separately, in this tabulation a student was counted once for each problem he presented. Thus, one student with two problems is treated the same as two students with one problem each.

[c] "Expected" number was computed by multiplying percentage in column 5 times 144, the total number of students who consulted the ombudsman regarding academic problems. Obtained figure was rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 3

CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN REGARDING NON-ACADEMIC PROBLEMS COMPARED WITH ALL STUDENTS ENROLLED AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

(1) Class rank	(2) Number of students who consulted ombudsman[b]	(3) Percentage of total students who consulted ombudsman	(4) Number of students enrolled	(5) Percentage of total university enrollment	(6) Difference between percentages (column 3 minus 5)	(7) Number of students "expected" to consult ombudsman based on class size[c]	(8) Difference between actual and "expected" number of students to consult ombudsman (column 2 minus 7)
Freshman	18	10.0	9,670	24.2	-14.2	44	-26
Sophomore	34	18.9	7,618	19.1	- .2	34	0
Junior	31	17.2	7,758	19.4	- 2.2	35	- 4
Senior	49	27.2	6,954	17.4	+ 9.8	31	+18
Graduate	45	25.0	7,668	19.2	+ 5.8	35	+10
Special	3	1.7	281	.7	+ 1.0	1	+ 2
Total	180	100.0	39,949	100.0	---	180	---

[a] In credit programs on East Lansing campus.

[b] Since the ombudsman handles problems separately, in this tabulation a student was counted once for each problem he presented. Thus, one student with two problems is treated the same as two students with one problem each.

[c] "Expected" number was computed by multiplying percentage in column 5 times 180, the total number of students who consulted the ombudsman regarding non-academic problems. Obtained figure was rounded to nearest whole number.

academic problems brought to the ombudsman, juniors and seniors were "over represented" and freshmen and graduate students "under represented" in proportion to class size. These comparisons are presented in Table 2.

A reversal is noted for graduate students when class rank distribution is applied to non-academic problems. Instead of being "under represented," they were "over represented." Again, freshmen were "under represented" and seniors were "over represented." See Table 3.

The general observation which can be made from the data in these three tables is that during the 1968 fall term students in Arts and Letters and University College were relatively more inclined to consult the ombudsman while students in Education and Natural Science were relatively less inclined.[1] Freshmen were relatively less inclined to consult the ombudsman while seniors were relatively more inclined. Graduate students were more inclined to consult the ombudsman about non-academic problems than academic problems.

General characteristics of the 218 students who responded to the ombudsman survey questionnaire are summarized in Table 4. It will be noted that all class ranks, all student age groups and all

---

[1]Of the 218 respondents, 49.5 per cent were enrolled in three colleges--Arts and Letters, Social Science and University College.

TABLE 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF 218 STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

Class rank	N	%
Freshman	25	11.5
Sophomore	38	17.4
Junior	49	22.5
Senior	61	28.0
Graduate	38	17.4
Others (special)	7	3.2

Sex	N	%
Male	151	69.3
Female	67	30.7

Marital status	N	%
Single	156	71.6
Married	60	27.5
Divorced	2	.9

Housing	N	%
On campus		
residence hall	85	39.0
married housing	28	12.8
Off campus		
supervised	23	10.6
unsupervised	82	37.6

Residency	N.	%
Michigan	167	76.6
Other states	49	22.5
Foreign countries	2	.9

Age	N	%
17-18	20	9.2
19	35	16.1
20	39	17.9
21	36	16.5
22	22	10.1
23-24	21	9.6
25-26	10	4.6
27-28	13	6.0
29 and over	13	6.0
Not indicated	9	4.1

[a]Based on 218 returns from 288 questionnaires sent. A total of 305 persons consulted the ombudsman between September 1 and December 31, 1968.

types of student housing were represented. (All grade point averages also were represented.) However, the percentage of male respondents (69.3) was higher than the all-university percentage (58.7) and the female percentage (30.7) was lower (41.3).[1] Also, a higher percentage of married students (27.5) was represented than in the total university population (17.5).

Experiences

The most frequently cited source of information about the ombudsman for students who consulted him during the 1968 fall term was the Michigan State News, the campus newspaper. The second most frequently cited source of information was another student (or students). Few students learned about the ombudsman through instructors or administrators. Sources of information are reported in Table 5. Only 6 per cent of survey respondents felt that the services of the ombudsman are widely known among students. Negative answers came from 44.5 per cent and the remaining 49.5 per cent were uncertain.

---

[1] Of the 305 persons who consulted Rust during the 1968 fall term, 68.9 per cent were men and 31.1 per cent were women. Note how closely this ratio corresponds with the sex distribution of survey respondents. Only 28.9 per cent of the survey respondents were underclassmen, whereas 43.3 per cent of all students enrolled were underclassmen.

TABLE 5

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN REPORTED BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

Source of information	Number of students who cited source:			Total	
	Under-graduates	Graduates	Others (Special)	N	%[a]
State News (campus newspaper)	109	29	3	141	64.7
Student(s)	86	14	2	102	46.8
Academic Freedom Report	32	3	1	36	16.5
Residence hall adviser(s)	23	0	1	24	11.0
Academic adviser(s)	13	3	1	17	7.8
Instructor(s)	5	2	0	7	3.2
Administrator(s)	5	2	0	7	3.2
Professional counselor(s)	3	0	1	4	1.8
Other sources	19	5	1	25	11.5
Total				363[b]	

[a]Percentage citing this source among all respondents (218).

[b]Total exceeds number of respondents (218) because some cited more than one source of information.

Nearly half the surveyed students had taken their problems to two or more persons in authority before turning to the ombudsman. Fewer than one in four had gone directly to the ombudsman. Underclassmen were less inclined to go directly to the ombudsman than upperclassmen and graduate students. Class rank comparisons are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

PREVIOUS PROBLEM-SOLVING ATTEMPTS MADE BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

Class rank	To how many people in authority did you take your problem before consulting the ombudsman?									
	None		One		Two		Three		More than three	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Freshman	5	20.0	4	16.0	11	44.0	4	16.0	1	4.0
Sophomore	7	18.4	9	23.7	9	23.7	8	21.1	5	13.2
Junior	12	24.5	13	26.5	19	38.8	2	4.1	3	6.1
Senior	17	28.3	16	26.7	14	23.3	10	16.7	3	5.0
Graduate	10	26.3	13	34.2	8	21.1	4	10.5	3	7.9
Other (special)	1	16.7	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0	1	16.7
Total[a]	52	24.1	58	26.9	62	28.7	28	13.0	16	7.4

[a]Two of the 218 respondents did not answer this question. Final percentages total 100.1 because of rounding.

A common student complaint on most large university campuses pertains to the inaccessibility of instructors and advisers in their offices. Students who consulted the Michigan State ombudsman were asked how long they waited to see him after arriving at his office. Most of the respondents indicated that they saw him immediately or waited less than ten minutes, with or without an appointment. The findings are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

ACCESSIBILITY OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AS REPORTED BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED HIM AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

If you had made an appointment, upon arriving at his office how long did you wait to see the ombudsman?			If you had not made an appointment, upon arriving at his office how long did you wait to see the ombudsman?	
N	%		N	%
73	68.9	No delay at all	39	40.2
21	19.8	Under 10 minutes	40	41.2
12	11.3	10 to 30 minutes	17	17.5
0	0	30 to 60 minutes	1	1.0
106	100.0	Total[a]	97	99.9

[a]Remaining 15 of 218 respondents consulted ombudsman by letter or telephone, not in person. Second percentage does not total 100 because of rounding.

When campus ombudsmen were asked how long it took to process a problem, answers varied widely. Surveyed students at Michigan State were asked to recall how long it took the ombudsman to process their problems. (See Table 8.) Although most responses

TABLE 8

EFFICIENCY OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AS REPORTED BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED HIM AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

Class rank	How long did it take the ombudsman to handle your problem?					
	10 minutes or less		10 minutes to 1 hour		More than 1 hour	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Freshman	9	39.1	8	34.8	6	26.1
Sophomore	9	24.3	16	43.2	12	32.4
Junior	11	23.4	21	44.7	15	31.9
Senior	23	41.1	17	30.4	16	28.6
Graduate	6	19.4	8	25.8	17	54.8
Other (special)	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6
Total[a]	60	29.9	73	36.3	68	33.8

[a]Seventeen of the 218 respondents did not answer this question. Some percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

were in the "ten minutes to one hour" range, nearly 30 per cent replied that it took ten minutes or less. Only 26.1 per cent of the freshmen answered "more than one hour" compared with 54.8 per cent of the graduate students. Rust's explanation for this difference is that the new student is more likely to bring a problem to the ombudsman which can be handled quickly because the student is not fully aware of existing channels and procedures available to him.[1]

To assess the ombudsman's effectiveness as perceived by students who had consulted him, one survey question asked, "To what extent is the problem you took to the ombudsman now solved?" (See Table 9.) Nearly half the respondents indicated that their problems were "completely solved"; one-third viewed their problems as "not solved at all."[2] Except for two students who reported a worsening of their grievances, the others saw their problems as partially solved. The junior class was the only class in which more students reported their problems "not solved at all" than "completely solved."

---

[1]Rust, private interview held at Michigan State University, December 12, 1968.

[2]Rust estimated in October of 1968 that two-thirds to three-fourths of the complaints he received during the 1967-68 school year were settled to the student's satisfaction. See Edward Brill, "Ombudsman's Power Helps Students," Michigan State News, October 30, 1968, p. 1.

TABLE 9

EFFECTIVENESS OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AS REPORTED BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED HIM AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

Class rank	To what extent is the problem you took to the ombudsman now solved?							
	Completely solved		Partially solved		Not solved at all		Problem is worse	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Freshman	12	52.2	3	13.0	8	34.8	0	0
Sophomore	20	54.1	3	8.1	12	32.4	2	5.4
Junior	18	36.7	12	24.4	19	38.8	0	0
Senior	29	48.3	9	14.9	22	36.7	0	0
Graduate	20	55.6	7	19.5	9	25.0	0	0
Other (special)	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0	0	0
Total[a]	103	48.6	37	17.4	70	33.0	2	.9

Class rank	How much did the ombudsman help you with your problem?					
	More than I expected		As much as I expected		Less than I expected	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Freshman	9	37.5	9	37.5	6	25.0
Sophomore	16	43.2	10	27.0	11	29.7
Junior	15	30.6	13	26.5	21	42.8
Senior	22	36.0	18	29.5	21	34.4
Graduate	17	47.2	10	27.8	9	25.0
Other (special)	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0
Total[b]	83	38.8	63	29.4	68	31.8

[a]Six of the 218 respondents did not answer this question. Some percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

[b]Four of the 218 respondents did not answer this question. Some percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

A related question--"How much did the ombudsman help you with your problem?"--was answered on the basis of expectations. (See Table 9.) The highest percentage of students answered "more than I expected" although nearly one-third replied "less than I expected." As with the previous question, favorable responses exceeded unfavorable responses in all classes except the junior class.[1]

The Academic Freedom Report directs the ombudsman to protect those who solicit his assistance "against retribution."[2] The implication is that persons against whom complaints are made may attempt to punish the student for his action. To determine whether this concern is warranted, surveyed students were asked if they experienced unpleasant treatment by anyone involved in their complaint after consulting the ombudsman. Of 207 students who answered the question, thirteen claimed some kind of unfavorable reaction although most of the explanations were vague. A few typical responses are cited:

> The prof was real mad and asked who it was that called Dr. Rust. No answer was forthcoming and he dropped the matter.

---

[1]A higher percentage of women (46.3) than men (35.4) felt that the ombudsman's assistance exceeded their expectations.

[2]Academic Freedom Report for Students at Michigan State University, p. 31.

My advisor did not seem to be the same. Once friendly and helpful, she would only do what she had to.

Professor made nasty remarks in class several times, once aimed obviously at me.

I have no real evidence that the Ombudsman's involvement had effect on my treatment, but people concerned became very defensive and less open when I next had contact with them about two months later.

Attitudes

In proposing the office of ombudsman, the Academic Freedom Report stressed the "sensitive and confidential nature of the Ombudsman's work." The recommendation provided that he "shall respect the privacy of all persons who solicit his assistance."[1] To determine whether surveyed students regarded confidentiality as essential, they were asked this question: "Would you have consulted the ombudsman if his records were open for inspection by anyone?" (See Table 10.) Nearly three-fourths of the respondents answered "Yes." Twenty-seven students gave a negative response and thirty were uncertain. Although comparatively few students were concerned about confidentiality, it could be argued that even a small percentage is enough to justify continuing the policy.

---

[1] Ibid.

TABLE 10

IMPORTANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY TO STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

Class rank	Would you have consulted the ombudsman if his records were open for inspection by anyone?			
	Yes	No	Uncertain	% Yes
Freshman	22	1	2	88.0
Sophomore	21	6	10	56.8
Junior	37	5	7	75.5
Senior	45	8	7	75.0
Graduate	29	6	3	76.3
Other (special)	5	1	1	71.4
Total[a]	159	27	30	73.6

[a]Two of the 218 respondents did not answer this question.

Attitudes concerning the ombudsman are presented in Table 11 according to the nature of the student's problem. Only polarized responses are included. In some problem areas the ombudsman appears to have been more successful than in others. However, surveyed students generally felt that the ombudsman had done everything he could to help them. With few exceptions, they

TABLE 11

ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ANALYZED BY NATURE OF PROBLEM, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

Nature of problem	Number of students with problem	Student's reaction to way ombudsman handled problem				Did ombudsman do everything within his authority to help student with problem?		Would student:			
		Generally satisfied		Generally dissatisfied				Return to ombudsman with other problems?		Recommend ombudsman to other students?	
		N	%	N	%	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Registration and admission	25	15	60	8	32	14	6	16	1	21	1
Academic requirements	24	17	71	5	21	15	4	18	0	21	1
Traffic regulations	11	7	64	4	36	6	3	7	3	8	2
Financial need	18	14	78	3	17	14	1	16	0	16	0
Quality of instruction	11	4	36	4	36	3	4	6	1	8	1
Housing	23	16	70	7	30	16	1	20	1	20	0
Use of facilities and services	12	7	58	3	25	6	1	9	0	11	0
Tuition and fees	23	15	65	5	22	13	3	14	3	18	1

TABLE 11--Continued

Nature of problem	Number of students with problem	Student's reaction to way ombudsman handled problem				Did ombudsman do everything within his authority to help student with problem?		Would student:			
		Generally satisfied		Generally dissatisfied				Return to ombudsman with other problems?		Recommend ombudsman to other students?	
		N	%	N	%	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Academic status	15	12	80	3	20	10	0	11	1	14	0
Academic advice	21	17	81	3	14	14	3	15	1	20	0
Health center	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	1	0	1	1
Employment	11	7	64	1	9	9	2	10	1	10	0
Library	4	2	50	2	50	1	1	3	0	4	0
Grades	28	21	75	5	18	21	2	19	2	23	1
Other problems	53	36	68	12	23	34	5	44	2	49	0
Total	281[b]	190		67		176	36	209	16	244	8

[a]Neutral and uncertain responses do not appear in table. Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

[b]Greater than number of students surveyed because some students had multiple problems.

would return to the ombudsman with other problems and would recommend him to other students.

From a list of fourteen traits, students who had consulted the ombudsman selected "knowledge of campus operations and

TABLE 12

MOST IMPORTANT TRAITS A CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN SHOULD HAVE, AS CHOSEN BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968[a]

Most frequent first choices		Most frequent second choices		Most frequent third choices	
Trait	Times chosen	Trait	Times chosen	Trait	Times chosen
Knowledge of campus operations and regulations	44	Knowledge of campus operations and regulations	31	Knowledge of campus operations and regulations	40
Effectiveness	36	Understanding	29	Effectiveness	28
Understanding	32	Authority	24	Accessibility	25
Authority	22	Effectiveness	15	Understanding	21
Empathy	18	Accessibility	15		
Honesty	15				
Total	167		114		114

[a]In each column, only those traits chosen by 15 or more of the 218 respondents are listed.

regulations" as the most important trait he should have. It was the most frequent of first, second and third choices. The next two most frequent choices were understanding and effectiveness. Other highly rated traits were authority and accessibility.[1] All traits chosen by fifteen or more respondents are presented in Table 12.

Attitudes regarding selection and tenure of the campus ombudsman by students who have consulted him are summarized in Table 13. A non-teaching faculty member (administrator) was the first choice, receiving twice as much support as a teaching faculty member. Selection by administration, faculty and students was the favorite method for filling the position.[2] Unaided faculty selection was the least popular. Interviewed campus ombudsmen generally

---

[1]Of the 218 respondents, 52.7 per cent included knowledge among their first three choices. Other percentages were: understanding, 37.6; effectiveness, 36.2; authority, 21.1; and accessibility, 18.3.

