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Data Analysis of the Seven Research Questions

Research Question No. 1 - What are the types of problems that are brought to the attention of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University?

Research Question No. 2 - Who, among the University community at Western Michigan University, brings problems to the Ombudsman's attention?

Research Question No. 3 - What are the circumstances which caused members of the University community to have a problem?

Research Question No. 4 - As a result of the Campus Ombudsman investigating a problem, what are the implications for institutional change, policy and procedures at Western Michigan University and higher education institutions in general?

Research Question No. 5 - What methods and procedures does the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University use in attempting to solve the problem?

Research Question No. 6 - Are the solutions satisfactory to all those involved with a problem?

Research Question No. 7 - What is the attitude of the University community at Western Michigan University toward the Office of the Ombudsman?
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose for studying the ombudsman concept in higher education, and specifically the Office of the University Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, seems appropriately predicated by a discussion of the matter of violent student protest which plagued many colleges and universities during the 1960's. Seemingly related to such discussion of campus unrest is a review of some of the literature concerning the growth and resulting complexity and bureaucracy of many institutions of higher education, especially the larger state universities.

Following the presentation of selected literature on campus unrest and the issues of institutional bureaucracy is a discussion of the origin of the ombudsman concept and the appearance of the ombudsman idea at government levels in the United States.

The discussion then focuses on the ombudsman concept in American higher education and includes selected references to provide background and determine the need for an empirical study of the campus ombudsman, which is what this study has as its primary focus.

Data-based studies concerning the ombudsman concept in higher education are relatively few at the present time. Dissertations completed on the subject of campus ombudsmen amount to three—Rowland (1969), Bottom (1970), and Janzen (1970).
Background of the Problem

Campus unrest and institutional bureaucracy

While violent protest on college and university campuses at the present time has seemingly subsided, higher education, as well as other social institutions, remains in a period of great stress. Demands for change are being directed from within and without the educational enterprise (Gerth, 1969). The year of 1969-70 has been described as the year that began the destruction of higher education. In some colleges and universities the destruction has been attributed to the actions of faculty and administration rather than forces from the outside (Moynihan, 1971). The Scranton Commission (1970) has warned colleges and universities of their indifference and naivety to society's attitudes. The Commission indicates that institutions of higher learning that involve themselves in controversial issues can expect to lose some support from the general citizenry.

Much has been written about the unrest and violence on American college and university campuses, as Humphrey (1971) reports: "Since The Free Speech movement in Berkeley in 1964, student militancy in the United States has generated an ample literature (p. 47)." An empirical study on student protest by Astin (1971) reports that almost all types of protest occurred more frequently in the larger and the more selective institutions of higher learning. Astin's study indicates that the larger the enrollment of a college or university, the greater the probability that protest-prone students would be among the
student population. Another explanation offered by Astin is based on the impersonal attitudes found within the larger institutions, particularly the universities. This impersonal environment is generated by little concern for the individual student and the low amount of personal interaction between students and faculty. The study concludes that feelings of student alienation and depersonalization result in protest behavior on the part of the students.

As to the matter of institutional size being a source of potential student discontent and grievances in institutions of higher education, there does not appear to be much relief in sight. The National Center for Educational Statistics (1970) projects that by 1979-80 degree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education will reflect an increase from 7.3 million in 1969 to 11.1 million in 1979. Bachelor's and first-professional degrees granted have the potential to increase from 784,000 in 1969-70 to 1,188,000 in 1979-80. Full-time-equivalent instructional staff for resident degree-credit courses may increase from 411,000 in 1969-70 to 570,000 in 1979-80. Although cutbacks in expenditures and programs are currently being realized in many colleges and universities, total expenditures of institutions of higher education are predicted to increase from $24.9 billion in 1969-70 to $42.2 billion in 1979-80. The foregoing projected statistics do not represent a slow-down in the student enrollment picture. These projected enrollment statistics of greater numbers of students will throw-off the stigma of their bigness and impersonalization.
Many thoughts, observations, and recommendations have been made since the period of violent student unrest had its beginning with the Berkeley student rebellion of 1964. Johnston (1968) suggested:

The only logical course for a college or university to follow currently is a policy of complete openness to honest demonstrators or dissenters who are willing to discuss problems within the university system. Most administrators know that the present system is far from perfect and are anxious for its improvement (p. 365).

An editorial in the Los Angeles Times (1970) commented on the efforts of colleges and universities to deal with tensions and frustrations over issues which can become the excuse for violence: "The problem is one of attempting to deal with these issues in rational, legitimate and constructive ways... ways that are rejected by the violent."

Many reasons were offered as to why students, faculty, alumni, and the general citizenry of the United States so abruptly became disenchanted with the university. Wilson (1970) offered the following:

All of us, including students, are disturbed by society's apparent inability to find peaceful resolutions of conflict at home and abroad. Recent campus events have dramatized deep-seated student convictions about the necessity for change, and events on the national level have occupied the center stage of student concerns... Universities are too significant in our society for us to be silent witnesses of their debasement, dismemberment, or destruction. To be sure, we must work continuously to reform them. Their curriculums should be revised, their governance modified, and their relevance to admittedly desperate social problems made more direct. But, is it not better to be guided by reason than by impulse as we go about making changes (p. 351)?

The Skolnick Report (1969) identified various key events or experiences as contributing to the unrest on university campuses. These
events included the "Nonviolent Southern Civil Rights Movement," the
"War on Poverty," the "Events at Berkeley," the "Escalation of the War
in Vietnam," the "Draft," "Police on Campus," "Race, Poverty, and
Urban Decline," and "Cooperation by Academic Institutions with the War
Effort and with Military Agencies Generally."

Many of the issues which upset the university community resulted
from frustrations which were directed toward society in general. How­
ever, many criticisms were directed toward the university alone. As
one protest leader exclaimed (U. S, News & World Report, 1968): There
is nothing racial involved here, it is no black and white problem,
it's just that we have demanded a better curriculum, a better faculty,
a better system of student finances, and we haven't been able to get
any satisfaction (p. 39)." Touraine (1968), in commenting on the
student movement on an international basis said: "Criticism is
directed at the content of courses, methods of instruction, examina­
tions, and especially at what students see as the submission of the
university to the forces that dominate society (p. 42)." Policies and
procedures found within institutions of higher learning such as the
grading system, the emphasis placed on grade point averages, the
academic dismissal, the lack of meaningful classroom experiences, and
the inability of institutional policy to take into account the unique­
ness of the individual, have been identified as legitimate student
concerns (Straube and Vermilye, 1968; Hurst and Ivey, 1971; Carey,
1969).
As stated earlier, studies have been made to discover the reasons for the unrest that came upon the college and university scene in the 1960's. In addition to these reasons, specific recommendations have been stated as to how colleges and universities should handle student grievances and frustrations. Butler (1970) reports:

There is no doubt that each of the "multi-versities" is attempting to become more personal as each becomes larger in enrollment . . . On my own campus, we too are attempting to achieve "personalization." The channels of communication between students and administration are open . . . For example, the president and I hold breakfast meetings every two weeks with small groups of students. These sessions from 7:30 to 9:00 A.M. provide our students with unique opportunities to discuss their concerns and their campus problems in an open and frank way . . . these seminars provide the administration with an opportunity to discuss campus policies, procedures, issues and the like from the administration's point of view (p. 136-7).

The Berkeley Study Commission on University Governance (1968) recommended that all members of the university community be involved to formulate institutional policy and procedure so that all alternatives and implications have been explored. Dutton, Appleton, and Birch (1970) also support the idea of more community involvement in the decision-making process. Their data-based study recommends that more active involvement of all members of the university community can improve decisions, remove conflict, help campus morale, and increase the confidence and trust among the members of the university community.

Tied closely with the involvement of all (administrators, faculty, and students) in the decision-making process, is the increased concern and attention being directed toward the university and the due
process which it provides for the lodging of complaints, the settling of grievances, and the handling of disciplinary procedures resulting from infractions of university rules and regulations. The matter of due process in disciplining students on and off campus, and the kinds of contracts entered into between the student and the university are receiving greater attention by the legal courts (Meyerson, 1965). Joyce (1970) speaks to the increase in legal development of due process in colleges and universities since 1961:

The growth of student activism, the increasing number of institutions and students, the view accepted by many that a college education is not only a growing need but perhaps therefore a "right," the increased legal concern with individual rights and the whole egalitarian movement of our times are responsible, it seems to me, for this greater attention (p. 236).

And Littleton (1971), in making reference to the report of the American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent states: "Many students question the values and priorities of higher education . . . Some charge universities are hypocritical in that they fail to practice what they preach, especially in areas of . . . fundamental fairness in disciplinary hearings . . . (p. 14)."

In addition to the attention that universities are to provide to assure due process for students, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970) emphasizes the inclusion of faculty, administrators, and staff and their right of due process by stating: "All members of the campus have a right to fair and equitable procedures which shall determine the validity of charges of violation of campus regulations (p. 3)." Not only are faculty, staff, and administrators capable of
violations of university policy and procedure which may require due
process, but they are also capable of expressing complaints and griev-
ances toward the university. As Stanfield (1972) states:

Here, then, are four sources of alienation for the univer-
sity worker: the confusion of role; the uncertainty of
support in his role; the quality of "invisibility" that
he has for many students and the disagreement with the
liberal and radical ideologies and movements on the uni-
versity campus. Such is the diagnosis. What is the
solution? Is there a solution? Perhaps it is best to
recognize that these are circumstances to which each must
adjust in his own particular way (p. 205-6).

It is perhaps all too evident that institutions of higher learn-
ing, and particularly the large universities, are faced with an
increasing amount of pressure to be more responsive to the individual
concerns of its members—the students, the faculty, and the many mem-
ers of the administrative and service functions. Sanford (1968) has
suggested that: "The next 12 years will be a period of much experi-
mentation and innovation on college campuses, and many of their
officers will learn to enjoy stimulation and change (p. 197)."

Origin of the ombudsman and its
appearance in the United States

In the Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions (Lin-
witz, 1970), one recommendation suggested that colleges and universities
should provide more effective communications through the establishment
of "ombudsmen to hear grievances, speed up communications and unsnarl
red tape (p. 48)."

The idea of ombudsmen on college and university campuses has been
borrowed from the Scandinavian countries and their concern for the
ability of the individual citizen to deal with bureaucracy in government. Speaking to the beginning of the ombudsman, Rosenblum (1966) indicates:

Of all the devices available to citizens for redress of grievances against the bureaucracy, the Swedish Justiti-ombudsman is perhaps the most colorful and has, in any event, received the most attention recently. Established by the Swedish Constitution of 1809 as Parliament's overseer of administrative behavior, the Ombudsman's sole job is to protect the people from infringement of their rights . . . (p. 191).

The ombudsman idea spread to Finland (1919), Denmark (1955), and Norway (1963). A separate ombudsman for military affairs was created in Sweden (1915), Norway (1952), and West Germany (1956). In 1965, bills introducing the ombudsman idea were introduced in California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, Utah, and the New York City Council. In 1966, ombudsman proposals were being considered in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, Holland, and the United States (Reuss and Anderson, 1966).

Reuss (1964) suggested that the United States Congress establish an Administrative Council of Congress to relieve the load of Congressmen and Senators. The Council's purpose was to be modeled after the ombudsman and, as an expert staff, was to specialize in the handling of problems of the various constituents of Congress.

Adding further to the relevance of the ombudsman in government, Anderson (1964) pointed out that the need for such an office is the result of the tremendous growth of bureaucracy at all levels of government—federal, state, and local. McClellan (1968) indicates that the establishment of the ombudsman does not necessarily mean the failure
of government, but that government has increased its responsibilities which used to belong to the individual citizen. And Rosenthal (1964) states: "The Swedish 'Grievance Man' affords a concept which has the great psychological value of providing each person with a systematic method of redress in his dealings with the government bureaucracy at all levels (p. 226)."

Further defining the relationship of the ombudsman with government, Mark A. Hogan (1968) reported to the Western American Assembly on his function as an ombudsman for the public in his official title of Lieutenant Governor of the State of Colorado. Identifying his experience of the ombudsman as an amateur venture, Hogan felt the major focus of his attention was that of enhancing the communication process between the government and the general public.

Anderson (1969) reviews the American experience with the ombudsman at the international, federal, state and local levels of government. He also reviews the origin of the ombudsman and cites the modern concept of the ombudsman as being that of the Danish version. He states: "The Ombudsman as we know him is a Constitutional officer appointed by Parliament to receive, investigate, and report on citizens' complaints of bureaucratic abuse (p. 3)." This more modern concept of the ombudsman is somewhat contrasted to the original intent of the ombudsman, as Rowat (1968) indicates: "However, in the society of today his duty is discharged in a different way. Initially the role of the Ombudsman was thought of as that of a prosecutor in proceedings taken against judges and civil servants (p. 40)." Anderson refers to
the post of the ombudsman as being someone who is impartial, independent, very accessible, an expert in government, and has the power to recommend and publicize. He also discusses the feasibility of an ombudsman at the federal level in the United States, indicating that the size of the population in the United States presents a problem of scale to the establishment of a single office of the ombudsman at the federal level. However, in citing the Final Report of the American Assembly (1967), Anderson quotes: "... we do recommend that applications of the concept be undertaken at the federal level (p. 6-7)."

These applications referred to included the Bureau of Prisons, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and the Veterans Administration. At the state and local level Anderson identifies the year, 1967, as the year of ombudsman proposals and experimentation.

In evaluating a municipal ombudsman experiment at Buffalo, New York, Tibbles and Holland (1970) concluded that the ombudsman was of some value in relieving racial and poverty tensions and improving public administration. They support the adaptation of the Scandinavian model of the ombudsman to American government, and urge that the local municipal ombudsman be allowed to extend to the local offices of state and national government. Tibbles and Holland caution that certain agencies such as police departments and hospitals may require special attitudes and procedures.

This section has presented relevant discussion as to the origin of the ombudsman and its development in government in the United States.
By no stretch of the imagination does the foregoing discussion include all of the literature to be found concerning the ombudsman in government. Rather it was the purpose to give general consideration to the subject of the ombudsman in government before discussing the rationale for studying the campus ombudsman in America, and specifically at Western Michigan University.

In summary, the potential for the ombudsman becoming an integral part of federal, state, and local government seems quite evident. Anderson (1969) and Rowat (1968) as well-known authorities on the ombudsman idea in government, indicate the urgency and appropriateness of establishing the ombudsman in American government. They both advocate the addition of the ombudsman in democratic forms of government, and predict the ombudsman idea to become a standard part of government throughout the democratic world.

Why Study the Campus Ombudsman?—The Rationale

Bottom (1970) reports: "Not surprisingly, published sources on campus Ombudsmanry are sparse. The experiment has been underway only since 1965 (p. 44)."

Janzen (1970) identifies the source of the first campus ombudsman in the United States when he identifies the origin of the ombudsman on the campus of Eastern Montana College:

On May 15, 1966, President Stanley Heywood stated he felt the Scandinavian concept of ombudsman had some relevance for colleges. The President then sought to find Eastern Montana College's and the United States' first ombudsman in higher education. President Heywood appointed George Gloege, a professor of Chemistry, to the post on October 7, 1966 (p. 170).
Bottom (1970) further reports: There were only fourteen campus ombudsmen by the end of 1968 (p. 44)." Dr. Howard Ray Rowland provided this writer with a list compiled by him in March, 1971, of Colleges and Universities with Campus Ombudsmen or Ombudsman-Like Operations (See Appendix A). The list includes sixty-nine colleges and universities which had ombudsmen as of March, 1971, and seven colleges and universities which were considering the possibility of ombudsmen on their campuses.

Bottom (1970) reported that much of the periodical literature is redundant and that book sources on campus ombudsmanry appear to be practically nonexistent. Rowat (1956) points out in the introduction of his work, The Ombudsman, that colleges and universities are considering the ombudsman concept. Stanley V. Anderson (1969) expressed interest in introducing the campus ombudsman in the United States. As Bottom (1970) indicates: "Anderson is the only known authority to have enthusiastically recommended and aided the establishment of campus ombudsmen (p. 45 - footnote 4)."

Glickman (1969) provided some insight into the American campus ombudsman by citing the opinions of practicing ombudsmen such as James D. Rust at Michigan State University; George Gloege at Eastern Montana College; Thomas F. Davis at the University of Detroit; Michael Farmer, a student ombudsman at the University of Kentucky; Nelson Norman at San Diego State College; Ralph Pablano at San Jose State College; Irving Delhoff at Columbia University; George Lietmann at the University of California at Berkeley; and Mrs. Alice H. Cook at Cornell University.

Seven articles appeared in the NASPA Journal (April, 1970) concerning the ombudsman in higher education. As author of the introductory article, Daniel B. Wolf pointed out the difficulty involved in evaluating the ombudsman's role. Louis C. Stamatakos and Olaf Isachsen provided guidelines on how to utilize the ombudsman as a more effective force in higher education, and also described case studies demonstrating conflicts which the university ombudsman typically handles. Earle W. Clifford's paper presented at the University of Detroit Conference on the Ombudsman in Higher Education (October, 1968) is also included. Clifford presents a viewpoint questioning the justification for the ombudsman's presence in American higher education. John Paul Eddy provides a review of campus ombudsmanry and suggests the office is too new to evaluate effectively. Nelson F. Norman provides a job description for the campus ombudsman, and Nancy K. Schlossberg identifies some issues which may present problems to the ombudsman concept.
Speck (1971) presents a review of the ombudsman in higher education by discussing his role, responsibilities and limitations. He refers to the need of the ombudsman as resulting from an increase in student enrollment and the accompanying impersonality resulting from academic and administrative procedures. Speck also presents a discussion on the type of problems brought to the ombudsman, the techniques he uses to handle these problems, the length of time in office, the methods of filling the position, the benefits derived from having an ombudsman on campus, and the ombudsman's role in crisis situations.

An article appearing in School and Society (February, 1968) reviews the appointment of Dr. James Rust as Michigan State University's first ombudsman, with his charge being to assist students in obtaining informal and speedy settlements of their problems.

Doolittle (1969 and 1970) speaks to the power of the ombudsman, suggesting that the ombudsman offers great potential for solving many problems that result from the bureaucratic structure of many institutions of higher learning. He also suggests that the power of the ombudsman lies in his prerogative of making public comment concerning maladministration. Doolittle warns that confusion over the role of the ombudsman may lead to the ombudsman serving the established bureaucracy or becoming so inoffensive as to be ignored.

Geossman (1967) presents an argument for installing ombudsmen in school districts in the United States, citing the first reported municipal ombudsman in the United States, Nassau County, New York, as the prime example and model to follow.
Rationale for the Study

Differing views are expressed concerning the role and function of the American campus ombudsman. These contrasting viewpoints, together with the data-based studies of Rowland (1969), Bottom (1970), Janzen (1970), and Pablano (1971), indicate further need for study of the campus ombudsman. A definite lack of empirical study of the campus ombudsman is evident. As Bottom (1970) indicated: "One dissertation has been completed on the subject; six more are known to be in progress (p. 44)." Bottom was referring to Rowland's (1969) dissertation as the completed study, and those in progress included his own, one at George Washington University, one at Ohio State University, one at the University of Montana, and two at the University of California, Berkeley. In addition to this writer's dissertation, one other at the University of Mississippi is known to be in progress.

The following discussion, then, represents the rationale for studying the campus ombudsman in higher education and specifically the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University.

Offering comments about the ombudsman conference in San Francisco in May of 1969, Beck (1969) felt that the participants of the conference were speaking of an advocate of special interest groups. He explains that the lobbyist function of a particular group is in direct conflict with the true concept of the ombudsman. Beck warns that the campus ombudsman idea may become "bastardized" and cause misunderstanding. Speaking further about the need for additional research, Beck (1969) states: "There are some vital areas where research, experience and
model building must take place if the Ombudsman concept is going to be successful in higher education (p. 2)."

Clark (1969) expresses doubts concerning the ombudsman's contribution to higher education: "... actual experience with the adaptability of the 150-year-old Scandinavian institution ... is so limited (p. 7)." Also, due to the lack of data, Norman (1969), speaking as a practicing campus ombudsman has to guess as to his effectiveness when he says: "As a guess, perhaps two-thirds to three-quarters of the students got the service they applied for ... (p. 27)." Moore (1968) recognizes the need for more data concerning the ombudsman when he says: "... judgments of its desirability incorporate certain assumptions which are capable of empirical verification (p. 70)."