[2]The preferred selection method may be interpreted as an endorsement of the system which was followed at Michigan State. The provost solicited nominations from deans, faculty members and student leaders. He and a student government selection committee placed the sixty-five names submitted in three categories: "recommended," "acceptable," and "not acceptable." A first recommendation and alternates were submitted to the university president, who then made his recommendation to the Board of Trustees. This is the process described in an untitled, undated mimeographed statement prepared by Rust, Michigan State University (revised in January, 1969), p. 3.

TABLE 13

ATTITUDES REGARDING SELECTION AND TENURE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN HELD BY STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, FALL TERM, 1968

The campus ombudsman should be a:			He should be selected by:			His term of office should be:		
	N	%		N	%		N	%
Teaching faculty member	42	20.0	Administration	8	3.7	Less than 2 years	9	4.8
			Students	19	8.9	2 years	22	11.6
Non-teaching faculty member (administrator)	84	40.0	Faculty	1	.5	More than 2 years	158	83.6
			Students and faculty	44	20.6	Total	189	
Professional student personnel worker	40	19.0	Students and administration	13	6.1			
Student	0	0						
Lawyer	11	5.2	Faculty and administration	21	9.8			
Campus minister	1	.5						
None of these	32	15.2	Administration, faculty and students	104	48.6			
Total	210							
			Some other group	4	1.9			
			Total	214				

agreed that a two-year term of office was sufficient. Students, by a five-to-one margin, favored a longer tenure.[1]

Responses to three other questions will be reported before turning to specific cases and comments. When asked where the ombudsman's office should be located, 41.4 per cent of 203 respondents chose the Student Services Building. The Administration Building was the next most popular choice. Least popular (7.9 per cent) was the Student Union. Two-thirds of the respondents thought the ombudsman helped alleviate student frustration and hostility. Of the remainder, 14 per cent did not think so and 19.6 per cent were uncertain. None of the surveyed students thought the functions of the ombudsman should be discontinued. Of 208 responses, 144 favored no change and 64 recommended changes.

Cases and Comments

The frustrations experienced by individual students in coping with the large university are not adequately expressed by counting

---

[1]Most students who recommended a term of office longer than two years considered effectiveness gained through experience as essential. A few typical comments convey this attitude: "Experience teaches him the ropes and how to handle odd situations." "The more experience this person has, the greater benefit to the person consulting him." "I feel that the more problems taken care of, the more efficient the Ombudsman." "It takes time to understand the loopholes." "The longer he serves, the better he knows the workings of the University." "I believe the longer he's in the job, the more aware he would be of how to cut through red tape." "Experience is definitely a requirement for efficient operation of this office."

and classifying their problems. Tables showing numbers and percentages of complaints and their disposition present only the surface features of student irritations and anxieties revealed to the campus ombudsman. In this section, a few specific cases are described in the students' own words. Student attitudes toward the ombudsman--both positive and negative--also are drawn from their questionnaire responses. The selected cases and comments provide further evidence of the diversity of student grievances and opinion at a "multiversity." All quoted statements were made by students who consulted the Michigan State ombudsman during the 1968 fall term and who subsequently responded to the survey questionnaire. Names are not revealed.

First, some student descriptions of their problems:

> My problem was really silly. I had received an F for a course I didn't take. After seeing 5 people who wouldn't believe me, I went to the ombudsman who solved the problem in 5 minutes. The reason I left MSU was that I hated red tape and belligerent administrative personnel. This makes an impersonal university even more so. Perhaps the ombudsman can do more to relieve this feeling.

> I was hardly here a month or so when I discovered I could not afford the ridiculous food prices in Owen Hall. I approached the manager of the hall and explained my financial distress; not only was he adamant about holding me to the contract, but he expressed a total lack of concern for my predicament. . . .
>
> I was quite distressed, especially since I would probably have to withdraw from school if not allowed to break the contract. It was then that I decided to take my case to Dr. Rust. . . .

. . . Once the application was sent on to the contract committee, I received word in less than a week that I had been released.

Although the entire process occupied a span of some two-three weeks, I blame the delay not on Dr. Rust, who was magnificent throughout, but on the slow-grinding wheels of bureaucracy. If I had had no recourse beyond the administration stumbling block, I would not be in school now. Furthermore, I am gratified to know that in an enormous university like this there is a least one person who cares.

My problem was that an additional fee was attached to my summer tuition AFTER I had completed the course. I was informed that the Schedule Book was in error as to the number of credits the course carried. The Ombudsman informed me that there was nothing he could do but that I should apply for fee reduction because the increased credits now made me eligible for that benefit. I did so and after some delay there was returned to me NOT the amount of fee reduction for which I was eligible, but the entire amount which I had paid for the added two credits. Those extra credits were dropped from my record. . . .

. . . trying to get the university to change my legal residence in order to receive grades and registration material. . . . I ran all over campus trying to find out who is responsible.

I had a question of when a final exam should be given since the time schedule listed 2 different class times as having the final at the same time and both instructors said that's when they were going to hold the exam. Since one cannot be in two places at the same time I called Dr. Rust to see if a correction to the time schedule had been published. He did not know but told me who to call in the Registrar's office. I called the Registrar's office and they said a mistake had been made and informed me of the correction.

. . . I purchased an H. P. R. fee receipt card from the cashier's window in the Administration building and lost it the same afternoon. Since I had made two copies when buying it and left one there I went back the next day to see if I could get a duplicate, and was told at the cashier's window that they did

> not keep the extra copy but sent it to another office . . . but that I would probably just have to buy a new one. After going to the indicated office, back to the cashier's window, back to the office, over to the I.M. building, and back to the office in the Administration building, I still had not found where the second copy of my fee receipt card was. Standing outside the Administration building rather frustrated and angry, I noticed I was just across the street from Morrill hall and decided to see Dr. Rust. He called up someone on the phone (he asked for the person by name) and immediately found the extra copy and told me to go back to a certain girl in the Administration building. When I got over there, a duplicate fee receipt card was waiting, and the girl informed me that as far as she knew, it was the first one ever issued at M.S.U. In all, I was rather impressed by the expediency with which the ombudsman was able to untangle the snarls a student can become enmeshed in when dealing with the bureaucracy of the University.

Other students expressed their enthusiasm for the personal touch and effectiveness of the ombudsman in more glowing terms. Here are a few examples:

> From my contact with the Ombudsman I believe it is one of the most important and useful offices in the University, and I have been in many of them in the 10 years I have spent here at MSU.
>
> . . . the OMBUDSMAN is one of the best things for <u>any</u> college campus. Many times, the student just doesn't get a fair break, and with the office of the Ombudsman, the student gets a second chance. . . .
>
> . . . This is . . . the finest possible assistance available in any type of large organization.
>
> Dr. Rust is the first administrator in this university who treated me like a person with feelings instead of just a student number. He listened to my gripes patiently--at no time was I rushed. . . .
>
> In an era of protest and dissatisfaction it was refreshing to try a constructive administrative channel and find it does

work. "Ombudding" . . . could be a real positive process for relieving student hostilities.

. . . Bureaucracy and computers cannot listen to explanations. A central office such as Dr. Rust's is effective as giving a feeling of someone personally interested in the student, a "last hope," and also I think it can offer significant suggestions about some of the problems encountered. . . . Maybe some of the ridiculous problems can be eliminated.

I see the Ombudsman . . . as working for understanding and unity among . . . students, faculty, and administrators.

. . . It was nice to know that out of 40,000 students there is time for one.

Appointment of an ombudsman was the best thing that's happened to MSU in years.

Long live the ombudsman.

Not all comments were positive, however. A few students were less favorably impressed with the ombudsman's services, and suggested changes. Here are some of their reactions:

The office as I see it now is just a figurehead. Dr. Rust either cannot or will not do anything to help students.

I think the ombudsman should treat the student with understanding and concern. I was confronted with a cold interview and did not feel comfortable. . . .

Get someone who is a bit more receptive to change.

The way the office seems to work now is not to really cut through the bureaucracy but to point the student back into it. It seems to be more an instrument to pacify the students than to really help them. What we don't need is another red tape tangled bureaucratic office.

I had hoped that the Ombudsman would be someone who could take <u>action</u> and not just say he would do something and not

do anything. But I got the typical run around from him. And it was a problem that required immediate action.

He monopolized the conversation and offered no real information about how I could alleviate the problems facing me. I was very disappointed in his defensive posture relative to University policies.

When I talked to the Ombudsman I felt that he was rude and sarcastic. My problem has since been completely solved but through no help of Mr. Rust.

Several students were bothered by the ombudsman's lack of authority to set aside rules and regulations or overrule previous decisions in order to solve their particular problems. A few of their comments reveal perceptions of the role quite different from that held by the ombudsman himself:

The ombudsman's office is a great idea but must . . . be given authority pervading the entire structure of the university.

This university has too many "cut and dried" rules and regulations. A student's problem should get individual attention and results, with exceptions made when necessary. As it is now, when there is a university ruling and a student's situation warrants him an exception to the rule, the student is lost and the Ombudsman cannot help.
Give the Ombudsman some "override" power.

With broader discretionary powers, Rust might effectively mediate between administration and student activists--much as Deans of Students often seek to do.

I found the ombudsman helpful in explaining <u>why</u> I couldn't get what I wanted, but not <u>how</u> I could possibly get it. I feel part of his job should be to help the students; not just to explain the administration's position.

A few comments were made regarding the need for more publicity about the office of ombudsman. These are typical:

> . . . If more students knew what the ombudsman is and how he can help a student, I'm sure many would seek his advice. The main problem is not many students know about this man.
>
> Perhaps Mr. Rust could get some additional publicity this year. . . . many students are unaware that his services are available.
>
> I hope that more people learn of this service--it needs more publicity. . . .

Rust has indicated that each time a feature story about his office appears in the campus newspaper, he notices an increase in complainants during the next few days.[1]

Summary

Students who consulted the ombudsman at Michigan State University during the 1968 fall term were generally characteristic of all students enrolled. All class ranks, student age groups, grade point averages and student housing types were represented. However, certain colleges were "over represented" and "under represented" in the proportions of students served by the ombudsman. Also on a proportional basis, underclassmen were generally "under represented" and upperclassmen "over represented." Male students and married students were "over represented" while female students and single students were "under represented."

---

[1] Rust, private interview held at Michigan State University, December 12, 1968.

The surveyed students most frequently cited the campus newspaper as their source of information about the ombudsman. Nearly half of them had taken their problems to two or more persons in authority before consulting the ombudsman. Most of them were able to see the ombudsman immediately or within a few minutes after arriving at his office, with or without an appointment. The ombudsman handled most problems in one hour or less. Graduate student problems generally required longer handling than freshman problems. Nearly half the students indicated that their problems were "completely solved"; one-third viewed their problems as "not solved at all." The highest percentage of students reported that the ombudsman helped them with their problems more than they expected, although nearly one-third replied "less than expected." Only thirteen of 207 respondents claimed to have experienced "unpleasant treatment" by anyone involved in their complaint after consulting the ombudsman.

Nearly three-fourths of the surveyed students would have consulted the ombudsman with their problems even if his records were open for public inspection. Wide differences appeared on the satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum regarding the way the ombudsman handled various kinds of problems. However, the students generally were satisfied that the ombudsman had done everything he

could to help them. Only a few would not return to the ombudsman with other problems or recommend him to other students. Traits selected by the students as most important for a campus ombudsman to have were, in descending order, knowledge of campus operations and regulations, understanding, effectiveness, authority and accessibility. A non-teaching faculty member (administrator) was their first choice for an ombudsman. The preferred method of filling the position was selection by administration, faculty and students. The survey respondents overwhelmingly favored a term of office extending beyond two years. The Student Services Building was the most popular choice for the location of the ombudsman's office. Two-thirds of the respondents thought the ombudsman helped alleviate student frustration and hostility. None thought the functions of the ombudsman should be discontinued, although nearly one-third recommended changes.

These and previous findings will be reviewed in the final chapter as research questions are reconsidered, conclusions drawn, and recommendations made.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter I fifteen research questions were presented as guides to the collection and analysis of information on the ombudsman in American higher education. Answers to those questions obtained from the study are summarized in this final chapter. In addition, conclusions are drawn and recommendations made.

Summary

The First Research Question

What are the characteristics of the campus ombudsman?

Drawing a profile of the campus ombudsman is difficult because of individual differences. Any generalized observation must be qualified because of exceptions. Yet there are certain characteristics shared by all or most of the six campus ombudsmen interviewed for this study. The following summary statements describing the "composite" campus ombudsman are based on those

findings. Taken together, they provide a more comprehensive description of the campus ombudsman than the preliminary definition which appears in Chapter I.

The primary responsibility of the campus ombudsman is to receive and help resolve individual student grievances at an institution of higher education. A secondary responsibility is to recommend ways of improving administrative and academic procedures in order to reduce the number and degree of student problems. He determines which complaints merit his consideration.

The campus ombudsman has spent a considerable length of time at his institution, where he has been a teaching faculty member and has advised students. He is identified with an academic discipline, in which he holds an advanced academic degree. He probably has not had professional preparation or experience in the law or in student personnel work. He regards his ombudsman role as a temporary assignment, not a career field. He reports to the officer or group which appointed him.

In conducting his activities, the campus ombudsman uses face-to-face contact more than any other form of communication. He has access to official files on the campus, except for classified records. He considers his own records as confidential. He may publicize his activities in various ways, but not individual cases

without permission from the students involved. He brings about changes in institutional policies and procedures as a result of his investigations and recommendations. He rarely conducts an investigation on his own initiative. He cannot on his own initiative reverse a decision or disregard an existing regulation. He does not have disciplinary power. His power rests in his personal prestige and persuasive ability. He states his views on a case to the persons concerned and possibly to their organizational superiors. His highest appeal to authority is to the president of the institution. He is auxiliary to, not a replacement for, existing campus functionaries.

The Second and Third Research Questions

How is the campus ombudsman selected?

To whom is the campus ombudsman responsible?

These questions are considered jointly because they are so closely related.

The campus ombudsman may be selected by students, faculty or administration--or any combination of those primary power groups--at his institution. If he is selected exclusively by one power group, he may be perceived as having loyalties and vested interests in that group. Regardless of which group or groups are involved in his selection, it is significant that the ombudsman is a

faculty member who returns to the faculty ranks after his term of office ends.

However the idea originates on a particular campus, two factors appear to be crucial in the establishment of the position. They are: (1) the method of selection, and (2) the person selected. The method of selection is important because the campus ombudsman normally is responsible to the appointing individual or body. The person selected is also an important consideration because the efficacy of the position develops from the prestige and style of the individual who fills it.

At Michigan State University, where the campus ombudsman has been relatively effective, his selection was broadly based, involving student, faculty and administrative leaders. The person chosen was a senior professor experienced in teaching, academic advising and administration. By contrast, at Macomb County Community College the president, acting alone, selected the ombudsman, who was himself a top-level administrator.

The arrangement at the University of California at Berkeley, where the ombudsman is a one-member committee of the Academic Senate, provides for independence and autonomy from the administration. However, there was no student representation in the selection process. White proved to be an able ombudsman at San Jose

State College because of his personal qualities but was hampered by a presidential appointment lacking formal student or faculty approval. By accepting a student government appointment as ombudsman at the University of Detroit, Davis became the students' advocate but also the students' servant.

The manner in which an institution of higher education appoints a campus ombudsman usually is consistent with its power emphasis. At Berkeley, with a tradition of strong faculty control in academic matters, the ombudsman was chosen by and reports to the Academic Senate. Since his jurisdiction is restricted to academic problems, neither students nor administrators had a voice in his selection. At Michigan State, where a tradition of administrative control is shifting, students and faculty were involved in the selection although the chief administrator made the final decision. At Eastern Montana College, where neither student nor faculty power has seriously challenged administrative authority, the president arbitrarily made the appointment.

In civil government, the ombudsman is normally appointed by the legislative branch to watch over the executive or administrative branch. He does not investigate legislative activity. A direct parallel cannot be drawn in higher education because neither the

faculty nor student governing bodies are equivalent to a national or state legislature and the administration is not fully comparable to the executive branch in representative government. These distinctions complicate the problem of selecting a campus ombudsman who is a part of, yet apart from, power groups involved in his investigations. Providing his salary from an outside source, such as a private foundation, might enable him to appear more independent, but would not solve the basic dilemma of selection and accountability.

The Fourth Research Question

What are the similarities and dissimilarities among various campus ombudsmen?

All six interviewed campus ombudsmen agreed that their basic responsibilities are to help individuals solve institutional problems and to seek institutional changes that will reduce individual problems. Operational styles differ according to which responsibility is uppermost in the mind of the ombudsman. The campus ombudsman who sees himself as a "catalyst," "change agent" or "activist" deviates from the civil government concept of ombudsman, which is essentially intended to make a system of

representative government function as it was designed to function rather than to restructure or replace that system.[1]

Similarities in characteristics, activities and attitudes of the six interviewed campus ombudsmen were described in Chapter III and in the answer to the first research question. Dissimilarities may be summarized as follows:

Campus ombudsmen represent a diversity of career fields and academic ranks. Some experienced a salary increase and/or higher status as a result of their appointment; others did not. Some are teaching part-time; others are not. Some process many complaints; others receive only a few. Some consider grievances from any person associated with his institution; others consider only student complaints. Some publicize their activities and circulate their reports more extensively than others. Some have experienced role conflict; others have not. Some identify with the "Establishment"; others do not. Some keep cumulative written records; others keep few records.

---

[1] Two authorities on the civil ombudsman, Gellhorn and Anderson, agree on this point. Gellhorn has written: ". . . an ombudsman is not a countervailing power in society. His criticisms alone cannot remake or undo malfunctioning governmental machinery." See Ombudsmen and Others, p. 192. Anderson has stated: ". . . the Ombudsman is only good for marginal deficiencies--correcting error, improving procedures, promptness, and politeness. If there is a basic inequity in the society, or something basically corrupt, the Ombudsman can't do a thing." See "An Ombudsman for the U.S.?" Center Diary: 14, p. 23.

The Fifth Research Question

What conditions and events have brought campus ombudsmen into existence on American college and university campuses?

This question was answered in the review of related literature in Chapter II and the description of campus ombudsman operations and proposals in Chapter III. To summarize, efforts to adapt the civil ombudsman idea to American higher education in the latter half of the 1960's reflected a general concern for individual rights in the large organization and a specific concern for student rights in the academic organization. At most institutions, the position was added during or after rapid enrollment growth and serious student protests: Student and faculty initiative or involvement were evident in nearly all instances, even where appointments were made by administrators. On a number of campuses, the ombudsman proposal first appeared along with other institutional reforms recommended by a special committee or commission of faculty, or faculty and students, or faculty, students and administrators. This was the case at Michigan State University, New York University, City College of the State University of New York and the University of Missouri at Columbia. The plan was successfully promoted by student leaders at San Diego State College and the University of Detroit. Direct presidential action established the position at such places as

Eastern Montana College, State University of New York at Stony Brook and San Jose State College.

Campus ombudsman developments in 1968 were greatly influenced by and patterned after those positions which had been established a year earlier. Proposals frequently referred to the Danish civil ombudsman model emphasizing "reasoned persuasion." Widely publicized and imitated were the positions at Michigan State, San Jose State and Stony Brook.

At some institutions, student protest became so turbulent that "mild" approaches for alleviating student grievances--such as a campus ombudsman--were inadequate to satisfy pressing demands. Thus, a campus ombudsman proposal at strike-plagued San Francisco State College in 1968 failed to materialize. Also, the campus ombudsman concept as defined in this study was bypassed at institutions where students were chosen to fill the position.

The Sixth Research Question

How prevalent is the ombudsman in American higher education?

As indicated in Chapter III, efforts to determine the number of campus ombudsmen in the United States as of December 31, 1968, were impeded by the absence of a central registry, the multiplicity of institutions, unanswered inquiries and the innovation's rapid

spread. Fourteen colleges and universities were known to have had full-time or part-time ombudsmen prior to 1969--and possibly five other western colleges and universities. At least sixteen more were considering the innovation. The remarkable flexibility of the campus ombudsman concept is evidenced in the wide range of institutions which have adopted it. They include colleges and universities that are large and small, public and private, old and new, eastern and western, graduate and two-year, urban and non-urban, conservative and liberal, and comparatively well-known and unknown.

The Seventh Research Question

What kinds of grievances do students bring to the campus ombudsman?

Student grievances can be classified broadly as "academic" and "non-academic," with several sub-categories under each. Academic problems include registration and admission, academic requirements, quality of instruction, tuition and fees, academic status, academic advice and grades. Non-academic problems include traffic regulations, financial need, housing, use of facilities and services, health center, employment and library.

Campus ombudsmen have encountered two major difficulties in classifying student grievances. One concerns the number of special problems that do not readily fit into any prescribed category.

Examples are inability to get a mailing address changed, abusive language by a university employee, racial discrimination in selecting members for a campus organization, and refusal by a university bookstore to make a refund. The other concerns the number of complaints that fit into two or more categories. For example, if a student claims he has been unjustly fired from a campus job he needs to pay for his room and board, should the problem be classified as financial need, housing or employment--or all three?[1]

All six interviewed ombudsmen were surprised by the diversity and complexity of student grievances brought to them. Some problems were beyond the competence of the ombudsman, requiring professional legal, psychiatric or medical attention.

The Eighth Research Question

What are the characteristics of students who consult the campus ombudsman?

All class ranks, student age groups, and grade point and student housing categories at Michigan State University were represented by students who consulted that institution's ombudsman during the 1968 fall term. However, on a proportional basis, upperclassmen,

---

[1]Rust described the complaint classification problem in his first report to the president at Michigan State University, "The Report of the University Ombudsman to the President for the School Year, 1967-1968," pp. 7-8.

male students and married students were more inclined to consult the ombudsman while underclassmen, female students and single students were less inclined. Also on a proportional basis, students from certain colleges--particularly Arts and Letters and University College--were "over represented" in the ombudsman's office while students from other colleges--particularly Education and Natural Science--were "under represented."

The Ninth Research Question

What are the similarities and dissimilarities of the campus ombudsman and the civil ombudsman?

Both the campus ombudsman and the civil ombudsman are professional persons, experienced in scholarship and public service. Both are appointed rather than elected to office. Both attempt to redress personal grievances and to improve administration. Both rely heavily on prestige and persuasion to attain their ends. Both make recommendations but neither can reverse decisions. Neither has disciplinary nor enforcement powers. Both are readily accessible to complainants. Both report to the body which appointed them, yet maintain independence from that body. Both decide which cases they will pursue. Both work in a relatively stable system of government supported and trusted by most of the people most of the time.

Both can bring about procedural review within an administrative agency. Neither functions in a formal, judicial manner.

By contrast, the scope of the campus ombudsman's services is far more restricted than that of the civil ombudsman. The campus ombudsman usually serves only student complainants at one institution of higher education while the civil ombudsman serves all citizens of a nation or state. The campus ombudsman is less likely to conduct investigations on his own initiative than is the civil ombudsman. The campus ombudsman normally works alone or with minimal assistance; the civil ombudsman has a staff. The campus ombudsman probably does not have formal legal training; the civil ombudsman usually is a jurist or a lawyer. The campus ombudsman is more likely to serve a shorter term of office than the civil ombudsman. Most complaints are conveyed to the campus ombudsman in person and to the civil ombudsman by mail. The position of civil ombudsman is more prestigious than the position of campus ombudsman.

The Tenth Research Question

What are the similarities and dissimilarities of the campus ombudsman and other college and university functionaries?

Assigned responsibilities and operational procedures distinguish the campus ombudsman from other functionaries in higher

education. The administrative officer he most closely resembles is the dean or vice president for student affairs. Both are appointed officers who attempt to help students solve their problems. Yet there are some basic differences. For one, the chief student affairs officer coordinates a staff of assistant deans, counselors, housing directors and other professional student personnel workers. The ombudsman, by contrast, has no staff to supervise. Except for a secretary, he usually works alone.

Another difference is that while the chief student affairs officer is concerned with student growth and development, the main thrust of his responsibility is in the non-academic or co-curricular area. Student problems involving specific courses and professors as well as other academic concerns are generally not considered to be within the purview of the student affairs office. By considering both academic and non-academic problems, the ombudsman covers a broader range of student concerns than the chief student affairs officer.

Still another difference is that the chief student affairs officer is involved--directly or indirectly--in student disciplinary matters. On most campuses, enforcement of rules and regulations is his ultimate responsibility. The ombudsman, on the other hand, has no disciplinary or enforcement powers.

Finally, the campus ombudsman has more investigatory authority than the chief student affairs officer in certain sensitive areas, such as a student complaint against a teaching faculty member. Also, the ombudsman may investigate complaints directed against the student affairs office. The chief student affairs officer does not have reciprocal investigatory authority regarding the ombudsman's office.

More than any other functionary, the professional student personnel worker is likely to regard the campus ombudsman as an encroachment, a nuisance or even a threat. Clifford's objection to an ombudsman and his contention that the ombudsman's role should be assumed by the chief student affairs officer[1] ignores two important considerations. One is the conflict that exists between faculty and student personnel staff at most colleges and universities. Chief student affairs officers often are held in relatively low esteem by teaching faculty.[2] The ombudsman, on the other hand, is an academic colleague. The other consideration is the fact that student discipline is usually one of the responsibilities of the chief student

---

[1] Clifford, "Second Thoughts on the Ombudsman in Higher Education," pp. 4-5.

[2] See Kauffman, "The Student in Higher Education," p. 153, and T. Roger Nudd, "The Dean Is a Marginal Man," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXV (December, 1961), 145-51.

affairs officer. Consequently, he is often regarded with suspicion or resentment by students.[1] The ombudsman is free of that stigma.

Another position which resembles the campus ombudsman in some respects is that of college chaplain or campus minister. Stroup has pointed out that the college chaplain tends to be a "middle man" readily accessible to those with complaints. If he is highly skilled, he may succeed both in maintaining the confidence of those who complain and those to whom the complaints are addressed.[2] For these and other reasons, White has proposed that campus ministers be considered for campus ombudsman posts.[3] The main distinction here is that the campus ombudsman usually comes from and returns to the faculty ranks whereas the campus minister is not considered a colleague. Also, the minister's identification with a particular religious faith or denomination might limit his effectiveness on a campus where religious affiliations are diverse.

---

[1]Kauffman, "The Student in Higher Education," p. 156, and Nudd, "The Dean Is a Marginal Man," p. 146. Also see Peter H. Armacost, "Faculty-Student Personnel Relationships: A House Divided," NASPA--Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, II (January, 1965), 8.

[2]Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, pp. 182-83.

[3]White, "The Ombudsman in Higher Education," pp. 96-110.

The Eleventh Research Question

How does the campus ombudsman assess his effectiveness?

All but one of the six interviewed campus ombudsmen believe their activities have helped alleviate student frustration and hostility. All consider good relationships with students as a prime qualification for the position. All but one feel that the ombudsman may grow less effective after two years in office. Four of the six believe their office will be in existence ten years hence; two are uncertain. Both Rust at Michigan State and Norman at San Diego State have estimated that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the complaints brought to them during their first year in office were settled to the students' satisfaction.[1] White also has made a favorable assessment of his effectiveness at San Jose State.[2] However, none of the six has attempted to measure his effectiveness by systematically sampling students who have consulted him.

---

[1] Brill, "Ombudsman's Power Helps Students," Michigan State News, October 30, 1968, p. 1. Norman, The Ombudsman: A New Bird on Campus, p. 6.

[2] White, "The Ombudsman in Higher Education," pp. 72-73.

The Twelfth Research Question

How do students who consult the campus ombudsman assess his effectiveness?

Surveyed students who consulted the campus ombudsman during the 1968 fall term at Michigan State University generally regarded the ombudsman as effective in helping them overcome institutional obstacles. Two-thirds of them felt that he was instrumental in relieving student frustration and hostility. Nearly half of them already had taken their problems to two or more persons in authority before consulting the ombudsman. Most students who consulted the ombudsman were satisfied that he had done everything within his authority to help them. Therefore, they would return to him with other problems and recommend him to other students. Their assessment is summarized at the end of Chapter IV.

The Thirteenth Research Question

Do students who consult the campus ombudsman experience retaliation from those involved in their grievances?

Only thirteen of 207 students who consulted the ombudsman during the 1968 fall term at Michigan State University later experienced "unpleasant treatment" by anyone involved in their complaint. No cases of severe retribution were reported. More detailed information appears in Chapter IV.

The Fourteenth Research Question

Is confidentiality important to students who consult the campus ombudsman?

Nearly three-fourths of 216 students who consulted the ombudsman during the 1968 fall term at Michigan State University would not have been deterred if his records were open for inspection by anyone. Of the remaining one-fourth, twenty-seven students would have been deterred and thirty were uncertain. The indication is that most students are unconcerned about confidentiality. However, those students who are concerned will not bring their problems to the ombudsman without the assurance of privacy. More detailed information appears in Chapter IV.

The Fifteenth Research Question

Can a model be developed for campus ombudsmen to follow, with modifications to meet the specific needs of their institution?

The six interviewed campus ombudsmen do not agree that a model can be developed that is applicable to all institutions of higher education. Norman, for example, has stated that because there is no model ombudsman, "each practitioner must fit the particular needs of students at his university."[1] Rust, on the other

---

[1]Norman, The Ombudsman: A New Bird on Campus, p. 1.

hand, believes that his operational procedures are applicable to any university campus. He has circulated numerous copies of a brochure describing those procedures and has seen them followed elsewhere. Schlossberg has emphasized the need for a campus ombudsman model before the concept becomes too "bastardized."[1]

When the first campus ombudsmen looked for a model, they turned to the Danish civil ombudsman, making necessary adjustments to fit their college or university. Generally, campus ombudsmen who have followed that model have been more effective than those who have accepted the office without carefully considering its origin and role in civil government.

The model suggested here is that of the Danish civil ombudsman adjusted to the organizational "climate" of the modern American institution of higher education. It closely resembles the office of ombudsman at Michigan State University because no other large university has yet equaled that institution in effectively transferring the civil government concept to the academic scene. The features listed are considered essential to the proper functioning of a campus ombudsman operation:

---

[1]Schlossberg, "The Ombudsman in Current Status and Theory," unpublished speech delivered at meeting on ombudsman in higher education in Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968, p. 5.

1. The institution with a campus ombudsman should have an organizational structure which is relatively stable, supported and trusted by most of the people within it most of the time.

2. The office of ombudsman should be equivalent in salary and prestige to that of high-level academic and administrative positions.

3. The campus ombudsman should be a long-time faculty member at the institution, experienced in teaching and advising, and highly respected by students, colleagues and administrators. Regardless of his academic discipline, he should have some rudimentary knowledge of the law and should become thoroughly acquainted with the civil ombudsman concept.

4. He should be carefully selected by a committee representing students, faculty and administration. The actual appointment should be made or confirmed by the governing board of the institution upon the recommendation of its chief administrative officer.

5. He should be appointed for a two-year term of office, renewable by mutual agreement of the ombudsman and the selection committee.

6. He should make periodic reports of a general nature that are widely publicized to all members of the institution. He also may make confidential reports with recommendations to the chief administrative officer, who should determine the extent of their circulation.

7. While serving as ombudsman, he should not be required to teach courses or perform other faculty duties.

8. He should have a private office separate from the main administration building and easily accessible to students. He should have a secretary but not a staff.

9. He should be receptive to individual student grievances concerning the institution, both of an academic and non-academic nature. He should decide which complaints are within his jurisdiction and competence and which of those merit his investigation.

10. He should use reasoned persuasion to bring about redress of genuine student grievances as expeditiously and equitably as possible.

11. Where a pattern of student grievances develops, he should work for a change in regulations, procedures or personnel to prevent such problems from recurring.

12. He should not conduct investigations on his own initiative but rather in response to student complaints.

13. He should have access to all campus offices and files, except medical, psychological and government-classified records.

14. He should keep written records on each case he considers and those records should be confidential.

15. When rebuffed in the course of an investigation, he should have the authority to appeal to the chief administrative officer for intervention.

16. He should not have authority to take disciplinary action, reverse decisions or circumvent regulations. His power should lie in his prestige, persuasiveness and persistence in stating his views to persons involved in a grievance and, if necessary, to their organizational superiors.

17. The campus ombudsman should supplement, not supercede, other means of redress for student grievances.

18. Decisions on whether to continue the office should be based on systematic sampling of students who have consulted the ombudsman.

Few non-teaching roles in higher education are as demanding--yet allow as much latitude for individual style and personality--as that of ombudsman. He seems to perform best where he has a specific mandate, vague guidelines and broad support. Although the

campus ombudsman can influence improvements in institutional policies and procedures, much of his day-to-day activity is individual case work whose results are long-term and cumulative, and therefore difficult to assess.

Conclusions

Although the ombudsman concept is well-established in civil government, it is still an innovation and an experiment in American higher education. Regarded as a fad and a threat by some faculty and administrators, the concept is receiving much of its initial support from students. Sanford has deplored the tendency of the collective faculty to resist innovation,[1] which Rourke and Brooks maintain does not reflect so much a lack of vision or a defense of vested interests as a belief that higher education "could easily be damaged by administrative innovations which might be perfectly acceptable in other types of organizations."[2] Lutz has encouraged the university to recognize that the only way to avoid disruptive change is to provide channels for student grievances so that the nature and sources of the grievances can be discovered and the "system" made

---

[1] Sanford, ed., The American College, pp. 19-21.