Since a lack of data exists as to how various campus ombudsmen function, many ombudsman authorities and practicing ombudsmen must rely on their reading and experience to state their opinions about the campus ombudsman. Dr. Randy H. Hamilton, a practicing ombudsman at San Diego State, has made some of the most meaningful contributions to understanding the campus ombudsman. His thoughts are seemingly agreed upon by Professors Gellhorn (1966), Rowat (1968), Anderson (1968), and Davis (1962). Hamilton (1969) states the characteristics of the campus ombudsman in the following manner:

He is a high level officer. He is free and independent of both the agencies he may criticize and the agency that appoints him. He has long tenure of office sufficient to immunize him from the natural pressures of seeking reappointment. He has the powers to investigate administrative practices on his own motion. He is unique in that his sole job is to receive and act
on complaints without charge to the complainant. He should have the power to subpoena records. He operates informally and expediently, without formal hearing procedures. His weapons are reporting, persuasion, criticism, and publicity, and he does not have the power to punish maladministrators or reverse administrative decisions (p. 17).

Sandler (1968) believes the campus ombudsman can play a "preventive role," i.e., identifying problems and correcting these problems before trouble starts. Sandler raises the question of having special ombudsmen to serve special interest and minority groups. The questions of whether or not the campus ombudsman should initiate grievances on his own, and whether or not the campus ombudsman should more closely follow the Swedish model are raised by Sandler.

White (1968), serving initially as an ombudsman for minority groups, reflects on the growth of the office of the Ombudsman at San Jose State when he states: "Although the major work of the office was with the problems of our ethnic minorities it soon became apparent the job could not limit itself to that area. Its very presence brought many others with unresolved problems for which they simply had no place else to go (p. 2)." White warns that the campus ombudsman will be effective only if he is trusted by those persons who created the office and by those who use the office. The campus ombudsman cannot be a substitute for academic reform, better administration, and constant evaluation.

Dr. James Rust (1969) of Michigan State University explains his role as the ombudsman in the following:
One, the charge to the Ombudsman is phrased in rather general terms so that the person appointed would have fairly wide latitude in creating the post to fit his own conceptions of the role. Two, the Ombudsman should be appointed from among the senior faculty and the position should be one of "high prestige." Three, he is outside the regular table of organization, representing the President of the University and reporting to him (or to his deputy, the Provost). Four, the Ombudsman has "broad investigatory powers" and "direct and ready access to all University officials." Subsumed under the phrase "broad investigatory powers" is the power of access to all University student records except those involving professional confidence, as in the Medical Center or the Mental Hygiene Clinic (p. 3).

The Ombudsman's position at Michigan State University is devised to handle grievances and problems of students only. Dr. Rust identifies the ombudsman's responses to student problems as a matter of listening, advising, explaining, referring, and reviewing. Each case may require calling on any one response or a combination of responses as the appropriate course of action for the ombudsman.

Norman (1969) suggests there is no particular model for the ombudsman, and that each practicing ombudsman must focus on the needs of the students within his institution. Norman's orientation, seemingly similar to that of Rust's at Michigan State, emphasizes clarification of the campus ombudsman's role in terms of method of appointment, accessibility to campus officials, office procedures (record keeping), nature of his power, payment of his salary, and guarantees for his "invulnerability."

Schlossberg (1967) commented that student personnel workers would be the most obvious group within the college or university structure to push the ombudsman idea. Schlossberg (1968) suggests: "A campus ombudsman would be a status person—possibly a legal philosopher—
attached to the office of the president (p. 61).” She further points out in selecting a campus ombudsman, the person selected should be impartial with an interest in hearing students and the ability or insight to understand the administrator. And Kellcher (1968) offers: "... university and college officials ... seemed to be in general agreement with the notion that a Campus Ombudsman should be chosen from the ranks of academicians—someone who knows the ropes (p. 21)."

However, Buccieri (1968) warns, in citing statements by Michigan State University's Provost Neville, that the academic professor assuming the role of ombudsman may become estranged from his colleagues and department because he will not be doing the same kinds of things as his colleagues throughout his term of office. Buccieri states an additional warning about the ombudsman's role: "Unfortunately ... the ombudsman cannot be all things to all people ... There is also the fear that one ombudsman, or three ombudsmen, is not enough to do the job (p. 6)."

Dr. Herbert London (1970) serving a one-year term as ombudsman in the School of Education at New York University reviewed the literature, attempting to determine how other campus ombudsmen were performing on their respective campuses. London reports that he found the literature a "mixed bag." London found that some campus ombudsmen were regarded as advocates of special interest groups, varying from advocates of the administration to advocates of student activism. He also discovered that some ombudsmen kept office hours twelve hours a day, as contrasted to some ombudsmen spending no more than ten hours a semester to handle their cases. While Dr. London's observations make reference
to confusion concerning the role and function of the campus ombudsman, others have doubt in regard to the contribution the ombudsman can make to colleges and universities. For example, Clifford (1968) states:

Appointment of an ombudsman could serve to convince members of an academic community that no real remedy will be sought for problems that have been identified. It can also encourage those who have ombudsman responsibilities throughout the institution that they need to give less attention to that function since it has been assigned to a special staff member. The ombudsman, to me therefore, smacks too much of the "gimmick," too much of the simplistic response to a complex problem, and too little of a willingness to confront the challenge of the real problem and its causes (p. 12).

And Kellcher (1968) states that the office of the campus ombudsman must be present before the "complex problem" of which Clifford speaks can be corrected: "The Ombudsman's thrust on a university campus must be a never-ending effort to create a situation wherein he becomes unemployable . . . (p. 21)."

As mentioned earlier, much of the rationale for studying the campus ombudsman is due to the lack of empirical information. However, a few studies do exist. Poblano (1971) attempted "to determine the extent of consensus or disagreement on the role behavior of California campus ombudsmen as perceived by four selected groups (p. 580)." Poblano polled a total of 153 subjects, including all fifteen California campus ombudsmen and 30 high-level administrators, faculty, and students who were selected because they had a working knowledge of the ombudsman's role as well as actual contact with an ombudsman. Due to the small sample and the fact that Poblano's sample was selected, much care would have to be taken in interpreting his findings.
However, a few conclusions of Poblano's research suggest further study. He reported that opinions differed as to how the ombudsman should resolve conflict, how the office should be funded, the length of term in office, and how the duties and responsibilities of the ombudsman should be defined and accepted.

Another study, presumed to be in progress at Ohio State University (1970), revealed that 14 out of 33 ombudsmen surveyed indicated a NO RESPONSE when asked how they thought they were perceived by faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

Rowland (1969) completed the first dissertation on the campus ombudsman. In his study of the Ombudsman at Michigan State University, Rowland presented a historical review of the ombudsman concept and also surveyed 218 students who had consulted the Ombudsman at Michigan State. As Rowland (1969) stated in recommending further study of the campus ombudsman:

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 (p. 190).

Bottom's (1970) dissertation on the subject of campus ombudsmen involved his interviewing four campus ombudsmen representing three major role types which he labels as Grievance Man, Advocate, and Innovator. Bottom also surveyed 65 students who had consulted the ombudsman of the Claremont Colleges and 55 staff and faculty department heads, top administrators and their assistants. Bottom compares his results with Rowland's in an attempt to clarify the role of the
ombudsman. In speaking of the Michigan State model, Bottom (1970) states:

Howard Rowland, who completed the first dissertation on the campus Ombudsman, has widely disseminated a model which can only be harmful to future development of the office on American campuses. The model has been shown, in this work, to be restrictive, overblown, and clumsy. Rowland’s campus Ombudsman is designed only for use by students. It must, according to Rowland, be operated by a faculty member (p. 190-1).

Rowland’s (1969) model for campus ombudsman that Bottom criticizes consists of 18 features and includes the following:

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 administrative 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 be 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 (p. 184-5).

As mentioned before, Bottom disagrees with Rowland's campus ombudsman model, and as a result of his dissertation offers a model of his own,

Bottom (1970) states:

Below lies another model. It, too, will be found to have faults. Hopefully they will be attended to by a potential user before activation on any campus. It is a model designed to protect the essentials of the concept. It is not purported to be complete.

a. The Ombudsman office should have the status of an independent agency.

b. All members of the campus community should have direct access to the Ombudsman.

c. The Ombudsman should have full access to all campus records.

d. The powers of the Ombudsman should be:

1. to decide what cases he will accept;
2. to initiate his own cases; and
3. to make public or private recommendations and/or revelation of fact.

e. The Ombudsman should be chosen by a nomination process involving staff, faculty, and students.

f. The individual nominated as Ombudsman should have majority endorsement by student government, faculty senate, and staff organization (if extant). Appointment should be automatic following this process.

g. The term of office, salary, staff allowances, and re-appointment, and removal procedures should be explicit. Removal should involve two-thirds approval of student government, faculty senate, and staff organization.
The Ombudsman should be required to submit public, annual reports (p. 129-30).

Making reference to needed additional studies of the campus ombudsman, Bottom (1970) suggests:

The Ombudsman concept has been subjected to more alteration on American campuses in the last four years than has occurred on the international scene in one hundred and sixty years . . . .

More attention should be paid to the campus Ombudsman. More studies should be made; they should be disseminated widely (p. 193-4).

In addition to Rowland (1969) and Bottom (1970) completing dissertations on the campus ombudsman, Janzen (1970) treated the campus ombudsman concept historically and attempted "to determine the nature and status trends of the ombudsman in United States higher education (p. 33)" through contacting 73 institutions of higher education thought to have ombudsman positions. Janzen (1970) states the following concerning the ombudsman: "Although his roles, functions, and duties vary some from institution to institution, consensus holds that his primary goal should be to aid students, faculty, and staff members with the redress of grievances as expeditiously and equitably as possible (p. 211)." However, Janzen indicates: "In 48 out of the 62 institutions employing ombudsmen, only one ombudsman serves the entire constituency (p. 217)." Among Janzen's recommendations for further study of the campus ombudsman, he identifies a need for studies to determine similarities and dissimilarities between various campus ombudsmen; to answer questions regarding duplication of ombudsman services on individual campuses; to determine the effectiveness of the campus ombudsman; to identify personal traits which are necessary for
the ombudsman to be successful; to establish if the campus ombudsman has a positive effect on decreasing campus violence and student unrest; and to determine the expectations of the campus ombudsman held by the constituents he serves.