[2] Rourke and Brooks, The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education, p. 1.

more responsive and accessible.[1] Looking ahead to 1980, Sanford has predicted that colleges or universities whose authorities can listen to students and adapt in reasonable ways to reasonable demands will avoid serious trouble. "The next 12 years will be a period of much experimentation and innovation on college campuses," he added.[2]

As with any innovation, the position of campus ombudsman is more likely to be accepted if it is perceived as a supplement rather than a threat to existing practice. As Miles has pointed out, innovations which can be added to a program without seriously disturbing other parts of it are likely to be adopted.[3] Kerr also has noted that in the university change "comes more through spawning the new than reforming the old."[4] Evans has indicated that the degree of acceptance of an innovation by professors may partly depend on whether they view the innovation as being instituted or imposed by the university administration or whether they feel that

---

[1]Robert Lutz, "Comment," Denver Law Journal, XLV (Special, 1968), 576-77.

[2]Sanford, "The College Student of 1980," *in* Campus 1980, p. 197.

[3]M. B. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 638.

[4]Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 102.

it originated as a result of their own planning.[1] The same observation probably holds true for students. Another factor is that some institutions, more than others, provide a more receptive social climate for the introduction and acceptance of innovations.[2]

Rogers has listed five characteristics which, when viewed from the standpoint of individual or group perceptions, past research has found to affect the rate of adoption of an innovation. They are: (1) relative advantage, (2) compatibility, (3) complexity, (4) divisibility, and (5) communicability. The individual determines relative advantage largely on the basis of whether he thinks the proposed innovation will improve the existing situation. Compatibility concerns the degree to which potential adopters feel it is consistent with their values and experiences. The most frequent divisibility that potential adopters employ is that of limited adoption, "which by not requiring wholehearted acceptance of an innovation leaves the way open to return to an older idea at any time."[3] If carefully introduced and implemented, the campus ombudsman concept has features which favor a rapid rate of adoption.

---

[1] Evans, Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education, p. 153.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

The testing period for the campus ombudsman concept has not ended; it has just begun. Its place or permanence in the organizational structure of the university is not fully established. During the next few years, many more colleges and universities are likely to "try out" the position. As with most ideas borrowed from government by higher education, the concept may undergo additional changes to make it more workable and acceptable within the academic institution. The spread of the ombudsman idea in higher education will be closely tied to its rate of adoption in civil government.

To the extent that the campus ombudsman is perceived as a temporary expedient--a "gimmick"--in higher education, his continuation is in doubt. To the extent that he is regarded as a permanent addition performing necessary functions, his stability is assured. Thus, each institution would be well advised to study the ombudsman concept and its implications carefully before deciding whether to adopt it.

It is a mistake for an institution to expect too much of its campus ombudsman. Even when performing effectively, he is not capable of warding off major student confrontations of a political nature challenging the organizational structure of the institution. A campus ombudsman, for example, would not have prevented student

uprisings on the scale of those at Berkeley, Columbia and San Francisco State. He relieves student pressures and frustrations, he improves administration, but he does not put down mass student rebellions.

Recommendations

Most research endeavors end with a plea for further investigation. This study is no exception. Although a great deal of information has been presented on these pages, the emphasis on Michigan State University leaves unanswered many questions about student and faculty reaction to the campus ombudsman at other institutions. Comparative studies would provide a more comprehensive view. Also, personal interviews with campus ombudsmen other than the six selected for this investigation would enlarge the "composite" picture of this new functionary in American higher education. In addition, a systematic study needs to be made of student ombudsmen and other alternate methods for redressing student grievances. Finally, an international survey might reveal that colleges and universities in nations other than the United States also are experimenting with the ombudsman concept. Because of national interest in the civil ombudsman in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and Western Europe, universities in those parts of the world are perhaps the institutions most likely to be involved in such experimentation.

These suggestions for further research are tied to the underlying reason for conducting this study--the pressing need for more information. Hopefully, the step taken here will lead to more steps toward a better understanding of the significance of the ombudsman in American higher education.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Sources

Books

Aaron, Thomas J. The Control of Police Discretion: The Danish Experience. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966.

Anderson, Stanley V. Canadian Ombudsman Proposals. Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1966.

_____, ed. Ombudsmen for American Government? Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Barzun, Jacques. The American University. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Thomas, Edwin J. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1967.

Boulding, Kenneth E. The Organizational Revolution. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

Brookover, Wilbur B., et al. The College Student. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.

Chambers, M. M. The Colleges and the Courts, 1962-1966. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Copp, James H., ed. Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.

Corson, John C. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Dennis, Lawrence E., and Kauffman, Joseph F., eds. The College and the Student. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

DeVane, William C. Higher Education in Twentieth-Century America. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Dimock, Marshall E. Administrative Vitality. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Downs, Anthony. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

Draper, Hal. Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Eurich, Alvin C., ed. Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Evans, Richard I. Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Festinger, Leon, and Katz, Daniel, eds. Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Freedman, Mervin A. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1967.

Gardner, John W. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Gellhorn, Walter. Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

_____. When Americans Complain: Governmental Grievance Procedures. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Gorovitz, Samuel, ed. Freedom and Order in the University. Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1967.

Gross, Neil; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Kahn, Robert L.; Wolfe, Donald M.; Quinn, Robert P.; Snoek, J. D.; and Rosenthal, Robert A. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Katz, Joseph, et al. No Time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Lindzey, Gardner, ed. Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. I. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.

Lineberry, William P., ed. Colleges at the Crossroads. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1966.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther, and Estrin, Herman A., eds. The American Student and His College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.

March, James G., ed. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

Martin, Roscoe C., ed. Public Administration and Democracy. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1965.

Mayhew, Lewis B., ed. Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1967.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Michigan State University: Catalog of Courses and Academic Programs. East Lansing: Michigan State University Publication, LXIII, December, 1968.

Miles, M. B., ed. Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Miller, Michael V., and Gilmore, Susan, eds. Revolution at Berkeley. New York: Dial Press, 1965.

Millett, John D. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Morison, Robert S., ed. The Contemporary University: U.S.A. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Perkins, James A. The University in Transition. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Pervin, Lawrence A.; Reik, Louis E.; and Dalrymple, Willard, eds. The College Dropout and the Utilization of Talent. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Research in Higher Education: Guide to Institutional Decisions. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

Robson, William A. The Governors and the Governed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

Rourke, Francis E., and Brooks, Glenn E. The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Rowat, Donald C., ed. The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1965.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Ruml, Beardsley. Memo to a College Trustee. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Sawer, Geoffrey. Ombudsmen. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1964.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. Stress and Campus Response. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1968.

Stoke, Harold W. The American College President. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: Free Press, 1966.

The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.

The Study of Academic Administration (8 articles). Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Utley, T. E. Occasion for Ombudsman. London: Christopher Johnson, 1961.

Von Hoffman, Nicholas. The Multiversity. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Whyatt, Sir John, ed. The Citizen and the Administration: The Redress of Grievances. London: Justice--British Section of the International Commission of Jurists, 1961.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Wise, W. Max. They Come for the Best of Reasons. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958.

Woodring, Paul. The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968.

Bulletins and Announcements

Anderson, Stanley V. "Ombudsman Proposals: Stimulus to Inquiry." Public Affairs Report. Bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies. University of California at Berkeley, VII, December, 1966.

_____. "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration." Public Affairs Report. Bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies. University of California at Berkeley, VI, April, 1965.

Announcement of Position: Ombudsman. Fresno, Calif.: Fresno State College, December 26, 1968.

"Announcement I - Ombudsman." Info from the Office of the President. Eastern Montana College, October 7, 1966, pp. 2-3.

"Dean for Faculty Counsel (Ombudsman)." Special Bulletin. Office of the President, Kent State University, January 8, 1969.

Havel, James T. "The Ombudsman." Your Government. Bulletin of the Governmental Research Center. University of Kansas, Lawrence, XXIII, January 15, 1968, 1-3.

Pazen, Dick. "Ombudsman." Informational Bulletin 67-6. Madison, Wis.: Legislative Reference Bureau, State of Wisconsin, April, 1967.

Journal and Magazine Articles

Abraham, Henry J. "A People's Watchdog Against the Abuse of Power." Public Administration Review, XX (Summer, 1960), 152-57.

Anderman, Steven D. "The Swedish Justitieombudsman." American Journal of Comparative Law, XI (Spring, 1962), 225-38.

Anderson, Stanley V. "Connecticut Ombudsman?" Case and Comment, LXX (March-April, 1965), 1-8.

_____. "The Scandinavian Ombudsman." American Scandinavian Review, LII (December, 1964), 403-9.

_____; Buchanan, Scott; Hoffman, Hallock; and Hutchins, Robert M. "An Ombudsman for the U. S.?" Center Diary: 14, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., (September-October, 1966), pp. 19-25.

Andren, Nils. "The Swedish Office of 'Ombudsman.'" Municipal Review, XXXIII (1962), 820-21.

Armacost, Peter H. "Faculty-Student Personnel Relationships: A House Divided." NASPA--Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, II (January, 1965), 3-9.

Ascher, Charles S. "The Grievance Man or Ombudsmania." Public Administration Review, XXVII (June, 1967), 174-78.

Bexelius, Alfred. "The Ombudsman's Office and Other Means for Protecting Citizens' Rights in Sweden." International Social Science Journal, XVIII (No. 2), 247-51.

_____. "The Swedish Institution of the Justitieombudsman." International Review of Administrative Sciences, XXVII (1961), 243-56.

_____, and Powles, Sir Guy. "The Ombudsman: Champion of the Citizen." Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, XXI (June, 1966), 385-411.

Blaustein, Albert P. "Creating the University Ombudsman." Journal of Legal Education, XXI (December, 1968), 191.

Bloustein, Edward J. "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges." Liberal Education, LIV (October, 1968), 345-64.

Bolang, Carl Olaf. "But the Ombudsman Thought Otherwise." American-Swedish Monthly, LVII (July, 1963), 22-24.

Brann, James W. "The Campus Ombudsman: College Students' Defender." Chronicle of Higher Education, III (November 11, 1968), 1, 4.

"Britain: Tough Cheese." Newsweek, LXXI (January 8, 1968), 32.

Buccieri, Claudia H. "Ombudsman: New Troubleshooter on Campus." College and University Business, XLIV (March, 1968), 52-55.

"Bureaucrats' Bugbear." Newsweek, LXVI (October 25, 1965), 54.

"The Campus Ombudsman." Nation, CCVII (December 9, 1968), 611-12.

Capozzola, John M. "An American Ombudsman: Problems and Prospects." Western Political Quarterly, XXI (June, 1968), 289-301.

Carter, L. J. "Student Unrest: Administrators Seek Ways to Restore Peace." Science, CLX (June 14, 1968), 1205-8.

Christensen, Bent. "The Danish Ombudsman." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (June, 1961), 1100-26.

"A Civilized Thing." The New Yorker, XL (February 13, 1965), 136+.

Cooper, Frank E. "The Need for an Ombudsman in State Government." Prospectus, I (April, 1968), 27-44.

Davis, Kenneth C. "Ombudsmen in America: Officers to Criticize Administrative Action." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (June, 1961), 1057-76.

De Smith, S. A. "Anglo-Saxon Ombudsman?" Political Quarterly (London), XXXIII (January-March, 1962), 9-19.

Eddy, John Paul. "Campus Ombudsman in American Higher Education." Kappa Delta Pi Record, December, 1968, pp. 33-35.

Egan, James. "Ombudsman." Holiday, XL (November, 1966), 28+.

Eller, J. N. "Swedes Have It, An Ombudsman." America, CXIV (March 19, 1966), 377.

Farley, Marta Pisetska, and Farley, Andrew N. "An American Ombudsman: Due Process in the Administrative State." Administrative Law Review, XVI (Summer, 1964), 212-21.

"First University Ombudsman." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (November, 1967), 142.

Flack, Michael J. "Innovation and the University in Crisis: Three Proposals." Educational Record, XLIX (Summer, 1968), 347-49.

Frampton, Geoffrey. "The Ombudsman." New Statesman, LXVI (October 25, 1963), 560-61.

Friedmann, Karl A. "Commons, Complaints and the Ombudsman." Parliamentary Affairs (London), XXI (Winter, 1967-68), 38-47.

Gellhorn, Walter. "The Ombudsman's Relevance to American Municipal Affairs." American Bar Association Journal, LIV (February, 1968), 134-40.

_____. "The Swedish Justitieombudsman." Yale Law Journal, LXXV (November, 1965), 2-58.

Glazer, Nathan. "'Student Power' in Berkeley." The Public Interest, XIII (Fall, 1968), 3-21.

"Grievance Man v. Bureaucracy." Time, LXXX (August 24, 1962), 20.

Grossman, Howard J. "Do School Districts Need an Ombudsman." American School Board Journal, CLV (December, 1967), 6-7.

Hamilton, Randy H. "Can You Fight City Hall and Win?" Public Management, XLIX (October, 1967), 268-75.

_____. "Ombudsman or What?" National Civic Review, LVII (March, 1968), 132-37+.

_____. "Ombudsman: What He Can and Cannot Do." American City, LXXXIII (May, 1968), 40, 44.

"Handling the People's Grievances." Christian Century, LXXXII (October 27, 1965), 1310-11.

Henderson, Algo D. "The Desired Influence." Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (June, 1967), 304-11.

Hogan, Charles. "Proposers of Reform." Saturday Review, L (January 7, 1967), 37-38.

Hurwitz, Stephan. "Denmark's Ombudsman: The Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil and Military Government Administration." Wisconsin Law Review, March, 1961, pp. 169-99.

Jagerskiold, Stig. "The Swedish Ombudsman." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (June, 1961), 1077-99.

Kass, Benny L. "We Can, Indeed, Fight City Hall: The Office and Concept of Ombudsman." American Bar Association Journal, LIII (March, 1967), 231-36.

Kauffman, Joseph F. "Student Personnel Administration: Some Questions and Recommendations." Educational Record, XLV (Summer, 1964), 291-98.

Katz, Joseph, and Sanford, Nevitt. "The New Student Power and Needed Educational Reforms." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (April, 1966), 397-401.

Kent, George. "They Fight City Hall--And Win." Reader's Digest, LXXXIII (July, 1963), 29-30+.

Kruszynski, Eugene. "An Ombudsman for Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan, L (November, 1968), 155-58.

Lefolii, Ken. "What the Right Ombudsman Would Do for Canada." Maclean's (Toronto), LXXVII (April 18, 1964), 6.

Levine, Daniel U. "Organizing for Reform in Big-City Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (March, 1967), 311-15.

"Little Man's Champion." Newsweek, LXVIII (December 12, 1966), 28, 33.

Long, Edward V. "Public Defender." New York Times Book Review, LXXI (November 27, 1966), 54+.

McKeown, Robert. "Why Canada Needs an Ombudsman." Weekend Magazine, XIV, 2-3, 24.

"MSU Appoints Dean As First Ombudsman." American School and University, XL (October, 1967), 58.

Moore, Wilbert E. "Forecasting the Future: The United States in 1980." Educational Record, XLV (Fall, 1964), 341-54.

Moran, William E. "The Study of University Organizations." Journal of Higher Education, XXXIX (March, 1968), 144-51.

Mueller, Kate. "Three Dilemmas of the Student Personnel Profession and Their Resolutions." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIX (Winter, 1966), 86-90.

Mundell, D. W. "Ombudsman for Canada?" Canadian Bar Journal, VII (June, 1964), 179-209.

Mundinger, Donald C. "The University Ombudsman." Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (December, 1967), 493-99.

Nader, Ralph. "An Answer to Administrative Abuse." Harvard Law Record, December 20, 1962, pp. 13, 15.

Nelson, Bryce. "Student Power: Demands for Change at Stony Brook's 'Talk-In.'" Science, CLXII (November 1, 1968), 545-48.

Norton-Taylor, Duncan. "Megaversity's Struggle with Itself." Fortune, LXXV (May, 1967), 161-65.

Nudd, T. Roger. "The Dean Is a Marginal Man." Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXV (December, 1961), 145-51.

"The Ombudsman: A Symposium." Administrative Law Review, XIX (November, 1966), 6-106.

"Ombudsman, Anyone?" National Review, XIII (August 28, 1962), 129.

"Ombudsman at Berkeley." Phi Delta Kappan, L (January, 1969), 307.

"Ombudsman at Work." Economist (London), CCIII (June 23, 1962), 1222.

"Ombudsman--On The Move." Public Management, XLIX (October, 1967), 267.