The need for further study of the campus ombudsman seems obvious. As Janzen (1971) indicated, only one institution out of forty-eight reported an ombudsman that serves the entire university community. A study of Western Michigan University's Ombudsman seems even more appropriate, since Western's Ombudsman, too, is designed to serve the entire university community. Wolf (1970) states: "Since the campus ombudsman is of such recent origin, it's difficult to evaluate his role. Nevertheless, many administrators, deans of students, and students are interested in learning more about the theory and practice of the ombudsman (p. 189)." And Stamatakos and Isachsen (1970) indicate: "It may be particularly timely to investigate the impact of the university ombudsman on the academic community (p. 190)."

It is evident that a lack of specific information exists as to the nature of the work of the ombudsman. Differing opinions are expressed and models (Rowland, 1969, and Bottom, 1970) offered concerning what the ombudsman should or should not be doing. It is entirely possible that the presence of an ombudsman on a college or university campus is an admission that the present organization or system represents much disregard for the individual and his rights. It is possible that many policies and procedures confuse the issues rather than solve them. Hence, we have the new concept of ombudsman emerging on college and university campuses. What does the ombudsman do, and how does he do it?
How do members of the university community perceive the ombudsman?
Is he an encroachment on someone else's authority and responsibility?
Is the ombudsman, as Clifford (1968) suggests, just another administrative "gimmick" to pacify all those who have a grievance? What implications does the recognized need for an ombudsman have on the validity of current university organization relative to its educational goals? Answers to these questions and many more give credence to further study of the ombudsman in higher education. London (1970) states: "Just what the role involves is still hard to say (p. 3)."
Tibbles (1969) summarizes the confusion: "Ironically, although the word Ombudsman is frequently used, there is still much confusion as to what an Ombudsman does and does not do (p. 1)." However, Brawer (1972) would question the ability of the American public to correctly use the word. He comments on his position as the first Ombudsman at Western Michigan University:

At the outset, it seemed that the most frequent question was, "You're a what?" ... Say are you Mr. Buzzman? No, I'm the Ombudsman. Oh I'm sorry but if you're Hans Budman, who's the University Ambushman (p. 15)?

Statement of the Problem

The study of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University is concerned with reviewing, (1) the problems brought to the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University for investigation, and (2) the circumstances arising before, during, and after the Ombudsman's problem-solving efforts; and with assessing the attitudes
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of selected members of the university community toward the general concept of ombudsman.

Recognizing that more information is needed before judgment and opinions can have meaning for the campus ombudsman's relevance to higher education, the objectives of the study involve an attempt to provide answers to the following seven research questions:

1. What are the types of problems that are brought to the attention of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University?

2. Who, among the university community at Western Michigan University, brings problems to the ombudsman's attention?

3. What are the circumstances which caused members of the university community to have a problem?

4. As a result of the campus ombudsman investigating a problem, what are the implications for institutional change, policy and procedures at Western Michigan University and higher education institutions in general?

5. What methods and procedures does the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University use in attempting to solve a problem?

6. Are the solutions satisfactory to all those involved with a problem?

7. What is the attitude of the university community at Western Michigan University toward the Office of the Ombudsman?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered to avoid, and hopefully, to prevent any confusion about the meanings of each of the significant terms used in the seven research questions of the study:
Attitude: The use of the word, attitude, in this study is that of Kerlinger (1964):

An attitude . . . is a predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a cognitive object. One has an attitude toward something "out there" . . . A summated rating scale (also called Likert-type scale) is a set of attitude items, all of which are considered of approximately equal "attitude value," and to each of which subjects respond with degrees of agreement or disagreement (intensity). The scores of the items of such a scale are summed, or summed and averaged, to yield an individual's attitude score. As in all attitude scales, the purpose of the summated rating scale is to place an individual somewhere on an agreement continuum of the attitude in question (p. 483-4).

Circumstances: This term refers to the reasons why a particular member of the university community sought assistance from the campus ombudsman at Western Michigan and is closely related to the types of problems definition. Circumstances involves a more detailed analysis of the reasons behind the problem, and is specifically utilized in the case study analysis portion of the study, referred to as Before the Ombudsman.

Implications: Suggestions and recommendations which may become evident as a result of the study of the Office of Ombudsman at Western Michigan University are referred to as implications.

Methods and procedures: Methods refer to the specific strategies which the campus ombudsman may use to accomplish his goals in solving problems. For example, his methods may include persuasion, criticism, public exposure, investigation, negotiation, status within the university, and appeal to a higher authority. The ombudsman's procedures may include individual interview, group interview, personal case notes,
public speaking, telephone inquiry, clarification and explanation, and referral. Methods and procedures may overlap and are used interchangeably, or in conjunction with each other. Methods and procedures are treated analytically in the case study analysis portion of the study referred to as During the Ombudsman.

**Problems (types of):** Types of problems include the identification of the nature of the grievance, complaint, or information brought to the Ombudsman at Western Michigan by the individual seeking assistance from his Office. Major categories of type of problem include Student Academic Problems, Student Non-Academic Problems, and Problems of Faculty and Staff. (Please refer to Appendix C for a detailed outline.)

**Solutions:** A solution refers to what happens as the result of an individual seeking assistance from the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, and as a result of the Office's investigation of a particular problem. Solutions are discussed in the case study analysis portion of the study referred to as After the Ombudsman.

**University community:** The university community is defined as the citizenry of Western Michigan University and is made up of the following groups: students, faculty, top-level administration and staff, and the larger group of University employees which provide either support or services to Western Michigan University.

**Western Michigan University:** A public, four-year, state supported institution of higher learning located in Kalamazoo, Michigan.
Major colleges within the University include the College of Education, the College of Applied Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, the College of Fine Arts, and the Graduate College. Western Michigan University has a student population of approximately 21,000 students and 3,200 employees.

Office of the University Ombudsman: Reference to the Office of the University Ombudsman specifically means the campus ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Established in a special meeting of the University's Board of Trustees on Monday, July 6, 1970, Dr. Milton J. Brawer was appointed as the University's first ombudsman to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. (A detailed description of the Western Michigan University Ombudsman's Office can be found in Appendix B.)

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The primary contribution of this study should be the additional information that will be provided concerning the work of the campus ombudsman in higher education. Although Rowland (1969) and Bottom (1970) provided some insight into the work of the campus ombudsman, this study should provide greater insight as to the attitudes held toward the ombudsman by various members of the university community. The study also provides information as to the kinds of problems brought to the ombudsman, how they are dealt with by the ombudsman, and the degree of effectiveness the ombudsman has in solving these problems. Also, this study will provide a means of comparison with
the results obtained on other campuses, i.e., Rowland's (1969) study and Bottom's (1970) study of the campus ombudsman.

This study was limited to the observation and analysis of the campus ombudsman at Western Michigan University. This factor alone limits the inferences that may be drawn from the results.

This study of a campus ombudsman, who is charged to provide service to all the various members of the university community, and not just students or faculty, is the first of its kind. It is anticipated the results will assist in clarifying the duties and responsibilities of campus ombudsmen in higher education. Finally, although the instruments used were tested for reliability and validity, and, in part, also used previously in Rowland's study (1969) and Bottom's study (1970), there remains a need for further revision and refinement.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN

Procedures

The purpose of the study was to discover more about the work of the campus ombudsman in higher education. The Ombudsman at Western Michigan University was selected for study. The objective involved an attempt to answer the seven research questions presented in Chapter I (See page 29)

To provide answers to these seven research questions, case studies representative of the problems brought to the Ombudsman at Western Michigan were analyzed. In addition, a questionnaire was sent to students, faculty and staff to assess their attitudes of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan. Students, faculty and staff were sent a questionnaire appropriately designed for the following four groups:

1. Students who consulted the Ombudsman (referred to as SCO).
2. Faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman (referred to as FSCO).
3. Students who had not consulted the Ombudsman (referred to as SBS or student body sample).
4. Faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman (referred to as FSS or faculty and staff sample).
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Population and Sample

The case studies

The population of case studies consisted of all those students, faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University during the fall semester, 1971. A stratified-random sample of twenty-one case studies was drawn from the total population of 486 case studies. Each of the twenty-one case studies was randomly selected from a problem category format (See Appendix D) used by the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Dr. Milton Brawer, Western's Ombudsman, revised the problem format originally developed by Michigan State University's Ombudsman, Dr. James Rust. Brawer's revision was necessary to accommodate his role of Ombudsman at Western Michigan, i.e., that of serving all members of the University community and not just students. Presently, the Ombudsman at Michigan State hears only student problems and grievances.

Table 1 indicates the stratification of the problem categories and the number of case studies randomly selected from each category. One case study was randomly selected from each of the Student Academic Problem Categories and Student Non-Academic Problem Categories; two case studies were randomly selected from each of the Faculty and Staff Problem Categories.

A case-log sheet (See Appendix E) maintained by the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan and a table of random numbers (Edwards, 1960, p. 332-3) were utilized to obtain a stratified-random sample of
### TABLE 1

PROBLEM CATEGORIES AND NUMBER OF CASE STUDIES
SELECTED AT RANDOM FROM EACH CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Category</th>
<th>Number of Cases Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Academic Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of admission and registration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems related to instructor's teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems related to grading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of records</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of academic requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of academic status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of academic advising and counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Student Academic Problems) = 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Non-Academic Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems and complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of auto use and police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem of student employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of University facilities and services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of student activities and organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal problems (non-academic and non-employment)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Student Non-Academic Problems) = 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems of Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of faculty and staff employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff policy and procedural questions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total (Problems of Faculty and Staff) = 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample of Case Studies Selected = 21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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case studies representative of the problem categories identified in Table 1. The case-log sheets summarize the problems brought to the Ombudsman. These case-log sheets contain the date the problem was brought to the Ombudsman; the identifying case number; the name of the client (person consulting the Ombudsman); whether the client was a student or employee at Western Michigan University; the type of problem (a short statement of the nature of the problem—the Brawer format of problem categorization as found in Appendix D); and whether the problem was solved, partially solved, or not solved. The population of case-study numbers from which the sample of twenty-one case studies was drawn, included case numbers 1 to 486. Case numbers were selected from a table of random numbers (Edwards, 1960) until all problem categories (as listed in Table 1) were represented. This process was repeated a second time for those case studies originally selected, but later eliminated because the client could not be reached for an interview. A total of six case studies originally selected was substituted as the result of unsuccessful contact with the client. A total sample of twenty-one case studies, then, was selected for analysis and was considered representative of the general problem categories in the Brawer format (The format originally used from which to draw the sample of cases has since been revised by Dr. Brawer.). These twenty-one case studies are presented in descriptive form in Chapter III.
The four questionnaire survey groups

Students, faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman between September 1, 1970, and December 18, 1971, and students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971, made up the population from which samples were drawn. A total population of 1,333 cases was brought to the attention of the Ombudsman between September 1, 1970, and December 18, 1971. Table 2 indicates the population of those who consulted the Ombudsman.

**TABLE 2**

**POPULATION OF PERSONS CONSULTING THE OMBUDSMAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Population</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO (students consulting Ombudsman)</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO (faculty and staff consulting Ombudsman)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (alumni, parents, off-campus agencies, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (identity of client not known)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman (cases initiated by the Ombudsman)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined (cases pending or not filed)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual case population total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,333</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minus undetermined cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Total (from which samples were drawn)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,280</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Members of the case population in Table 2 designated as other, anonymous, Ombudsman, and undetermined were excluded from the population. Only the members of the SCO group and members of the FSCO group were included in the study. Therefore, a total population of 1,002 students consulting the Ombudsman (SCO) and 182 faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman (FSCO) were used from which to select a sample. The samples drawn represent all those members of the total population for which an address could be obtained.

An attempt was made to secure addresses for the total population of the SCO group. Within the population of the 1,002 membership of the SCO group, there were 38 duplicates, or students who consulted the Ombudsman more than one time. An address was not obtained for an additional 159 members of the SCO group. These 159 members (SCO) represented an inaccurate student identification number, a name change, an inaccurate spelling of their name, or a deletion of their name and address from the student master file contained on a magnetic tape in the Data Processing Office of Western Michigan University (the Data Processing Office is used for administrative purposes of the University and should not be confused with the Computer Center of the University utilized primarily for scientific research purposes).

A total of 805 students had an obtainable address. The sample of 805 students who had consulted the Ombudsman (SCO) made up one of the four survey groups. Each of the members of the SCO group was sent a questionnaire through the mail (See Table 3). Of the 805 members of the SCO group sent a questionnaire, 55 were returned marked "insufficient address" or "no such person at this address." The total number
of questionnaires returned by the members of the SCO group was 515
or a 68.5 percent return. Of these 515 questionnaires returned, 487
were machine-processed for analysis.

Faculty and staff who had consulted the Ombudsman (FSCO) totaled
182 (See Table 3). Questionnaires were sent to a sample of 129 of
these faculty and staff who had consulted the Ombudsman. Faculty and
staff consulting the Ombudsman more than one time (duplicates)
amounted to 45 and were excluded from the sample. An additional
eight FSCO members were also excluded because they were no longer
employed at the University and a forwarding address could not be
obtained.

The return percentage of questionnaires sent to the 129 member
sample of the FSCO group was 65.5 percent, or 82 returned. A total
of 68 questionnaires was capable of being machine-processed for
analysis.

Table 3 indicates the number of persons in the SCO and FSCO popu­
lation and sample, and the percentages of the questionnaires returned
for these two survey groups.

A questionnaire was also sent to students, faculty and staff who
had not consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971. A random
sample of 1,000 students (SBS) enrolled during the fall semester,
1971, was drawn from a total of 21,846 students having a record on the
student master file (magnetic tape file) in the Data Processing
Office of Western Michigan University. The student identification
numbers of the 21,846 students contained on the student master file
### Table 3
POPULATION AND SAMPLE DATA OF STUDENTS CONSULTING THE OMBUDSMAN (SCO), AND FACULTY AND STAFF CONSULTING THE OMBUDSMAN (FSCO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group (1)</th>
<th>Number in population (2)</th>
<th>Number excluded from population (3)</th>
<th>Number in sample (4)</th>
<th>Number excluded from sample (5)</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires mailed (6)</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires returned (7)</th>
<th>Percentage of Questionnaires returned (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO (students consulting the Ombudsman)</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO (faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incorrect addresses

**NOTE:**
1. Totals in column (4) are obtained by subtracting column (3) from column (2).
2. Totals in column (6) are obtained by subtracting column (5) from column (4).
3. Percentages in column (8) are obtained by dividing column (7) by column (6).
were copied onto a separate magnetic tape. A program was designed by the programming staff of the Computer Center at Western Michigan University to specifically select at random, 1,000 student identification numbers from the 21,846 numbers contained on the copy of the student master file. These 1,000 students made up the SBS group or members of the student body who had not consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971. Addresses were obtained for 983 of the total SBS sample of 1,000. Seventeen members of the SBS group were excluded from the sample because they had consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971. A total of 983 students who had not consulted the Ombudsman, then, made up the random sample, and were sent a questionnaire (See Table 4). Forty-three questionnaires were returned marked "insufficient address." Questionnaires returned totaled 568, or 60.4 percent. Of these 568, a total of 513 SBS questionnaires were able to be machine-processed for analysis.

The fourth group receiving a questionnaire about the Ombudsman consisted of faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971, and referred to in Table 4 and through the study as FSS (faculty and staff sample). The members of the FSS group were randomly selected within the various departments at Western Michigan University as defined by the University Directory. All departments of the University were included, except for the Geology Department, the Institute of Public Affairs, and the off-campus offices of the Division of Continuing Education. The Geology Department and Institute of Public Affairs were not included in the
original printing of the University Directory. The off-campus extension centers were excluded from the study due to their limited contact with the on-campus operation of the University.

A total of 2,006 faculty and staff were listed in the 1971-72 University Directory. Using a table of random numbers (Edwards, 1960, p. 332-3), approximately one-fourth of the members listed within each department were randomly selected and sent a questionnaire concerning the Ombudsman. The random selection procedure resulted in the selection of 527 faculty and staff from the total population of 2,006, or 26.2 percent (See Table 4).

It was necessary to exclude 33 members of the FSS group from the original sample of 527 because these 33 persons had consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971, and were, therefore, considered duplicates of the FSGO group (faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman). As indicated in Table 4, 494 faculty and staff (FSS) were mailed a questionnaire, or 24.6 percent of the total population of 2,006. Eleven of the 494 questionnaires were returned marked "insufficient address," "no such person at this address," or had left the University. A total of 291 FSS questionnaires were returned, or 60.2 percent. Of the 291 returned, 281 were able to be machine-processed for analysis.

Population and sample data for students (SBS), and faculty and staff (FSS) who had not consulted the Ombudsman prior to December 18, 1971, are presented in Table 4. The data in Table 3 and Table 4 provide a summary of the four survey groups mailed a questionnaire;
the 751-member SCO group, the 125-member FSCO group, the 940-member SBS group, and the 483-member FSS group.

The Data Gathering Devices

The case study interview

Each of the twenty-one clients whose problem was selected for case study was interviewed. Permission to study each of the twenty-one case studies was granted by Dr. Milton Brawer, Western Michigan University Ombudsman.

Each client was contacted by telephone and asked if he/she would be willing to participate in the study. All clients contacted agreed to participate. An interview appointment was then arranged at the client's convenience. Each interview usually involved 30 to 90 minutes of verbal interaction between the client and the investigator (the reference made to the investigator in the study is the same as the writer of the study). The client was told that his/her case was selected at random, and was representative of one of the general categories of problems that is brought to the attention of the Ombudsman. Each client was also told that his/her name would remain anonymous, as would any specific reference he (hereafter used in the generic sense to refer to male or female) made to specific departments or members of the University community.

The reasons for the interview were explained to each client during the initial contact via the telephone and at the beginning of the personal interview. The reasons explained to each client were
TABLE 4

POPULATION AND SAMPLE DATA OF STUDENTS WHO HAD NOT CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (SBS OR STUDENT BODY SAMPLE), AND FACULTY AND STAFF WHO HAD NOT CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (FSS OR FACULTY AND STAFF SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Number in population</th>
<th>Number in sample</th>
<th>Number excluded from sample*</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires mailed</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires returned</th>
<th>Percentage of Questionnaires returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBS (student body sample)</td>
<td>21,846</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS (faculty and staff sample)</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Duplicates and incorrect addresses

NOTE: 1. Totals in columns (5) are obtained by subtracting column (4) from column (3).
2. Percentages in column (7) are obtained by dividing column (6) by column (5).
as follows:

1. The client was told that a study of the Ombudsman was being conducted by the investigator, a former graduate intern in the Office of the Ombudsman, and that his problem or grievance was one of twenty-one randomly selected as being representative of the types of problems brought to the University Ombudsman.

2. The client was informed that the purpose for interviewing him was to obtain his attitudes, opinions, and observations as to how the Ombudsman dealt with his specific problem or grievance. Specifically, each client was asked to respond to three general, open-ended questions as follows:

   A. What caused you to bring your problem or grievance to the Ombudsman?

   B. What did the Ombudsman do to resolve your particular problem or grievance?

   C. Do you consider your problem or grievance resolved to your satisfaction?

The individual interview was conducted on a very informal, non-structured basis. No attempt was made by the investigator to direct the interview, except to determine the answers to the three questions described in the preceding paragraph. The major focus of each interview was (1) to determine the circumstances which caused the problem or grievance to be brought to the Ombudsman—the before Ombudsman circumstances; (2) to determine the events which occurred while the Ombudsman was attempting to resolve the client's problem or grievance—the during Ombudsman; and (3) to determine the client's reaction to the solution resulting from the Ombudsman's investigation of the client's problem or grievance—the after Ombudsman.
At the completion of each interview, the client's description of his experience with the Ombudsman was recorded by the investigator on the back side of a duplicated copy of the original case sheet. As the result of the client's description being recorded, the case sheet then contained the client's original description of his grievance or problem, the Ombudsman's original record of his involvement and action in the case, and the investigator's description of the client's experience with the Ombudsman.