"Ombudsman--The People's Champion." American Bar Association Journal, LIII (January, 1967), 48-49.

"Ombudsmen in America." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (June, 1961), 1057.

O'Neill, David P. "The New Zealand Ombudsman." America, CXII (January 30, 1965), 166-68.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Academic System: A Sociologist's View." The Public Interest, XIII (Fall, 1968), 173-97.

Peel, Roy V., ed. "The Ombudsman or Citizen's Defender: A Modern Institution" (14 articles). The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXXVII (May, 1968), i-138.

"The People's Watchdog." Time, LXXXVIII (December 2, 1966), 58+.

Pollack, Jack H. "O-M-B-U-D-S-M-A-N! The New College Hero." Parade, March 17, 1968, pp. 16-18.

Potthoff, E. H. "An 'Ombudsman,' U.S. Style." American City, LXXXIII (July, 1968), 152, 154-55.

Powles, Sir Guy. "A Citizen's Rights Against the Modern State, and Its Responsibilities to Him." New Zealand Journal of Public Administration, XXVI (March, 1964), 1-33.

_____. "Aspects of the Search for Administrative Justice with Particular Reference to the New Zealand Ombudsman." Canadian Public Administration, IX (June, 1966), 133-57.

Quade, Quentin L., and Bennett, Thomas J. "Shield for the Citizen." Modern Age, VIII (Fall, 1964), 377-88.

Reuss, Henry S. "An American Ombudsman?" Public Management, XLIX (October, 1967), 265-67.

_____. "An 'Ombudsman' for America." New York Times Magazine, September 13, 1964, pp. 30+.

_____. "A Trouble-Shooter for Congress." Progressive, XXX (February, 1966), 23-25.

_____. "We Need an American Ombudsman." Christian Century, LXXXII (March 3, 1965), 269-71.

_____, and Anderson, Stanley V. "The Ombudsman: Tribune of the People." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCLXIII (January, 1966), 44-51.

Rogers, Everett M. "The Communication of Innovations in a Complex Institution." Educational Record, XLIX (Winter, 1968), 67-77.

Rosenthal, Albert H. "The Ombudsman--Swedish 'Grievance Man.'" Public Administration Review, XXIV (December, 1964), 226-30.

Rowat, Donald C. "An Ombudsman Scheme for Canada." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXVIII (November, 1962), 543-56.

_____. "Ombudsmen for North America." Public Administration Review, XXIV (December, 1964), 230-33.

_____. "Recent Developments in Ombudsmanship." Canadian Public Administration, X (March, 1967), 35-46.

_____. "We Need a New Defense Against So-Called Justice." Maclean's (Toronto), LXXIV (January 7, 1961), 10, 82-83.

Sanders, M. K. "Sweden's Remedy for Police Brutality." Harper's, CCXXIX (November, 1964), 132+.

Sandler, Ake. "The Ombudsman: What Is He? Is He Needed? Who Will Benefit?" Vital Issues, XVII, February, 1968.

_____; Kirk, Henry P.; and Hallberg, Edmond C. "An Ombudsman for the University." Journal of College Student Personnel, IX (March, 1968), 112-15.

"Savannah's 'Ombudsman.'" American City, LXXXII (June, 1968), 70.

Schlossberg, Nancy K. "An Ombudsman for Students." NASPA--Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, V (July, 1967), 31-33.

Sheppard, Claude-Armand. "An Ombudsman for Canada." McGill Law Journal, X (No. 4, 1964), 291-340.

Silver, Isidore. "The Corporate Ombudsman." Harvard Business Review, XLV (May-June, 1967), 77-87.

Singletary, Otis A., and Yegge, Robert B., eds. "Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships" (7 articles, 12 comments). Denver Law Journal, XLV (Special, 1968), 497-678.

Smith, Austin. "What This Country Needs Is An Ombudsman." Association Management, XV (1963), 40-42.

Sparzo, Frank J. "Facing the Issues of Student Unrest." School & Society, XCVI (October 26, 1968), 359-61.

"A State Statute to Create the Office of Ombudsman." Harvard Journal on Legislation, II (June, 1965), 213-38.

Storing, James A. "The Norwegian Ombudsman for Civil Affairs: The First Three Years, 1963-66." Western Political Quarterly, XXI (June, 1968), 302-24.

Thorson, Kim. "What About an Ombudsman?" Saskatchewan Bar Review, XXVIII (December, 1963), 169-79.

Wainwright, Loudon. "For the Ombudsman, a Hearty Skoal." Life, LXI (December 16, 1966), 26.

Weber, Paul J. "A Friend in City Hall." America, CXIX (October 19, 1968), 352-54.

Werner, Ray O. "Educational Tyranny and the Ombudsman." School & Society, XCV (October 28, 1967), 391-92.

White, J. Benton. "Humanizing the Universities." Humanity, V (February, 1969), 6-7.

"Why Those Students Are Protesting." Time, XCI (May 3, 1968), 24-25.

Newspaper and Newsletter Articles

"Advice and Consent." Editorial, New York Times, December 5, 1966, p. 44.

"Auditor General Named as British Ombudsman." New York Times, August 5, 1966, p. 9.

Bennett, Charles G. "U.S. Offers To Aid Ombudsman Plan." New York Times, June 7, 1967, p. 40.

Brill, Edward. "Ombudsman's Power Helps Students." Michigan State News, October 30, 1968, p. 1.

Bylin, James E. "The Ombudsman." Wall Street Journal, November 22, 1966, p. 18.

"Citizen's Protector." Editorial, New York Times, January 21, 1967, p. 30.

Clegg, Helen. "Complaints." Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, March 13, 1969, p. 3.

Craib, Ralph. "Ombudsman Allays Campus Racial Strife." San Francisco Chronicle, November 20, 1967, p. 13.

Fowle, Farnsworth. "Two Ombudsmen Report on Roles--Civic Control Described by Swede and New Zealander." New York Times, February 20, 1966. Quoted in: U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Ombudsman. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senate, on S. 190. 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966, p. 380.

Fox, Sylvan. "Columbia Names an Official To Be Ombudsman for the Students." New York Times, May 29, 1968, p. 24.

Gettner, Victor S. "Curb on Abuses of Public Power." Letter to editor, New York Times, October 17, 1965, IV, p. 17.

Grant, William. "College Ombudsman--Valuable New Official." Detroit Free Press, December 8, 1968, p. C10.

"Hawaii Approves Bill Creating Ombudsman." New York Times, May 1, 1967, p. 54.

Hofmann, Paul. "Swedish Ombudsman Finds Most Cases Baseless." New York Times, June 20, 1967, p. 41.

_____. "Wide Use of Ombudsmen in U. S. Is Urged by American Assembly." New York Times, October 30, 1967, p. 25.

Item in CJCA News concerning ombudsman at West Valley (Calif.) College (California Junior College Association newsletter), January, 1969.

Kifner, John. "Reforms Planned at City College." New York Times, October 9, 1968, p. 47.

King, Seth S. "Ombudsman Bill Filed by O' Connor." New York Times, May 12, 1967, p. 36.

Knowles, Clayton. "Ombudsman Plan Submitted by Bar." New York Times, May 9, 1967, p. 30.

Nader, Ralph. "An Ombudsman for the U. S. ?" Christian Science Monitor, April 1, 1962, p. 20.

"A New High Budget Is Voted in Hawaii." New York Times, April 1, 1968, p. 7.

Nietert, Rebecca. "Freshmen Found Brighter Than Predecessors." Michigan State News, January 16, 1969, p. 14.

"Ombudsman Begins New Job." University of Nevada Sagebrush, March 11, 1969, p. 3.

"Ombudsman for the U. S." Editorial, Washington Post, August 20, 1962, p. A16.

"Ombudsman Is Making a Big Hit in New Zealand." New York Times, August 25, 1968, p. 6.

"Ombudsman Is Urged by N. Y. U. Advisory Board." New York Times, November 19, 1967, p. 116.

"Ombudsman Plan Urged in Newark." New York Times, April 28, 1968, p. 44.

"Ombudsman Urged To Protect Poor." New York Times, October 27, 1967, p. 56.

Parness, Barbara. "Ombudsmen Perform No Miracles." Michigan State News, January 6, 1969, p. 17.

"Professor Herbert I. London Elected New Ombudsman." Newsletter, Graduate Students Organization, School of Education, New York University, January, 1969, p. 1.

"Profile: Sir Edmund Compton, The New Ombudsman." Sunday Times (London), April 2, 1967, p. 11.

"Public Protector." Editorial, New York Times, October 14, 1965, p. 46.

"A Real Ombudsman." Editorial, New York Times, June 22, 1967, p. 38.

"Rep. Reuss Begins Ombudsman Test." New York Times, February 5, 1967, p. 67.

"Rights Campaign Begun in San Jose." New York Times, October 3, 1967, p. 33.

Rosenthal, Benjamin S. "Ombudsman as Citizen-Government Link." Letter to editor, New York Times, February 2, 1967, p. 34.

Salpukas, Agis. "'Ombudsman' on L.I. Finds Defeat Has Given Him More Power." New York Times, December 3, 1967, p. 59.

Sikes, James R. "L.I. Ombudsman Is a Busy Adviser." New York Times, November 20, 1966, p. 53.

Silver, Roy R. "Nickerson Names a Public Protector." New York Times, June 1, 1966, p. 1.

"Somebody to Listen." Editorial, New York Times, May 13, 1967, p. 32.

Stepp, Carl. "Noland Appointed First Ombudsman." Gamecock, campus newspaper at University of South Carolina, October 29, 1968, p. 1.

"Stony Brook Appoints 3 Faculty Ombudsmen." New York Times, April 16, 1967, p. 82.

Twitchell, Beverly. "Academic Freedom Report Swings Into Effect." Michigan State News, p. 10.

"U. of Chicago Ombudsman." New York Times, October 9, 1968, p. 47.

"University Ombudsman Kept Busy at Stony Brook." New York Times, December 10, 1967, p. 146.

"UPC Open Meeting Will Discuss Ombudsman." UCLA Daily Bruin, February 25, 1969, pp. 2-3.

Waggoner, Walter H. "Newark Mayor Bars Police Review Board." New York Times, March 1, 1968, p. 1.

Wiskari, Werner. "Norway's Experience: How an Ombudsman Operates." New York Times, November 20, 1966, IV, p. 3.

Pamphlets

Administrator's Handbook: Understanding the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. Chicago: College and University Business, undated.

Faculty and Staff Handbook. Eastern Montana College, September 1, 1967. "Ombudsman," pp. 62-63.

Krathwohl, David R. How to Prepare a Research Proposal. Syracuse, N.Y.: By the Author, Syracuse University, 1966.

Michigan State: Profile of a University. East Lansing: University Editor's Office, Michigan State University, undated.

Norman, Nelson F. The Ombudsman: A New Bird on Campus. San Diego State College, undated.

Schneider, Franz. Yes! and No! Needed: A Dean of Instruction and a Student-Faculty Reaction Sheet. Berkeley, Calif.: By the Author, January, 1966.

The Student and His Public Image--The Dean Speaks Out. A Publication of NASPA--Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. Bulletin No. 2, April, 1967.

The University in America. An Occasional Paper on the Role of Education in the Free Society. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1967.

Public Documents

United Nations, General Assembly. Remedies Against the Abuse of Administrative Authority--Selected Studies. (ST/TAO/HR/19) 1964.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Administrative Ombudsman. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senate, on S. 1195. 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Ombudsman. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senate, on S. Res. 190. 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Regional Ombudsman Proposal. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senate, on S. 3123. 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education, by Archie R. Ayers and John H. Russel. Bulletin No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Reports

Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University. A Report of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs to the Academic Council, February 7, 1967.

Crisis at Columbia. Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

Education at Berkeley: Report of the Select Committee on Education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Foote, Caleb; Mayer, Henry; and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. The Majority Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, University of California at Berkeley; also The Dissenting Report. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Goals for Americans: Programs for Action in the Sixties. The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. (See especially Wriston, Henry M., "The Individual," pp. 35-58.) Published for the American Assembly by Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

The Ombudsman. Report of the Thirty-second American Assembly, October 26-29, 1967. New York: Columbia University, undated.

Orr, G. S. Report on Administrative Justice in New Zealand. Wellington: R. E. Owen, 1964.

The President's Report of Progress, 1966-67. Michigan State University Publication, LXII, November, 1967.

Unpublished Sources

Discussion Notes

Meeting on ombudsman in higher education. Sponsored by Higher Education Executive Associates and University of Detroit. October 24-25, 1968.

Documents

Little, Jack F. Ombudsman, University of California at Irvine. "Job Description Card." University of California Personnel Office. Dated February 15, 1968.

Interviews

Davis, Thomas F. Ombudsman, University of Detroit. Private interview held at University of Detroit, December 11, 1968.

DeKoff, Irving. Director for Student Interests, Columbia University. Private interview held during meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

Gloege, George. Ombudsman, Eastern Montana College. Private interview held during meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1968.

Leitmann, George. Ombudsman, University of California at Berkeley. Private interview held during meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

Norman, Nelson F. Ombudsman, San Diego State College. Private interview held during meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

Rust, James D. Ombudsman, Michigan State University. Private interview held at Michigan State University, December 12, 1968.

White, J. Benton. Associate Ombudsman, San Jose State College. Private interview held during meeting on ombudsman in higher education, Detroit, Mich., October 24, 1968.

Letters

Received By Author

Anderson, Stanley V. Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California at Santa Barbara. March 5, 1969.

Blaustein, Albert P. Professor of Law, Rutgers University. March 5, 1969.

Eddy, John Paul. Dean of Students, Johnson (Vt.) State College. February 21, 1969.

Franz, John M. Chairman, Graduate Faculty Senate Committee on Problems and Procedure, University of Missouri at Columbia. January 24, 1969.

Gloege, George. Ombudsman, Eastern Montana College. November 4, 1968.

Glover, Frederic O. Executive Assistant to the President, Stanford University. February 19, 1969.

Goldfarb, Theodore. Former Ombudsman, State University of New York at Stony Brook. October 21, 1968.

Hiatt, Robert W. Acting President, University of Hawaii. February 25, 1969.

Kitner, Harold. Ombudsman, Dean for Faculty Counsel, Kent State University. March 14, 1969.

Leitmann, George. Ombudsman, University of California at Berkeley. February 5, 1969.

Little, Jack F. Ombudsman, University of California at Irvine. February 24, 1969.

McDermid, Nancy. Member, Ombudsman Selection Committee, San Francisco State College. February 18, 1969.

Mundinger, Donald C. Vice President for Academic Affairs, Valparaiso University. February 20, 1969.

Schneider, Franz. Professor Emeritus, University of California at Berkeley. February 6, 1969.

Speck, David G. Assistant Dean of Men, George Washington University. January 24, 1969.

Toll, John S. President, State University of New York at Stony Brook. March 10, 1969.

White, J. Benton. Associate Ombudsman, San Jose State College. February 19, 1969.

Others

Blaustein, Albert P., to Clifford, Earle W., Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University. November 19, 1968.

White, J. Benton, to Clark, Robert D., President, San Jose State College. July 19, 1968.

Manuscripts

Anderson, Stanley V. "Ombudsman Papers: American Experience and Proposals." Chapter V. Book manuscript. Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, undated.

Memoranda

Memorandum to Student Affairs Staff. Prepared by Jack F. Little, Ombudsman. University of California at Irvine, August 3, 1967.

Toll, John S. "Announcement of Selection of Ombudsmen and Other Key Appointments." State University of New York at Stony Brook, March 29, 1967.

_____. "Procedures for the Ombudsmen." State University of New York at Stony Brook, April 18, 1967.

_____. "1966-67 Report of the Ombudsmen." State University of New York at Stony Brook, November 10, 1967.

News Releases

Kurlinski, Wayne. "In What May Be U.S. College 'First,' Stony Brook Names 'Ombudsmen' To Investigate Special

Problems On Fast-Growing University Campus." News release, State University of New York at Stony Brook, April 13 (1967).

News release on appointment of ombudsman. Office of Public Information, Macomb County Community College, Warren, Mich., April 11, 1968.

Papers

Boland, Walter Reed. "American Institutions of Higher Education: A Study of Size and Organization." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

Bradley, Walter E. "An Ombudsman for Macomb." Macomb County Community College, Warren, Mich., February 20, 1968.

Coleman, James. Paper written for the Commission on Tests, College Entrance Examination Board, 1968.

McClellan, Stephen Douglas. "An Analysis of How the Role of Law Has Affected Specific Relationships Between Public Universities and Their Students: Legal Guidelines for Administrative Decision-Making." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Mundinger, Donald C. "The University Ombudsman." Unsigned, undated paper prepared at Valparaiso University.