For clarification of the events and action on the part of the Ombudsman, each of the twenty-one case studies was reviewed with the Ombudsman. The resulting descriptions of each of twenty-one case studies selected for study appear in Chapter III.

The Ombudsman questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed for each of the four groups surveyed (See Appendix I)—students who consulted the Ombudsman (SCO), faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman (FSCO), students who had not consulted the Ombudsman (student body sample or SBS), and faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman (faculty and staff sample or FSS). The design of the questionnaire was similar to that used by Rowland's study of the Michigan State Ombudsman (Bottom [1970] also used Rowland's questionnaire for his study of the Ombudsman of the Claremont Colleges). Many of the questionnaire items used in this study were similar to those of Rowland's (1969). The attitude-scale items (items 24-47 on the SCO and SBS questionnaires and items 19-42 on the FSCO and FSS questionnaires) represented the
thoughts and opinions expressed by various authors of papers presented at a conference on the campus ombudsman held in May of 1969 at San Francisco, California. (The San Francisco Conference was jointly sponsored by the Higher Education Executive Associates of Detroit and The Ombudsman Foundation of Los Angeles. Some of the papers were originally presented at the Detroit Conference on the Ombudsman in 1968. The papers were obtained from The Institute for Local Government and Public Service, Chico State College, Chico, California 95926.)

Each member of the four survey groups was sent the appropriate questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter (See Appendix G) from Dr. Milton Brawer, the Western Michigan University Ombudsman. A return envelope addressed to the Office of Research Services at Western Michigan University was also included. Approximately ten days after the first mailing of the questionnaires, a follow-up letter (See Appendix H) was sent to those persons not responding to the first mailing. A second questionnaire and a second return envelope was included in the follow-up mailing. The return envelopes were stamped for the convenience of those persons living at an off-campus address; otherwise, the on-campus mailing system at Western Michigan University was utilized.

The first mailing of the questionnaires occurred during the second week of classes of the winter semester, 1972. The follow-up mailing was sent during the fourth week of classes of the winter semester, 1972. No questionnaires were received after March 1, 1972.
A third mailing (second follow-up) of the questionnaires was not conducted due to the prohibitive cost of first-class mail, i.e., 24 cents per envelope for off-campus addresses—16 cents to send and 8 cents to return.

Validity. Validity of any instrument is usually determined by asking the question: "Are we measuring what we think we are measuring?" Content and face validity is basically judgmental, and alone or in cooperation with others, the representativeness of items on a questionnaire is determined through one's judgment. (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 444-6). To provide a reasonable degree of content and face validity of the questionnaires used in the study, feedback as to the content of the questionnaires was obtained from the following persons:

1. Five professors
2. Two campus ombudsmen
3. Two staff members of the Office of the Ombudsman
4. Two administrators (non-academic)
5. One academic dean
6. Five students
7. Two clerical staff (non-academic departments)

The above-mentioned persons served as judges as to the content of the items on the questionnaires. The following discussion represents their comments.

Two clerical staff, one academic dean, and two transfer students thought the brief introductory statement concerning the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman and his function and role at Western
Michigan University was helpful, as they were not very familiar with the Ombudsman's purpose at Western Michigan University.

The two campus ombudsmen and the two staff members of the Ombudsman's Office felt that the problem categories, the list of traits an ombudsman should possess, the methods the ombudsman uses to solve problems or grievances, and the list of functions was representative of their experience and knowledge of a campus ombudsman.

Two administrators felt the identifying data for students, faculty and staff were appropriate for the various classifications of students and employees at Western Michigan University. Both thought the employee classifications provided all participants the greatest opportunity to remain anonymous because of the "very general categories."

Three students who had consulted the Ombudsman thought there was sufficient opportunity provided by the items of the questionnaire to evaluate their experience with the Ombudsman.

Four professors indicated there were a sufficient number of scaled items on the questionnaires for the purpose of measuring the attitude of various members of the university community toward the Ombudsman. A fifth professor felt that a sufficient number of items was contained in the questionnaires "to lessen chance errors from essentially random responses."

All of the persons providing feedback commented that the questionnaire was long, but "very interesting," and, as a result of completing the questionnaire, each felt he/she was "better informed about the campus ombudsman." The content validity of the attitude-scale items...
is further satisfied due to these items being representative of the thoughts and opinions expressed by campus ombudsmen and authorities from other colleges and universities.

A factor analysis produced groupings of items which were generally predicted by those giving feedback to measure the attitude of the various members of the university community. Table 5 indicates the items that clustered together to measure the attitude factor. Kerlinger (1964, p. 680-5) explains that the use of a factor analysis for construct validity purposes is an accepted procedure, and that a factor loading equal to or greater than a .30 is considered significant (p. 679).

As Table 5 indicates, items tend to load heavily on two major attitude factors. Heavy loadings occurred on those items which were originally predicted to measure the attitude toward the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, the (a) Ombudsman Attitude Factor. Heavy loadings also occurred on a group of items which tend to measure an attitude toward the University in general, its policies and procedures, and its faculty and staff members, arbitrarily referred to as the (b) Institutional Attitude Factor.

Reliability. Guion (1965), in discussing reliability of measurement, indicates: "Good measurement is characterized by functional unity . . . (p. 42)." Functional unity is defined by Guion as a situation where all items on a questionnaire are so interrelated that they must be interpreted as measuring the same thing. To determine this unity, or the estimate of reliability of the attitude-scale items of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>SCO &amp; SBS Item No.</th>
<th>FSCO &amp; FSS Item No.</th>
<th>Description of Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ombudsman Attitude Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Ombudsman did all he could within the authority of his office to assist me with my problem. and</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>If I had another problem I could not handle through normal University &quot;channels,&quot; I would return to the Ombudsman. and</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Assuming that I encountered additional problems other than the one I would have originally consulted the Ombudsman about, I would probably return to him for assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would recommend the Ombudsman to other students, faculty or staff.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>Description of Item</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO &amp; SBS Item No.</td>
<td>FSCO &amp; FSS Item No.</td>
<td>The establishment of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University merely compounds the problems of institutional bureaucracy.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Because of the Ombudsman's faculty status, he is better able to deal effectively with academic matters than are members of the administrative staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Ombudsman is just another potential bureaucrat.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>The best that can be said about the Ombudsman is that he serves as a &quot;traffic cop,&quot; routing an individual to the office responsible for dealing with his problem.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I see no permanent future for the Office of Ombudsman on the Western Michigan University campus.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Ombudsman performs an adequate job of correcting the smaller neglects and defects within the bureaucratic structure of Western Michigan University.</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Ombudsman is just another &quot;gimmick&quot; devised by the &quot;powers&quot; of the institution.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>The Ombudsman has influenced decisions primarily in favor of the individual seeking assistance, and not the institution.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Description of Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO &amp; SBS</td>
<td>Establishing the office of the Ombudsman is an indication of the efforts of the institution to take additional interest in its students, faculty and staff and their problems.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO &amp; FSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Within a large institution such as Western Michigan University, the Ombudsman and his efforts give humanism the edge over bureaucracy.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>(b) Institutional Attitude Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I experienced unpleasant treatment by various persons as a result of the Ombudsman's investigation.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The services of the Ombudsman are widely known among students, faculty and staff.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Group</td>
<td>SCO &amp; SBS Item No.</td>
<td>FSCO &amp; FSS Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the four questionnaires (Items 24-47 for SCO and SBS groups and items 19-42 for the FCO and FSS groups), a split-half estimation method was used. Scores obtained from responses to the odd-numbered items were correlated with scores obtained from responses to the even-numbered items. The resulting correlation between the two half-scores yielded a coefficient of equivalence for one-half of the attitude-scaled portion of each questionnaire. The coefficient of equivalence was then corrected for length using the Spearman-Brown formula. The correction is necessary since it has been demonstrated that reliability is a function of the length of a measuring instrument (Guion, 1965, p. 43). Table 6 presents the reliability data for all four questionnaires used in the study.

**TABLE 6**

SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY CORRELATIONS (r_{12}) AND FULL-LENGTH RELIABILITY CORRELATIONS (r_{11}) AS CORRECTED BY THE SPEARMAN-BROWN FORMULA FOR THE SCO, FSCO, SBS AND FSS ATTITUDE-SCALE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questionnaire</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
<th>Number of Subjects (n)</th>
<th>Half-score Reliability Correlation (r_{11})</th>
<th>Split-half Reliability Correlation (Spearman-Brown Correction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>24-47</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>.7068</td>
<td>.8282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO</td>
<td>19-42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.7195</td>
<td>.8369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>24-47</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>.5475</td>
<td>.7076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>19-42</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>.6966</td>
<td>.8211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations presented in Table 6 indicate that 70.7 percent (SBS) to 82.8 percent (SCO) of the variance of responses is accounted...
for, leaving only chance error variance of responses ranging from
17.2 percent to 29.3 percent. The high reliability coefficients \( r_{11} \)
of \( .8282 \) (SCO), \( .8369 \) (FSCO), \( .7076 \) (SBS), and \( .8211 \) (FSS) also indicate the extent to which the items are intercorrelated and equivalent in content, and the extent to which they are free from error due to heterogeneity of content (Guion, 1965, p. 42).

Items 1 to 23 and 48 and 49 on the SCO and SBS questionnaires,
and items 1 to 18 and 43 and 44 of the FSCO and FSS questionnaires
do not lend themselves to measures of reliability, since these items require an independent or selective response. Since the attitude-scale items are the first of their kind to be used in a study of the campus ombudsman, no comparison can be made with other reliability coefficients, as none were computed by Rowland (1969) or Bottom (1970).

Objective and Data Analysis

The primary objective of the study was an attempt to determine answers to the seven research questions. The following discussion presents each of the seven questions and the approach used for analysis.

1. What are the types of problems that are brought to the attention of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University?