"A Proposal for a Student Information and Complaint Office (Ombudsman) for Southern Illinois University." Unsigned, undated paper provided by George McClure, Department of Philosophy, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Rust, James D. Untitled, undated statement on role of campus ombudsman. Michigan State University, revised January, 1969.

Sandberg, Carl H. "Ombudsman: The Redress of Citizens' Grievances." Honors paper, Ohio University, 1968.

Weeks, Kent M. "A Comparative Analysis of the Civil Ombudsman Offices in Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden." Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 1967.

White, J. Benton. "The Ombudsman in Higher Education." Thesis, Graduate Division, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, 1968.

Reports

"The Function of the Ombudsman (Revised October 3, 1967)." San Jose State College.

Goldberg, Homer; Goldfarb, Theodore; and Weinberg, Robert. "A Report to President Toll and the University Community from the Ombudsmen." State University of New York at Stony Brook, undated.

"Graduate Faculty Participation in Academic Government." Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Faculty Organization and Participation in Government and of the Committee on Planning and Policy of the Graduate Council. University of Missouri at Columbia, April 18, 1968.

"Institutional Policy Changes at San Jose State College Coming Out of Recommendations or Investigations." (Report prepared by J. Benton White, Ombudsman, 1967-68.) San Jose State College, undated.

"Position Resume of Ombudsman at San Jose State College." Office of the Executive Vice President, San Jose State College, May 3, 1968.

"The Report of the University Ombudsman to the President for the School Year, 1967-1968." (Prepared by James D. Rust, Ombudsman.) Michigan State University, undated.

Speck, David G. Ombudsman report addressed to William P. Smith, Vice President for Student Affairs. George Washington University, December 19, 1968.

Speeches

(All delivered at meeting on ombudsman in higher education sponsored by Higher Education Executive Associates and University of Detroit, October 24-25, 1968, in Detroit, Mich.)

Clifford, Earle W. Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University. "Second Thoughts on the Ombudsman in Higher Education."

Davis, Thomas F. Ombudsman, University of Detroit. "Campus Troubleshooter--The Ombudsman."

Rust, James D. Ombudsman, Michigan State University. "The Ombudsman in Practice."

Schlossberg, Nancy K. Associate Professor, Wayne State University. "The Ombudsman in Current Status and Theory."

White, J. Benton. Associate Ombudsman, San Jose State College. "The Ombudsman in Practice."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION
ERICKSON HALL

October 14, 1968

Dr. _____
Ombudsman
Institution
City, State

Dear Dr. _____:

Among the current innovations of interest in American higher education is the attempt to adapt the ombudsman concept to the college and university campus. To date, at least seven persons at five institutions have been named academic ombudsmen and a number of other appointments are being considered.

Because of the widescale implications of the ombudsman movement in American higher education, I am conducting a descriptive and analytical study of this phenomenon for my doctoral dissertation at Michigan State University. I have received encouragement and assistance from the Michigan State ombudsman, Dr. James Rust. To our knowledge, no other dissertation study in this area is in progress.

Since the population I am studying is so small, it will be necessary for me to obtain a considerable amount of data from each existing academic ombudsman. My best opportunity for gathering this information is at the "Consultation on the Ombudsman in American Higher Education" October 24-25, 1968, in Detroit sponsored by the University of Detroit in cooperation with Higher Education Executive Associates. I have received permission from consultation officials to tape record the proceedings. In addition, I plan to conduct and tape record a private semi-structured interview with each campus ombudsman present. I anticipate that each interview will take about one hour. In order not to interfere with the consultation program, I plan to conduct the interviews during these periods:

Before 1:30 p.m. Thursday, October 24
After 9:30 p.m. Thursday, October 24
Before 9 a.m. Friday, October 25
After 3 p.m. Friday, October 25

The purpose of this letter is to make you aware of this study, to solicit your cooperation and to request your participation in the interviews I will be conducting in Detroit. I will contact you to make specific arrangements at the meeting. In the event that you do not attend, I will attempt to interview you at a later date. If that cannot be arranged, I will send you a questionnaire.

Ombudsmen and others who assist in the preparation of the study will be provided with a summary of findings. My goal is to complete the project by June of 1969.

I would appreciate a response from you prior to the Detroit meeting.

Sincerely,

Ray Rowland
NDEA Graduate Fellow
College of Education
Room 401-I Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

P.S. - Materials you may have which would be useful in this study include the following:

1. Personal data sheet or biographical sketch
2. Job description
3. Copy of document establishing your office
4. Information on how selection of ombudsman was made
5. Copies of published articles regarding your office
6. Copies of speeches or statements you have made regarding your office
7. Reports issued by your office

Please bring these and other pertinent materials to the Detroit meeting or send to me. Materials will be returned at your request.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN

A. Personal Data

1. Name of respondent
2. Age of respondent
3. Present title
4. Previous title
5. Academic rank
6. Tenure?
7. College degrees held
8. Career field or major academic discipline
9. Previous professional experience
10. Number of years at present location
11. Faculty and administrative positions held during that period
12. Previous experience in counseling? Administration?
13. Membership in professional and honorary organizations, including offices held
14. Scholarly activities (research and publications)
15. Honors and awards
16. Other volunteered information

B. Institutional Data

1. Name of institution
2. Age of institution

3. Location
4. Size
5. General description (coed? public or private? urban?)
6. Organizational structure
7. Type of government
8. Student characteristics
9. Faculty characteristics
10. Major changes in institution in recent years
11. Other volunteered information

C. Origin of Office of Ombudsman

1. Describe sequence of events which brought office of ombudsman into existence:
   a. Original suggestion or proposal
   b. Subsequent action (including delays)
   c. Final decision (authorization)
2. On what date was office of ombudsman officially established on your campus?
3. On what date were you chosen to serve as ombudsman?
4. On what date did you begin your duties?
5. Is the assignment a full-time responsibility or do you spend some time teaching or engaged in other administrative activities? Explain.
6. Did you actively seek the office?
7. Are you the first ombudsman on your campus? The only ombudsman? If not, explain.
8. Did your selection involve any change in your academic rank or salary? Explain.
9. Has the length of your term of office been determined? If so, how long is the term of office?
10. Has a process been determined by which the ombudsman can be removed from office before his term expires? If so, what official or agency has this authority?

11. Did any organized group actively support the establishment of the office? If so, identify and describe.

12. Did any organized group actively oppose the establishment of the office? If so, identify and describe.

13. Describe process by which you were chosen ombudsman:

    a. Nomination procedure
    b. Election or appointment procedure
    c. Official or agency making final selection

D. Rationale for Office of Ombudsman

1. What were the main arguments advanced by proponents to justify the establishment of office of ombudsman?

2. Can you recall any incidents on your campus prior to the establishment of the office which supported those arguments?

3. What offices, services and procedures already existed on your campus for handling individual problems at the time the office of ombudsman was established?

4. Have any of those services changed or been discontinued since the appearance of the ombudsman?

E. Description of Office of Ombudsman

1. Describe the location of your office on the campus.

2. Describe the physical arrangement of the office.

3. Describe the office equipment and facilities (such items as telephone, tape recorder, copying machine, intercom system, etc.)

4. Do you work alone or do you have assistance in the office?

5. If you have assistance, identify the other staff members by title and describe their duties.

6. Where does your office fit into the administrative framework of your institution?

7. To whom do you submit written reports?

8. What is contained in the reports?
9. How often are written reports submitted and how detailed are they?
10. How widely circulated are your written reports?
11. To whom is your office fiscally accountable?
12. Does any official or agency have authority to investigate the operations of your office?
13. Has such an investigation ever occurred?

F. Objectives of Office of Ombudsman

1. List and briefly describe the major objectives of your office, in order of priority if possible.
2. How do these objectives make your office different from any other office on your campus?

G. Operational Procedures

1. On your campus, who may seek assistance from the ombudsman?
   a. Undergraduate students
   b. Graduate students
   c. Faculty
   d. Administrators
   e. Civil service (non-academic) employees
   f. Persons from off campus
2. From which group indicated in 1 do you receive the largest number of clients? The smallest number of clients?
3. Are your records and files confidential or are they open for inspection by any interested person?
4. Do you have access to official records throughout the campus? Indicate what kinds of information are not available to you.
5. In what ways do you publicize your activities?
   a. Speeches to campus organizations
   b. Newspaper articles

c. Radio and/or television interviews
d. Notices or posters
e. Letters to students or campus organizations
f. Other ways (specify)

6. How many clients contact you in a typical week (or whatever time period seems most appropriate)?

7. List the broad categories of complaints received by your office, such as grades, fees, housing, library, parking, etc.

8. Can you rank these categories of complaints from most frequent to least frequent?

9. What is the average length of time it takes to solve a problem presented to your office?

10. What kind of complaints do you refuse to consider (out of your jurisdiction)?

11. Describe a "typical" case and its disposition.

12. What techniques do you generally use to solve a problem?

a. Counseling or advising client
b. Appeal to authority
c. Persuasion
d. Implied threat of investigation
e. Other techniques

13. In general, how would you describe the reactions of faculty and administrators against whom complaints have been lodged?

14. How do you proceed if no remedy can be found for a valid complaint?

15. Can decisions made by the ombudsman be overruled? If so, by whom?

16. Is there any authority on campus to which a person with a complaint may appeal beyond the ombudsman?

17. In your day-to-day operations, which of these means of communication do you use the most and the least?

a. Telephone
b. Face-to-face contact
c. Written messages

H. Effects of Ombudsman

1. Can you recall any incidents of organized student support for the office of ombudsman? Describe.
2. Can you recall any incidents of organized student opposition to the office of ombudsman? Describe.
3. Can you recall any instances in which institutional policies or procedures have been changed as a direct result of inquiries and/or recommendations by the ombudsman? Describe.
4. Do you believe the office of ombudsman will continue to function as it is during the next ten years? If not, do you expect it to be expanded, reduced or abolished?

I. Attitudes and Opinions

1. How would you describe the general attitude of professional student personnel workers on your campus regarding the ombudsman?
2. What education and experience would best prepare a person to serve effectively as a campus ombudsman? List several, then rank them in order of importance.
3. What terms best describe the role of the campus ombudsman?
4. If you could start over again as a campus ombudsman, what would you do differently?
5. You probably had some notions of what you would be doing as a campus ombudsman when you assumed that office. Have your actual operations differed from your expectations? If so, in what ways?
6. Because of the relative isolation of the campus ombudsman from his colleagues and his discipline, the possibility of role conflict exists. Have you experienced this feeling? If so, how do you counter it?
7. Do you consider yourself a part of or apart from what is commonly referred to as the academic "Establishment" (those who hold and wield power over others)?

8. Do you believe the office of ombudsman has helped alleviate student hostility and frustration regarding administrative bureaucracy and the academic "Establishment"?

9. Can you recall the greatest disappointments you have experienced in serving as a campus ombudsman? Describe them.

10. Can you recall the greatest satisfactions you have experienced in serving as a campus ombudsman? Describe them.

11. How long should the term of office be for a campus ombudsman? Why?

12. Are your budget, staff and facilities adequate for handling the work load of your office?

13. Should the findings and recommendations of the campus ombudsman be publicized? Why or why not?

14. In your opinion, what are the broad sociological implications of the ombudsman "movement" in American higher education?

15. Have you established contact with ombudsmen on other campuses? Do you feel you can improve your performance by exchanging information and ideas with your counterparts elsewhere?

16. Do you believe campus ombudsmen will gain professional status and become a permanent addition to American colleges and universities? Are you favorable or unfavorable toward efforts to form a national organization of campus ombudsmen?

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN INTERVIEWS

TABLE C1

CHARACTERISTICS OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Name	George Leitmann	Irving DeKoff	Thomas Davis	James Rust	Nelson Norman	Benton White[a]
Age	43	45	37	58	51	37
Present title	Ombudsman	Director for Student Interests	Ombudsman	Ombudsman	Ombudsman	Ombudsman
Previous title	Professor	Assistant Dean	Assistant Professor; Dean	Professor	Professor	Campus Minister
Academic rank	Professor	None	Assistant Professor	Professor, Assistant Dean	Professor	Associate Professor (Equivalent)
Tenure?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Highest degree	Ph.D.	Ed.D.	M.A.T.	Ph.D.	Ph.D.	B.D.

TABLE C1--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Career field or major discipline	Engineering	Physical Education	Mathematics	English	History	Theology
Previous professional experience	Government; university teaching	University teaching, administration	Teaching at all levels	College and university teaching	Radio; high school, college teaching	Ministry, counseling
Years at present location	11	18	8	21	8	7
Positions held during that period	Assistant professor to professor	Instructor, assistant dean	Instructor, dean	Acting department chairman, assistant dean	All academic ranks	Campus minister
Previous experience in counseling? administration?	Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No No	Yes Yes

TABLE C1--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Scholarly activities	Journal articles and books	Journal articles	Textbook manuscript	Journal articles	Journal articles	Journal articles
Honors and awards	General	Fencing coach citation	"Teacher of Year" award	Phi Beta Kappa	Minor	None

[a]In all tables, San Jose State College information pertains to Benton White in his capacity as ombudsman in 1967-68. He was associate ombudsman in 1968-69 while Ralph Poblano served as ombudsman.

TABLE C2

CHARACTERISTICS OF SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITH CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Institution's age (in years)	100	215	88	114	72	111
Number of students	28,000	17,500	8,000	39,949	23,000	24,000
Description	Coed, public, semi-urban	Coed, private, Ivy League	Coed, urban, Catholic	Coed, public, semi-urban	Coed, public, urban	Coed, public, urban
Organization	One of 9 campuses of state university, each with a chancellor.	16 separate colleges, 2 of which are totally autonomous.	President, deans, department chairmen.	15 colleges, all under central control.	Shifting from college to university.	Board of trustees for State College System.

TABLE C2--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Government	Division is smallest administrative unit; Academic Senate; Board of Regents between university and legislature.	University Council is advisory body; provost is chief administrative officer; no faculty senate.	More student oriented than before.	Regents, president, provost, Academic Council, Associated Students.	California State College System (18 units).	President, academic and executive vice president.
Students	Very intelligent, aggressive; only top 3% of high school graduates admitted; nearly half of students are in graduate work; very small racial minority.	Highly selected; large contingent of foreign students; graduates outnumber undergraduates.	Above national norms; 85% are Catholic; most are graduates of Catholic high schools in Detroit area.	Presence of increasingly large numbers of first-rate students has transformed campus.	Very able; university takes very small upper percentage of high school graduates; state colleges take larger segment, down to top 30%.	Whole spectrum, but very small racial minority; activist student government.

TABLE C2--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Faculty	Fairly aggressive; rather liberal.	One of the more brilliant in nation; extremely well-qualified.	Majority have Ph.D.'s; prefer to work on small campus.	Wide range from many institutions; much research and experimentation.	Not parochial; trying to get 12-unit teaching load reduced to 9.	Middle-of-road to liberal; typical state college limitations.
Major changes in recent years	Most occurred since 1964 Free Speech Movement; curricula revamped; quarter system.	Significant increase in black students; new president; major changes in progress.	Building new dorms to attract distant students; more black students; more involvement in community.	Rapid growth; administration encourages innovation; more student power and restlessness.	Growth	Growth; new president; Academic Council with students as voting members.

TABLE C3

ORIGIN OF OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Original suggestion or proposal	Originally suggested by Prof. Franz Schneider, long-time faculty member (date not established).	DeKoff, in 1965, recommended expansion of "Director of Student Interests" office which had been in operation about 10 years.	Campaign promise of candidate for president of Student Government in spring of 1968.	Faculty Committee on Student Affairs held hearings on student rights and responsibilities in 1966-67 at request of university president.	Campaign promise of candidate for Associated Student Body president in spring of 1968.	In fall of 1967 black students demonstrated in protest of conditions on campus and in community; president of college set up hearings.
Subsequent action	Considered by Associated Students and Faculty-Student Relations Committee of Academic Senate after 1964 Free Speech Movement.	DeKoff's recommendation supported by Committee on Student Life in 1967.	Student Government president proposed faculty names for ombudsman to Student Senate, which interviewed Davis in August of 1968.	After study and hearings, committee issued Academic Freedom Report of 1967, which recommended office of ombudsman.	Candidate won election; no opposition to ombudsman idea from administration or faculty.	College president proposed ombudsman to protect rights of ethnic minorities on campus; supported by Academic Council Executive Committee.