Frequencies and percentages of responses to items 12 (SCO questionnaire) and 7 (FSCO questionnaire) are reported to indicate the types of problems that persons brought to the Ombudsman seeking his assistance. For comparative purposes, responses to items 12 and 13 of the SBS questionnaire and responses to items 7 and 8 of the FSS
questionnaire are also reported in frequency and percentages. Since the SBS group and the FSS group represent members of the University community who had not consulted the Ombudsman, an analysis as to their possible intention of consulting the Ombudsman, and for what type of problem, was considered important for comparison with the SCO and FSCO groups.

2. Who, among the University community at Western Michigan University, brings problems to the Ombudsman's attention? Analysis of this question involved only the SCO and FSCO groups, i.e., those students, faculty and staff who actually consulted the Ombudsman. Frequencies and percentages are reported for students in terms of their student classification, legal residence, sex, age, marital status, major field of study, accumulated grade point average, student residence, and whether or not they had attended another institution of higher learning or Western Michigan University only. For faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman, frequencies and percentages are reported in terms of position with the University, number of years employed, sex, age, marital status, and highest level of education attained.

3. What are the circumstances which caused members of the University community to have a problem? Answers to this question are attempted through the case study analysis resulting from the individual interview of twenty-one persons who consulted the Ombudsman. Further analysis is also provided as a result of interviewing Dr. Milton Brawer, University Ombudsman, concerning these twenty-one case
studies. SCO and FSCO comments in response to items 49 (SCO questionnaire) and 44 (FSCO questionnaire) are also presented.

4. As a result of the Campus Ombudsman investigating a problem, what are the implications for institutional change, policy and procedures at Western Michigan University and higher education institutions in general? Analysis of this question is the same as that used for research question number 3.

5. What methods and procedures does the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University use in attempting to solve the problem? The During Ombudsman portion of the case study analysis is utilized in attempting to answer this question. The methods and strategies the Ombudsman actually used for problem-solving of the twenty-one case studies are discussed. Also reported are the frequencies and percentages of responses of all four groups surveyed (SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS), as to what they perceived to be the most effective "tools" an ombudsman could use in order to accomplish his goals (See item number 23, SCO questionnaire—Appendix I).

6. Are the solutions satisfactory to all those involved with a problem? For the purpose of this study, all those involved with a problem include the SCO and FSCO groups, i.e., only those persons consulting the Ombudsman. Items 15 and 16 of the SCO questionnaire and items 10 and 11 of the FSCO questionnaire are analyzed in terms of frequency and percentage of response. A t test is utilized to determine if any significant differences can be observed between the students (SCO group) and faculty and staff (FSCO group) as to the extent their problems were solved by the Ombudsman, and their degree
of satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled their problem.

7. What is the attitude of the University community at Western Michigan University toward the Office of the Ombudsman? A comparison of attitude-score means of the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups was made using the F analysis. Attitude-score means were obtained for each of the individuals within the four survey groups, and included responses on a 1 (agree very strongly) to 6 (disagree very strongly) scale to items 24 to 47 on the SCO and SBS questionnaires and items 19 to 42 on the FSCO and FSS questionnaires. Selected attitudes of the University community concerning who the Ombudsman should be, what group(s) should select him, the most important traits he should possess, the location of his office, his role and function, and how he is perceived in terms of "whose man," are reported in frequency and percentage of responses.
CHAPTER III

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The Approach to Data Presentation

As described in Chapter II, the data obtained for the study of the Western Michigan University Ombudsman was collected through the use of the case study interview and a questionnaire. In the attempt to answer the seven research questions, the analysis of the data is reported descriptively. Frequencies and percentages of responses are reported for certain items of the questionnaires to examine differences among the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups. The t test and F analysis are also utilized to make comparisons among the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups.

The twenty-one cases presented in this chapter represent an attempt to describe the events (Before, During, and After Ombudsman) which took place as a result of a person seeking assistance from the University Ombudsman. As Table 1 (See Chapter II, p. 36) indicates, each of the twenty-one cases is representative of a general category of problems brought to the attention of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University.

The format for the present chapter includes a description of the twenty-one cases, followed by the presentation and analysis of the research questions. Each of the seven research questions is
presented individually with accompanying tables where appropriate, and followed by further comparisons and discussion.

Description of the Twenty-One Case Studies

Each of the following twenty-one case descriptions includes a discussion of the circumstances or events as a result of a student, faculty or staff member seeking assistance from the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Each of the following descriptions include the circumstances which caused the person to seek assistance from the Ombudsman, the Before Ombudsman description; the During Ombudsman description, or the events and circumstances which occurred as the Ombudsman was attempting to resolve the problem; and the client's reaction to the solution resulting from the Ombudsman's investigation and attempt to resolve the problem, the After Ombudsman description. The Before Ombudsman and After Ombudsman descriptions reflect the observations from the client's point-of-view. No attempt was made to interview other members of the University that may have been involved in a particular case. The Ombudsman was interviewed to clarify his role in attempting to resolve each case. The During Ombudsman description reflects the Ombudsman's clarification and the events as they were described on the original case sheet. Each of the case studies is presented anonymously to preserve the confidentiality of those who sought assistance from the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Names used in the case descriptions are fictitious.
Case No. 1 - Pete (Problem category - Admission and Registration)

Before Ombudsman. Pete, a graduate student, had previously seen the Ombudsman concerning a grade grievance against an instructor. Pete was concerned about having received an "E" grade in his Master's degree course work, and the possible effect a failing grade may have regarding his admission to a doctoral program at a university located in the southern part of the United States. Because of his previous contact with the Ombudsman, Pete again sought assistance from the Ombudsman regarding his admission to a doctoral program at Western Michigan, instead of the university in the South.

The Ombudsman was somewhat familiar with Pete's problem, due to Pete's contacting him earlier in the school year about the grade grievance. Although Pete had successfully repeated the course with a grade of "B," the first grade of "E" remained in the calculation of his accumulated grade point average. As a result of Pete's grade grievance problem, the Ombudsman was successful in requesting the department head to write a letter explaining the reasons for Pete's failing efforts in the course. The department head would write a letter for Pete when he was ready to make application for admission to a doctoral program. Now that Pete had decided to make application to a doctoral program at Western Michigan, he sought assistance from the Ombudsman for clarification of the admissions policy.

During Ombudsman. Four days after the initial contact with Pete concerning his admission problem, the Ombudsman telephoned the
appropriate office to inquire about the general policy governing admission to doctoral programs. The office informed the Ombudsman that all work completed by a graduate student is taken into consideration in the matter of doctoral program admission. The Ombudsman explained Pete's situation of the failing grade. It was agreed that Pete was to apply for admission and attach a letter explaining his problem. The office would confer with the department advisor, then make a decision to interview for admission status or not to interview. Special consideration would be granted where warranted. After three phone calls covering two days, the Ombudsman was successful in reaching Pete to arrange an interview time. Pete was given an appointment to see the Ombudsman at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday. As the 10:30 a.m. appointment failed to develop (the reason is not known), the Ombudsman and Pete got together Wednesday, the following day. The Ombudsman told Pete to file an application for admission, accompanied by a letter of explanation of the "E" grade, with a copy for the Ombudsman's file.

After Ombudsman. In the case study interview, Pete indicated that he wished he would have been "more demanding" of the Ombudsman in pursuing his initial grade grievance with the instructor. At the time of the interview, or three and a half months after Pete's last contact with the Ombudsman, Pete had not formally applied for admission to graduate school. Pete said that when he applies, "if the letter from the department head does not favorably influence the decision, and instead I get a 'no' decision on admission, I may
consider going back to the Ombudsman." Pete indicated, "I might have felt differently if the Ombudsman would have gotten a positive decision concerning my grade grievance."

Case No. 2 - Linda (Problem category - Instructor's teaching)

Before Ombudsman. Linda, a junior at Western, was off campus for one week participating in a field experience required in one of her courses. Prior to leaving on the field experience, Linda turned in a written assignment to the teacher of another course. Upon returning to campus, the teacher of the course indicated to Linda that he could not accept her written assignment, since she did not follow the prescribed format given to the class. Linda had talked with the teacher on two occasions prior to the due date of the written assignment. The teacher thought Linda should have been able to submit an acceptable paper, since she had seen other samples of similar assignments. Linda became upset when the teacher refused to tell her why he would not accept the paper. Linda could turn in a "corrected" assignment, or be satisfied with her original assignment and receive a grade of "D." Linda viewed her situation as unsolvable, since she could not determine from the teacher what she had done incorrectly on her first attempt. Linda had read about the Ombudsman in the campus newspaper, and had heard about the Ombudsman from a friend of a friend who had consulted the Ombudsman. Linda decided to consult the Ombudsman for the purpose of assisting her to
obtain an explanation from the teacher as to why her written assignment was not acceptable.

**During Ombudsman.** On a Friday, one week prior to the end of the semester, Linda went to the Ombudsman's Office for assistance. After listening to Linda's explanation of her problem, the Ombudsman telephoned the teacher who, in turn, immediately invited Linda and the Ombudsman to his office. The meeting resulted in the teacher explaining the improvements which he wanted in Linda's written assignment. Linda understood the assignment and submitted a corrected paper.

**After Ombudsman.** As a result of submitting a corrected assignment, Linda received a "B" in the course, a grade she felt was fair, since she had a "B" average prior to her problem with the written assignment. Linda remarked: "I was very pleased with the results." Linda thought the Ombudsman "listened very well," and she would return to him if she had another problem. She felt the Ombudsman was "very objective," and did not take "any side" in attempting to enhance the communication process between herself and the teacher. Linda described the Ombudsman's efforts in the meeting as: "He didn't beat around the bush, but went straight to the issue." Linda indicated that the teacher seemed offended at first, but after the Ombudsman explained his role and function, the teacher seemed satisfied with the Ombudsman's explanation.

As a result of her experience, Linda remarked that she would "make a greater attempt to communicate with a teacher before getting
emotional." Since receiving a grade of "B" in the course, Linda had not talked with the teacher.

Case No. 3 - Ken (Problem category - Grading)

Before Ombudsman. Ken was enrolled in a course which was speeded up due to the teacher leaving the country for one and possibly two years. Ken, along with the other students enrolled in the course, were informed of the shortened class schedule at the time of registration.

Ken, a junior at the time, had received a grade of "E" in the course. However, Ken had learned from other students in the class receiving an "E" that they had been allowed to drop the course with a grade of "W." Since the course ended two days prior to the end of the official drop period for the spring session, the following circumstances developed as a result of final grades being issued by the teacher.