TABLE C3--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Final authorization[a]	Meeting of Academic Senate in May of 1968.	Final decision made in January of 1968.	Instigation from Student Senate to academic vice president and president for authorization. No faculty involvement in selection.	Accepted by Academic Council, Academic Senate, Trustees by spring of 1967; student leaders given chance to veto names on provost's list of 60 nominees; university president made final selection.	Both college president and student government leaders involved in selection; financial problem delayed final action until mid-September of 1968.	As soon as black community accepted proposal, college president asked White to fill position.
Date office was established	May 16, 1968	January, 1968	April, 1968	March 16, 1967	September, 1968	September 22, 1967

TABLE C3--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Date first ombudsman was chosen	June, 1968, by Academic Senate Committee on Committees	Announced on May 28, 1968, by university president[b]	April, 1968	August, 1967	September 15, 1968	September 27, 1967
Date first ombudsman began duties	September 30, 1968	July 1, 1968	September 5, 1968	September 1, 1967	September 15, 1968	October 1, 1967
Full-time or part-time assignment?	Half-time (also teaches)	Full-time	Part-time (holds other administrative offices)	Full-time (teaches one course per year)	Full-time (teaches off-campus course annually)	Full-time
Any change in rank or salary?	No	Status change and significant salary increase.	No	Rank remains unchanged but salary is increased.	No, but is now on 12-month instead of 9-month assignment.	Equivalent to associate professor; no previous academic rank.

TABLE C3--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Length of term of office	Academic year[c]	Year-to-year	Academic year	Informal arrangement with president of university; after 2 years either can make change.	Undetermined	Undetermined (First ombudsman accepted on one-year basis)
Can ombudsman be removed from office before term expires?	If so, method of removal is unknown.	No process established; only university president could do it.	"Student Government can remove me any time; university administration can't do it."	By university president.	Uncertain	No process established; would have to be done by president of college.

TABLE C3--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Group(s) which supported establishment of office[d]	Student-Faculty Relations Board of Associated Students; also group which proposed office.	Committee on Student Life.	University Student Government.	Faculty Committee on Student Affairs.	Student Government, student newspaper, AAUP.	None

[a]All six ombudsmen indicated that they did not actively seek the office.

[b]After his appointment, DeKoff received university president's approval to serve in "an ombudsman-like capacity." On October 1, 1968, his title was changed from "Director of Student Interests" to "Director for Student Interests."

[c]Leitmann has been asked to serve a second one-year term.

[d]No ombudsmen indicated awareness of any organized opposition to the establishment of the office.

TABLE C4

RATIONALE FOR OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Arguments used to justify establishment of office	Many student complaints regarding academic status and program.	To act as a catalyst for resolving student grievances.	Any large organization needs an ombudsman.	Testimony of students in hearings conducted by Faculty Committee on Student Affairs.	Rapid growth causing procedural problems; student didn't know where or how to get help.	Communications breakdown in organization regarding executive decisions; college president needed to be better informed.
Campus incidents which supported those arguments	Free Speech Movement of 1964; impersonal nature of operation; student needed someone to talk to other than secretary or dean.	See Report of Cox Commission (issued after student rebellion in spring of 1968).	Many small irritations.	Schiff case; general student unrest and appearance of New Left; sit-ins.	No specific incidents.	Black student was refused admission to a sorority; president of college was unaware of incident.

TABLE C4--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Campus agencies and procedures for handling individual student problems in existence before office of ombudsman was established	Department chairmen, assistant deans, deans, vice chancellor and chancellor; judiciary committee; dean of students office.	Associate dean of students for Columbia College; nothing on a university-wide basis.	Non-academic problems to dean of student affairs; academic problems to college deans.	Many offices to handle a wide variety of problems, such as student affairs, academic advisers, assistant deans, counseling center; but weak system in some colleges.	President of college and Faculty Senate responsive to student needs; plus usual services.	Student Activities Office and all its service agencies; academic committees; many grievance procedures.
Have any of these services been changed or discontinued?	No	More coordination but no significant changes expected; disciplinary function to be removed from dean's office.	No	No. "I refer many students to them."	No. "One problem is that many students don't know what's available to them."	"They operate more effectively when they know someone directs students to them and checks back."

TABLE C5

DESCRIPTION OF OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Location of the office on campus	Temporarily in a small wooden building at north end of campus; eventually to be with other Academic Senate offices near center of campus.	Low Library (administration building) in the center of Morningside campus (DeKoff's choice).	Student Union.	Basement of Morrill Hall, one of the older buildings on campus; between Student Union and Student Services building.	Basement of new Student Union.	Old barracks building in heart of campus, between administration building and office of college president.
Arrangement of the office	Two rooms, one for ombudsman and one for secretary.	Nice, large private office, outer office and reception area; conference room and work room to be added.	"Nine-by-nine foot cubicle with round table and four chairs."	Outer office and inner office; "only suitable place at time of appointment."	"Windowless, grim room with bright orange rug I provided."	Reception area and two offices for ombudsman and associate ombudsman; "not very attractive."

TABLE C5--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Office equipment[a]	Access to copying machine.	Recorder, access to copying machine.	Access to recorder, copying machine.	Dictaphone, copying machine.	Access to recorder, copying machine.	None
Assistance in office operation	Secretary; provision for graduate law student assistant, "but hasn't become necessary."	Full-time "top-flight" executive secretary; 5 student research assistants.	None, but "must get student secretarial help."	Full-time secretary "who sometimes advises students in my absence."	None in office; "secretary of student body president takes my calls."	Associate ombudsman (one-quarter time) and secretary (full-time).
Where does the office fit in institution's administrative structure?	Committee of one of Academic Senate.	"Right now it's in limbo."	"Handmaid" of University Student Government.	Ombudsman reports to university president.	"It doesn't; I am not accountable to president of college."	Ombudsman is member of college president's staff.

TABLE C5--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
To whom are written reports submitted?	Academic Senate.	University president.	Student Government president and Senate; academic deans; faculty.	University president (provost gets copy).	President of college and student body president.	College president.
What is included in the reports?	Outstanding individual cases (but no names); analysis; legislative proposals.	"Action proposals" (recommendations) plus summary of problems ombudsman has dealt with.	Summary of problems and procedures used to solve them, plus recommendations.	Summary of ombudsman's activities, student problems, solutions, recommendations.	General impressions; major cases; recommendations.	Summary of activities of office, with recommendations.
How often are reports made?	Annually	As needed.	As necessary.	Annually	Monthly, "but I hope they won't be too exacting."	As often as necessary, plus end-of-year report.

TABLE C5--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
How widely circulated are reports?	Not circulated but open to any member of Academic Senate; may be printed in minutes.	University president's decision.	Faculty, students, academic deans, university president.	University president and provost.	All administrators and others interested in the office.	Not made public but copies go to offices and persons referred to in reports.
To whom is the office fiscally accountable?	Academic Senate.	University president.	University Student Government.	University president.	Not clearly established.	President of college.
Does any agency or official have authority to investigate the office?[b]	No	University president.	President of University Student Government.	Trustees, university president, Academic Council.	Unknown	Trustees, chancellor, president of college.

[a]In addition to standard items, telephone(s) and typewriter(s).

[b]At none of the institutions had such an investigation actually occurred.

TABLE C6

OBJECTIVES OF OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
What are the major objectives of the office?	To hear student grievances regarding academic status decisions; after investigation, recommendations may be made where appropriate.	To make contact with entire university; to inform administrators, faculty and students regarding redefinition of office for handling grievances.	To make certain all students have opportunity to be heard, covering wide range of complaints--academic, personal, financial, etc.	To help students find solutions for their problems, whether academic or non-academic.	To be available to any student with any problem; to help him solve it or tell him how he can get assistance.	Originally, to protect human rights of ethnic minorities on campus: now, to protect individual rights of all students on campus.
How do these objectives make the office different from other offices on campus?	Autonomy and neutrality; office is not linked to administration, Associated Students, or, in a sense, to faculty.	Unanswered	"Shouldn't be different. Every dean, assistant dean, administrator and faculty member should be an ombudsman in his own right."	More scope and power of investigation; immediate and forceful access to senior faculty and higher echelon administrators.	Unanswered	The ombudsman personalizes individual concern. "If every office operated perfectly, he wouldn't be needed."

TABLE C7

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Who may seek assistance from the ombudsman?	Undergraduate and graduate students, for academic problems only.	Undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, faculty.	Undergraduate and graduate students, administrators (including president), faculty.	Undergraduate and graduate students, and a few parents.	Undergraduate and graduate students.	Undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, faculty, persons from off campus, civil service employees.
Largest number of clients?	Evenly divided between undergraduate and graduate students.	Undergraduate students.	Undergraduate students.	Undergraduate students.	Undergraduate students.	Ethnic minorities among undergraduate students.
Smallest number?		Non-students.	Off-campus persons.	Parents of students.	Graduate students.	Off-campus persons.

TABLE C7--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Records open or confidential?	Confidential	Some open but some confidential.	Open "because I never record anything confidential."	Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
Does ombudsman have access to official records on campus?	Yes	Yes, except classified government research contracts.	Yes, "but it might be more difficult if I weren't also a dean."	Yes, except for student health or psychiatric records; uncertain about faculty personal records.	All except psychological records.	Yes, including faculty.
How does ombudsman publicize activities?	Newspapers, faculty bulletin.	Newspapers, speeches, radio.	Newspapers, speeches, notices on bulletin boards.	Speeches, newspapers, radio.	Speeches, newspapers, radio interviews.	Speeches, newspapers, radio-TV.

TABLE C7--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Number of client contacts in typical week	6 to 8	Too soon to determine.	25	27	12 to 15	About 15
Broad categories of complaints received	Grades, use of facilities, admission policy, regulations.	Housing, food services, library service, bookstore.	Grades, fees, housing, library, parking, unfair grading, rude treatment, poor teaching.	Wide range of academic and non-academic problems.	Grades, fees, housing, personal.	Grades, fees, housing, library, parking.
Most frequent complaints	Lack of information.	Too soon to determine.	Academic requirements.	Problems of instruction.	Grades	Housing

TABLE C7--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Length of time required to solve a problem	Simple problems take 1 or 2 days; serious problems haven't been resolved yet.	Some problems take about 2 minutes, but others will take 2 years.	For some complaints no solution is possible; in general, 2 to 4 days.	Some can be settled in a few seconds; "one I have spent several hours on for almost a month."	Some can be settled in 3 minutes; others take weeks, even months.	Some can be handled by a phone call, "but I've worked as long as 3 weeks on one complaint."
What kinds of complaints are not considered?	Non-academic or solely political.	Uncertain	None	Any student problem that involves off-campus people or laws.	Emotional problems that should go to a counselor.	Preliminary inquiry made for all complaints.
Typical case and its disposition	Student upset by change in academic requirement; investigation revealed that it didn't affect her.	Too soon to determine.	Pre-senior wasn't permitted to buy senior ring; investigation put an end to arbitrary regulation.	For 2 years student was unable to get university to change her home address; ombudsman corrected it by phone call.	Student with father in service claims resident low-fee status; legislator is helping ombudsman solve problem.	Faculty member charged with improper treatment of Negro student made public apology after ombudsman intervened.

TABLE C7--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Problem-solving techniques used	Counseling, information gathering, persuasion, recommendations.	Get and check facts because some complaints are unjustified; appeal to authority if necessary.	Counseling, advising, appeal to authority, persuasion, publicity.	Listen, advise, explain, refer, take direct action, review.	Advice to student; persuasion to faculty and administrators.	Get details, refer student to proper office; or investigate, find solution or make recommendation.
Reactions of faculty and administrators against whom students make complaints	Most serious case brought adverse reaction from faculty member involved.	Reaction in one case involving administrator was satisfactory.	Excellent cooperation in general; "so far only one faculty member and one administrator have given me trouble."	Generally excellent cooperation.	"No pattern here at all."	"Defensive at first but now that they know I will defend them if they are right, acceptance has increased."

TABLE C7--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Procedure if no remedy can be found for valid complaint	Publicity	Follow-up on recommendations; "if one administrator balks, I take it to the next level."	"I serve as contact man between faculty decision-making groups and students."	"I admit I'm stumped. If I get several like it, I go to president or provost for advice or with suggestions."	"If no remedy can be found within the structure, I go beyond the structure."	Recommend a change in rules or procedure so problem won't happen again.
To whom may a complainant appeal beyond the ombudsman?	Chancellor (highest authority on campus).	President (final authority on campus).	President of Student Government or university president.	Student-Faculty Judiciary or university president.	Vice president or president.	President's office.
Which means of communication is used most by the ombudsman?	With complainant, face-to-face contact; for gathering information, telephone.	Telephone and face-to-face contact.	Face-to-face contact.	With students, face-to-face contact; with faculty, telephone.	Face-to-face contact.	Telephone and face-to-face contact.
Which is used the least?	Unanswered	Written messages.	Telephone	Written messages.	Written messages.	Written messages.

TABLE C8

EFFECTS OF OFFICE OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS REPORTED BY THOSE OMBUDSMEN (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Any evidence of organized support for office of ombudsman?	Student-Faculty Relations Board of Associated Students gave office "very strong support."	Unanswered	Student Government.	Some agitation in favor of office on part of students "but I don't recall student government going on record in favor of it."	1968 campaign promise of Student Government president.	"Students wanted it continued, at least black community did. Students have established their own ombudsman in student government."
Any evidence of organized opposition to office of ombudsman?	No	"Student government opposition at first because my appointment was by university president without student involvement."	No	No	No	"Mexican-American community does not trust any college officials, to an extent."

TABLE C8--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Any instances where policies or procedures were changed as direct result of ombudsman's inquiries and/or recommendations?	"Not yet. I hope it will happen."	"One committee decided to get rid of old rules; library set up grievance committee of students and faculty."	"Certain requirements for graduation were changed."	"Operation of several campus offices is tightened up as result of my inquiries and recommendations."	"More student participation on college committees."	"A number of policies were changed, in such areas as placement, housing, terminating enrollment."
Will office of ombudsman function "as is" for next ten years?	Will continue to function.	Will receive a much better definition; ombudsman will be concerned with more than students; more staff may be needed.	Should be a full-time position; qualified people hard to find because it is such a difficult job.	"No idea; I don't foresee any real lessening of student tension, not in immediate future."	"Don't know; it may have permanent utility."	It has a place and will continue functioning; its role will be better understood; it will be expanded to include broader spectrum of problems.

TABLE C9

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN AT SIX INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (OCTOBER, 1968)

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Attitude of student personnel workers regarding ombudsman	On the whole, very cooperative.	"Very much in accord with what I am doing because we are acting as a unit; good feedback."	Average or less than average; "our dean of student affairs doesn't 'buy' this position as much as he should."	Unknown; "I have had no feedback from them."	"Very healthy; many of them are my personal friends. There's no reason for competition."	"They are suspicious of ombudsman, somewhat misinformed and resentful; they feel an intrusion on them."
What are best qualifications for campus ombudsman?	Years of experience on a particular campus; sympathetic toward students; open minded; not subject to outside pressures; tenure; no worries about promotion.	Teaching and administrative experience, plus student contact; experience on a particular campus depends on its size.	"Sort of born to the position; rapport with students; love for university; teaching experience; an outsider would have difficulty."	Much experience as classroom teacher; some administrative experience useful; also student advising or counseling; legal experience or access to lawyer.	Education (discipline) makes little difference; experience in working with students.	Experience in academic community; good rapport with students; some administrative "know-how"; campus minister fits this description.

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
What terms best describe ombudsman role?	Court of last resort.	Settler of grievances, impartial judge, Mr. Honesty.	Foot in the door, wedge in the wall.	One who encourages students to work through established channels.	Red tape cutter, middle man, friend of all, public defender, miracle man.	Advocate of human rights.
If you could begin again as an ombudsman, what would you do differently?	Unanswered	"I would have started as an ombudsman."	"I would demand formal acceptance of position by university president."	Unanswered	"I would keep good records from the beginning, no matter how busy I was."	Learn more about role; relate better to Mexican-American community.
Have activities differed from expectations?	No	"I changed existing operations to meet my expectations."	"Not really, except they are multiplying."	"Much more varied; I expected more academic complaints."	"Yes. I did not have time to study what to do; just started doing it."	"Others expect him to be some kind of god and resolve all difficulty. He isn't and can't."

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Have you experienced role conflict?	"No, because this is a half-time appointment."	"I haven't felt isolated yet; ombudsman who gets stuck in his office can't be effective."	Occasionally	"I have felt some isolation from my academic department, but I try to keep in touch through meetings and by teaching at least one course a year in my area."	"I feel very lonesome being separated from my colleagues. I am not keeping up in my subject field."	No, because role of ombudsman is so similar to role of campus minister.
Are you a part of or apart from the campus Establishment?	"The intent is to be apart from the Establishment."	A part of it. "I can't divorce myself from those in power; yet my role is peculiar."	Apart from it. "I'm more student oriented. Formal support from university president won't change that, either."	"A part of it, but in a curious position. I was given post by Establishment to criticize it. I'm a faculty member, not an administrator."	Apart from it, "although this is debatable. Ombudsman can't be a defender of status quo."	A part of it. "Ombudsman must have some kind of commitment to the institution."

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Does the office of ombudsman help alleviate hostility and frustration of students?	"Not yet. It will never remove all the frustration but it certainly will help."	"I'm surprised at the amount of quiet on campus now and the amount of hope that changes will occur."	"Absolutely. I have more understanding and more patience."	"If so, very slightly. It still goes on."	"Yes, but we haven't come to any of the main tests yet."	"Yes, but it is not going to prevent all confrontations."
Disappointments experienced in serving as ombudsman	Unanswered	Unanswered	"When someone doesn't appreciate or misinterprets what I am doing."	Inability to do anything about valid grievances concerning student-faculty relationships, especially grades.	"Running into a stone wall. Students are in haste. I hate to be a long-range operator."	Inability to relate to Mexican-American community.

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Satisfactions experienced in serving as ombudsman	Unanswered	Students filtering into office with complaints or just to talk.	Getting any small problem solved.	Helping students in almost desperate situations.	Moving a case sheet from "in process" file to "completed" file.	Acceptance and praise of black community.
How long should ombudsman's term of office be?	Two years.	Two years, perhaps longer.	Two years. "It's good to have new blood."	"Two years for me, although 3 or 4 might be more sensible. No longer than that."	One year, renewable for another year. "After a year or so you are psychologically drained and perhaps a bureaucrat yourself."	Tenured faculty member on 2-year appointment. "Each ombudsman has his blind spots and might lose perspective."
Are your budget, facilities and staff adequate?	Yes	No. Must be larger to increase work load.	No	"Yes, so far."	No	Yes. "Plush facilities are not important."

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Should findings and recommendations of ombudsman be widely publicized?	Depends on case. If publicity pinpoints complaint, no. If identity can be concealed and case is of general interest, yes.	Uncertain. Some means is needed to let students know that office is viable.	Yes	Caution must be exercised. "I wouldn't publicize an individual case."	"Haven't made up my mind."	When they involve policy he can't get changed. At times, he can help university by making a public issue (policies rather than people).
Sociological implications of campus ombudsman development	Ameliorates impersonal nature of the large campus, but shouldn't unduly pressure young faculty members to conform.	Only way of making bureaucracy more humanistic.	A "gimmick," but a very good one. All universities will have one in ten years because students will demand it.	Is it spreading because it is a "gimmick" to keep students quiet? "If I believed that I'd give up the job."	A new instrument in projective psychology. Each sees in it what he wants to. Adding new frosting to an old job is an error.	Personalizing large institutions; giving individual accessibility to organization.

TABLE C9--Continued

Item	University of California at Berkeley	Columbia University	University of Detroit	Michigan State University	San Diego State College	San Jose State College
Have you made contact with other campus ombudsmen?	Yes	"Absolutely."	Yes	"Limited, but it has improved my performance."	"I am trying to develop unity among California ombudsmen."	Yes, by correspondence.
Will campus ombudsman attain professional status and become permanent addition to academic scene?	"Separate profession, I doubt; permanent addition, yes."	"Yes. People with common concerns band together."	Yes, but a national organization would be difficult to maintain because no one will stay in office long.	"There should never be a professional ombudsman. I'm not keen about a professional organization."	"Probably not. Individual will have standing in a profession before he gets the job."	"A qualified yes. National organization could help people share ideas."

APPENDIX D

FORM USED BY OMBUDSMAN

AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

No. _____

OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

Date _____

Name _____ Student Number _____

College _____ Major _____

Class F S J S G Spec. Program (Circle One)

Local Address _____

_____

Telephone _____

I wish to consult the Ombudsman about

APPENDIX E

LETTERS INCLUDED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

February 3, 1969

The opening of the Office of Ombudsman in 1967 at Michigan State University marked another innovation in American higher education. Since then, there has been much interest on the campus and across the nation regarding its functions.

Although I have received considerable informal "feedback" from students who have called on me, as yet no organized effort has been made to obtain an evaluation of the office from students who have used its services.

Now the time has come for such an assessment. With my cooperation, Mr. Howard Ray Rowland, a doctoral student in the College of Education, is conducting by means of the enclosed questionnaire a survey of students who consulted the Ombudsman during the last four months of 1968. You are included in that group. I sincerely hope that you will fill out this questionnaire and send it promptly to Mr. Rowland in the envelope provided. Results of this survey will affect the future operation of this office and perhaps the operation of similar offices which are being established on other campuses.

To insure full and free response from students surveyed, Mr. Rowland has devised a system whereby neither he nor I will be able to identify by name the individual respondents. The only exceptions will be students who voluntarily reveal their names to Mr. Rowland so that he might contact them for interviews. So please don't hesitate to "tell it like it is" in this questionnaire. Your participation will be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

Sincerely,

James D. Rust

James D. Rust
Ombudsman

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

February 17, 1969

Recently you were sent a survey questionnaire seeking information about your experience with the Office of Ombudsman. Mr. Howard Ray Rowland, the doctoral student who is conducting the survey, informs me that some of the questionnaires still have not been returned.

Enclosed is another copy of the questionnaire. Please fill it out and send it to Mr. Rowland in the envelope provided at your earliest convenience. Responses not received within the next two weeks cannot be included in the survey results.

May I remind you again that this is the first systematic effort to assess the Office of Ombudsman by surveying students who have used its services. Your participation will make the study more complete.

Please be assured that your name will not be revealed to anyone involved in this evaluation, unless you volunteer for an interview. In that event, only Mr. Rowland will learn your identity and he has pledged that he will keep it confidential.

If you have already returned the first questionnaire, you may disregard this appeal.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James D. Rust

James D. Rust
Ombudsman

encls.

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED OMBUDSMAN AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Form No.

OMBUDSMAN SURVEY

at

Michigan State University

(Winter Term 1969)

This confidential survey is being conducted by Howard Ray Rowland, NDEA Graduate Fellow, Room 401-I, Erickson Hall, College of Education, Michigan State University (Phone 353-3798).

OMBUDSMAN SURVEY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

(Winter Term 1969)

Please read this first: The Office of Ombudsman was established in 1967 at Michigan State University in response to a recommendation of the Academic Freedom Report that a senior faculty member be appointed to "assist students in accomplishing the expeditious settlement of their problems." To assess the effectiveness of that office, this questionnaire is being mailed to all students who consulted the ombudsman during the period September 1 through December 31, 1968. Your cooperation is earnestly solicited. Please answer all questions and mail the completed questionnaire to the researcher within two weeks. For your convenience, a return envelope is enclosed.

Important! The researcher conducting this survey does not know your name. Although information you provide will be made available to interested persons, including the ombudsman, you will remain anonymous to all concerned. This precaution is taken to enable you to answer all questions candidly and completely. Unless you choose to do so in Section F, do not reveal your name on this form. Thank you!

A. Information About You

IN THIS SECTION, ANSWER ALL ITEMS AS THEY APPLIED WHEN YOU CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN SOMETIME BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 1 AND DECEMBER 31, 1968.

1. When you consulted the ombudsman, your class rank was:

   (1) ___ Freshman (4) ___ Senior (7) ___ Other (indicate)
   (2) ___ Sophomore (5) ___ Special Student _____
   (3) ___ Junior (6) ___ Graduate Student

2. When you consulted the ombudsman, your age (in years) was: _____

3. Your sex is: (1) ___ Male (2) ___ Female

4. When you consulted the ombudsman, your marital status was:

   (1) ___ Single (2) ___ Married (3) ___ Divorced (4) ___ Widow or Widower

5. When you consulted the ombudsman, you were a legal resident of:

   (1) ___ Michigan (2) ___ Another state (3) ___ Another country

6. When you consulted the ombudsman, your student residence was:

   On campus
   (1) ___ in a residence hall
   (2) ___ in married housing

   Off campus
   (3) ___ in supervised housing (home of parent(s) or relative(s), co-op house, fraternity, sorority, supervised apartment)
   (4) ___ in unsupervised housing

7. When you consulted the ombudsman, your school or college within the University was:

(1) ___ University College
(2) ___ College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
(3) ___ College of Arts and Letters
(4) ___ College of Business
(5) ___ College of Communication Arts
(6) ___ College of Education
(7) ___ College of Engineering
(8) ___ College of Home Economics
(9) ___ College of Human Medicine
(10) ___ James Madison College
(11) ___ Justin Morrill College
(12) ___ Lyman Briggs College
(13) ___ College of Natural Science
(14) ___ College of Social Sciences
(15) ___ College of Veterinary Medicine
(16) ___ Other (specify) _____

8. When you consulted the ombudsman, were you also enrolled in Honors College?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No

9. When you consulted the ombudsman, your cumulative grade point average was:

(1) ___ 4.0
(2) ___ 3.0 to 3.9
(3) ___ 2.0 to 2.9
(4) ___ 1.0 to 1.9
(5) ___ Below 1.0
(6) ___ None (first-term student)

If uncertain about your cumulative grade point average, remember this letter grade scale:

A = 4.0
B = 3.0 to 3.9
C = 2.0 to 2.9
D = 1.0 to 1.9
Below D = Below 1.0

10. When you consulted the ombudsman, how many institutions of higher education other than Michigan State had you attended?

(1) ___ None (2) ___ One (3) ___ Two (4) ___ More than two

11. If you had attended some other institution(s), indicate kind(s):

(1) ___ Two-year college
(2) ___ Four-year college or university
(3) ___ Other (explain) _____

12. When you were in high school, what was the approximate total enrollment of the school you attended for the greatest length of time?

(1) ___ Under 500 (2) ___ 500 to 1000 (3) ___ 1000 to 2500 (4) ___ Over 2500

B. Your Prior Knowledge About the Ombudsman

1. From which source(s) did you learn about the ombudsman? (Check one or more)

(1) ___ Student(s)
(2) ___ Residence Hall Adviser(s)
(3) ___ Instructor(s)
(4) ___ Academic Adviser(s)
(5) ___ Administrator(s)
(6) ___ Academic Freedom Report
(7) ___ State News
(8) ___ Professional Counselor(s)
(9) ___ Other (indicate) _____

2. If you checked more than one source, from which did you get the most information about the ombudsman? (Check only one)

(1) ___ Student(s)
(2) ___ Residence Hall Adviser(s)
(3) ___ Instructor(s)
(4) ___ Academic Adviser(s)
(5) ___ Administrator(s)
(6) ___ Academic Freedom Report
(7) ___ State News
(8) ___ Professional Counselor(s)
(9) ___ Other (indicate) _____

C. Nature of Your Problem

1. Indicate the general nature of the problem you took to the ombudsman: (Check one or more)

(1) ___ Registration and Admission
(2) ___ Academic Requirements
(3) ___ Traffic Regulations
(4) ___ Financial Need
(5) ___ Quality of Instruction
(6) ___ Housing
(7) ___ Use of Facilities and Services
(8) ___ Tuition and Fees
(9) ___ Academic Status
(10) ___ Academic Advice
(11) ___ Health Center
(12) ___ Employment
(13) ___ Library
(14) ___ Grades
(15) ___ Other (indicate) _____

2. The identity of a student who consults the ombudsman is not revealed except possibly to those directly involved in his complaint. Would you have consulted the ombudsman if his records were open for inspection by anyone?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No (3) ___ Uncertain

D. Disposition of Your Problem

1. To how many people in authority did you take your problem before consulting the ombudsman?

(1) ___ None (3) ___ Two (5) ___ More than three (indicate) _____
(2) ___ One (4) ___ Three

2. If you made an appointment with the ombudsman, how long beyond the appointed hour did you wait to see him?

(1) ___ No delay at all (3) ___ 10 to 30 minutes (5) ___ Over 60 minutes
(2) ___ Under 10 minutes (4) ___ 30 to 60 minutes

3. If you did not make an appointment with the ombudsman, how long did you wait to see him after arriving at his office?

(1) ___ No delay at all (3) ___ 10 to 30 minutes (5) ___ Over 60 minutes
(2) ___ Under 10 minutes (4) ___ 30 to 60 minutes

4. How long did it take the ombudsman to handle your problem?

(1) ___ 10 minutes or less
(2) ___ 10 minutes to 1 hour
(3) ___ 1 hour to 1 day
(4) ___ 1 day to 1 week
(5) ___ 1 week to 1 month
(6) ___ more than 1 month

5. As far as you personally are concerned, to what extent is the problem you took to the ombudsman now solved?

(1) ___ Completely solved
(2) ___ More than half solved
(3) ___ Half solved
(4) ___ Less than half solved
(5) ___ Not solved at all
(6) ___ The problem is worse than it was before

6. How much did the ombudsman help you with your problem?

(1) ___ Much more than I expected
(2) ___ Slightly more than I expected
(3) ___ About as much as I expected
(4) ___ Slightly less than I expected
(5) ___ Much less than I expected

7. How would you describe your degree of satisfaction with the way the ombudsman handled your problem?

(1) ___ Totally satisfied
(2) ___ Mostly satisfied
(3) ___ Slightly satisfied
(4) ___ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
(5) ___ Slightly dissatisfied
(6) ___ Mostly dissatisfied
(7) ___ Totally dissatisfied

8. In your opinion, did the ombudsman do all he could within the authority of his office to help you with your problem?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No (3) ___ Uncertain

9. If the ombudsman could not help you attain the outcome you desired, did he adequately explain why?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No

10. After consulting the ombudsman, did you experience unpleasant treatment by any person(s) involved in his investigation of your complaint?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No

11. If your answer to Question 10 was Yes, please describe what happened:

_____

_____

_____

12. IN THE EVENT YOU ARE NOT PRESENTLY ENROLLED, ANSWER THIS QUESTION AS IF YOU WERE STILL A STUDENT AT MICHIGAN STATE:

If you had another problem you could not handle through normal University "channels," would you return to the ombudsman?

(1) ___ Yes, for any kind of problem

(2) ___ Yes, but only for certain problems

(3) ___ Uncertain about returning

(4) ___ No, would not return

13. Would you recommend the ombudsman to other students?

(1) ___ Yes, for any kind of problem

(2) ___ Yes, but only for certain problems

(3) ___ Uncertain about recommending

(4) ___ No, would not recommend

E. Your Attitudes Regarding the Ombudsman

1. The ombudsman should be: (Check one)

(1) ___ a teaching faculty member

(2) ___ a non-teaching faculty member (administrator)

(3) ___ a professional student personnel worker

(4) ___ a student

(5) ___ a lawyer

(6) ___ a campus minister

(7) ___ none of these (explain)

_____

2. How long should one person serve as ombudsman?

(1) ___ Less than 2 years (2) ___ 2 years (3) ___ More than 2 years

3. Reason(s) for your answer to Question 2: _____

_____

4. Which group or combination of groups should select the ombudsman?

(1) ___ Administration

(2) ___ Students

(3) ___ Faculty

(4) ___ Students and Faculty

(5) ___ Students and Administration

(6) ___ Faculty and Administration

(7) ___ Administration, Faculty and Students

(8) ___ Other (indicate)

_____

5. Read the following list of traits. Then mark a 1 in front of the most important trait an ombudsman should have. Mark a 2 in front of the second most important trait and a 3 in front of the third most important. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

(1) ___ Patience
(2) ___ Empathy
(3) ___ Understanding
(4) ___ Accessibility
(5) ___ Impartiality
(6) ___ Knowledge of campus operations and regulations
(7) ___ Efficiency
(8) ___ Campus "contacts"
(9) ___ Authority
(10) ___ Persuasiveness
(11) ___ Honesty
(12) ___ Experience
(13) ___ Sensitivity
(14) ___ Effectiveness
(15) ___ Other (identify) _____

6. Are the services of the ombudsman widely known among students?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No (3) ___ Uncertain

7. What was your general impression regarding the location of the ombudsman's office on the campus?

(1) ___ Very positive
(2) ___ Positive
(3) ___ Neither positive nor negative
(4) ___ Negative
(5) ___ Very negative

8. In your opinion, where on the campus should the ombudsman's office be located?

(1) ___ Where it is
(2) ___ Student Union
(3) ___ Student Services Building
(4) ___ Administration Building
(5) ___ Other (specify) _____

9. Drawing from your personal experience, do you believe the ombudsman helps alleviate student frustration and hostility?

(1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No (3) ___ Uncertain

10. The functions of the ombudsman should be:

(1) ___ continued without modification
(2) ___ discontinued
(3) ___ modified in some way

11. If you believe the ombudsman's functions should be modified, indicate how:

_____

_____

F. Your Availability for Interview

The researcher may want to interview some respondents. If you have no objection to being contacted for an interview, please list your:

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Phone _____

MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS YOU WISH ON THIS PAGE OR ON A SEPARATE SHEET.

PLEASE PLACE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN RETURN ENVELOPE AND MAIL IMMEDIATELY. DO NOT PUT YOUR RETURN ADDRESS ON ENVELOPE. THANK YOU!