(1) One student dropped the course with permission reluctantly granted by the teacher.

(2) One student dropped the course after receiving advice from the department head and the University Ombudsman.

(3) A third student followed the correct drop procedure and successfully dropped the course on his own.

(4) A fourth student filed a grade grievance, but the grade review procedure was not fully available to him because of the teacher's leaving the country.
(5) Last, a group of students who received low or failing grades were not allowed to drop the course because the department secretary, under advisement from the teacher, told these students that she could not give them permission to withdraw from the course (The teacher's advice to the secretary concerning the dropping of a course was incorrect according to University regulations).

(6) Additionally, the teacher was not available to defend, explain or rectify the situation.

Ken was one of the students who had been incorrectly informed by the secretary concerning his dropping the course. Upon learning from another student who had filed a grade grievance with the Ombudsman, Ken decided to also file a grade grievance.

During Ombudsman. As a result of previous grievances, the Ombudsman was already aware of Ken's problem in the course. Ken was able to see the Ombudsman on the same day he filed the grade grievance. The Ombudsman explained the situation to Ken and informed Ken that he would be receiving a communication from a committee that was investigating the situation.

After Ombudsman. Exactly one month after Ken's initial contact with the Ombudsman, the committee rendered a decision. After two days and three telephone calls, the Ombudsman was successful in reaching Ken. Ken was informed, as were other students receiving failing grades, that he had the option to withdraw from the course with a grade of "W" to replace the failing grade. Ken had received a letter from the committee and was quite pleased with the Ombudsman's efforts. Ken's comments included the following: "What I thought to be a real
injustice to me and other students, was actually solved by fair procedures of the University. This experience has caused me to have a better attitude toward the department in which I have my major.

Case No. 4 - Ramona (Problem category - Records)

Before Ombudsman. Ramona, a recent transfer student with junior status at Western Michigan University, had taken a course at a community college for the purpose of satisfying bachelor of arts degree requirements at Western. Ramona had checked the WMU catalog and the instructor of the course at the community college to assure herself that the course credits would successfully transfer to Western Michigan. Both the catalog and the instructor at the community college verified the transferability of the course.

After transferring to Western, Ramona was informed by the department head that the course credit was not transferable. Upset about the non-transfer of credit, Ramona sought assistance from an academic department advisor whom she knew. The advisor suggested that Ramona contact the Ombudsman about her transfer credit problem. Ramona had heard of the ombudsman concept and decided to seek his assistance.

During Ombudsman. Two and one-half weeks before the end of Ramona's first semester at Western Michigan, she discussed her problem in an interview with the Ombudsman. Ramona went to the Ombudsman without an appointment and was able to see him the same day.
The Ombudsman, after hearing Ramona's dilemma, telephoned the appropriate office of the University. The office indicated that notification had been sent to the community college, and as of September of 1969, credit for Ramona's course would no longer be transferable. Ramona had taken the course during the winter semester of 1970, or the semester following WMU's notification to the community college.

Upon receiving this explanation, the Ombudsman contacted the academic department to explore the possibility of Ramona receiving credit for the course. The academic department recommended that Ramona take a proficiency exam, pass it, and thereby qualify for credit in the course. The Ombudsman suggested to Ramona that she take the proficiency exam.

After Ombudsman. Ramona made arrangements with the academic department to take the proficiency exam a few days after her interview with the Ombudsman. Ramona failed the proficiency exam. She remarked: "I couldn't recall after a two-year period."

At the time of the case interview, Ramona was quite disillusioned. She thought the Ombudsman had contacted all the people she, herself, could and did contact. Ramona expected the Ombudsman to refer her to a "higher-up" for the purpose of granting her an exception to the transfer credit policy as it now existed. Her reasoning involved the fact that she was a much older student who had just recently decided to complete bachelor degree requirements. Ramona further reasoned that she did take the course "in good faith, based
on the information provided to her by the community college." She felt the community college had taken her for a "ride," and had "wished that WMU would have been more humanistic in recognizing the spirit of the rule, rather than the rule itself." Although Ramona felt that WMU had taken the necessary steps to keep the community college informed, she emphasized that the community college had evidently failed to keep its students informed through their advisory system.

Concerning the Ombudsman's efforts, Ramona indicated: "I cannot see the purpose of the Ombudsman if all he can do is retrace the steps that a student can do on his own." Ramona was contemplating a contact with her Congressional representative about the inefficiency of the community college," but also indicated: "I probably will not cause any problem." Because of Ramona's inability to transfer credit of a particular course, she almost "decided not to continue at Western Michigan University or elsewhere."

Case No. 5 - Matt (Problem category - Academic requirements)

Before Ombudsman. Matt had recently discovered that he could graduate at the end of the next major semester if he registered for twenty semester units of credit during his last semester. He had previously decided to register for eighteen academic credits, leaving only two non-academic credits (activity units) left for him to complete during a short term, plus whatever academic credits were remaining.
However, this new information afforded him two alternatives: (1) to register for eighteen academic credits and two non-academic credits for a total of twenty units carried during one semester; or (2) to inquire of the department as to the possibility of accepting his four non-academic credits he had completed at another university.

Matt was upset after contacting the department. Since his non-academic transfer credits consisted of only one credit and not the acceptable two units, and the other three credits were completed in a professional course and not an activity course, Matt's four transfer units were equal to only two non-academic credits (activity units) at Western Michigan. Matt would have to complete the two remaining activity credits at Western Michigan University to satisfy University undergraduate degree requirements.

Because Matt did not wish to attend an additional term to complete degree requirements (he felt twenty semester units of credit in one semester was too heavy a class load), and because he felt that Western Michigan University should recognize and accept his completion of non-academic credit requirements at another major university, Matt decided to consult the Ombudsman. He had learned of the Ombudsman through his association as an officer of the Associated Student Government at Western. Immediately after talking with the department, and being upset, Matt went directly to the Office of the University Ombudsman.

During Ombudsman. When Matt arrived at the Ombudsman's Office, he was unable to meet immediately with the Ombudsman. However, the
receptionist in the Ombudsman's Office suggested he talk with one of the Ombudsman's assistants (There were three assistants to the Ombudsman at that time: two graduate students serving internships and one assistant that was salaried and a full-time employee in the Office). Wishing to talk with someone concerning his problem, Matt consented to discuss the matter with one of the graduate student assistants.

After a two-month time period and approximately seventeen contacts in the form of telephone calls and interviews, the assistant informed Matt that he should consider dropping his course load and take an additional term to complete degree requirements. The assistant's reasoning was based on the fact that the department was correct in the evaluation of Matt's transfer credit, and twenty credit hours was a demanding course load for Matt to carry in a single semester.

During the two-month period involving the attempt to resolve Matt's problem, the assistant contacted a "higher-up" requesting that he over-rule the decision of the department. The request resulted in an official reprimand by the "higher-up" to the department suggesting that they solve their own problems and keep them at the departmental level. The department, in turn, contacted the Ombudsman and wanted an explanation as to why the assistant had not contacted department personnel first, before taking the matter to a higher authority. In consultation with the Ombudsman, it was decided that the assistant would call the department and make the necessary explanation. It was reaffirmed that the Office of the Ombudsman and the department would continue to resolve the problem.
After Ombudsman. Matt decided to follow the recommendation of the assistant and split his degree requirements over a period of two terms. He was "grateful" for the efforts of the assistant. Matt indicated that he would return to the Ombudsman for another problem, but felt the Ombudsman "should have more power to make decisions in favor of the individual where the circumstances are unique enough to justify an exception to the rule." Matt had expected a favorable decision from the Ombudsman concerning his transfer of credit. Matt explained: "I didn't get it, and I guess I would push harder with the department if I had the opportunity to do it over again." Matt remarked that he was not really aware of the contacts that were made by the assistant, and was somewhat "confused and frustrated about the great elapse of time between contacts."

Case No. 6 - Chet (Problem category - Academic Status)

Before Ombudsman. Chet had received a letter from a University official confirming his appointment as a graduate assistant for the spring and summer sessions of 1971, plus the academic year 1971-72. However, upon registering for classes for the spring session, Chet was informed that his assistantship had been withdrawn, that the official no longer occupied his position, and that the financial support was no longer available due to budgetary considerations. The new official explained to Chet the possibility he would not have his
assistantship, or at best, the assistantship would be reduced to part-time status. Chet had read about the Ombudsman in the campus newspaper and decided to consult him.

**During Ombudsman.** Chet secured an appointment with the Ombudsman the day following his initial inquiry. The Ombudsman listened to Chet explain his problem and told Chet he would investigate the case and inform him of the results. Seven telephone calls and twelve letters of correspondence later, the Ombudsman and Chet were informed by the official that Chet would be granted his full-time assistantship as was originally offered to him.

**After Ombudsman.** Chet was "very impressed" with what the Ombudsman did for him. However, he questioned the Ombudsman's ability to "exclude himself from the system and be impartial, since it is the system which pays his salary." Chet further stated: "If everyone would understand the Ombudsman's role that is employed by the system, then okay, but I doubt the extent to which that understanding exists." Chet indicated he would return again to the Ombudsman for assistance, should he need it.

**Case No. 7 - Shirley (Problem category - Academic advising and counseling)**

**Before Ombudsman.** Shirley, a transfer student with junior status at Western Michigan University, had been unsuccessful in determining the reason as to why she suddenly had not been accepted to a "particularly sought-after and overcrowded curriculum" at Western
Michigan University. She had not been successful in securing advice-
ment from the department in which she originally thought herself to
be enrolled. Since the department had no record of her admission to
the curriculum they refused to pursue any advisement program with
Shirley.

As the department would not investigate as to why Shirley had
not been admitted to this much sought-after curriculum, Shirley
obtained advice from a professor who suggested she see the Ombudsman.
Shirley had heard of the Ombudsman from another student living in
the same residence hall and decided to telephone the Ombudsman for
an appointment.

During Ombudsman, Shirley obtained an appointment with the
Ombudsman the day following her telephone call. After hearing of
Shirley's desire to find out why she had not been originally accepted
into the curriculum, the Ombudsman telephoned the office responsible
for maintaining student records. After approximately forty-five
minutes of telephone conversation, the Ombudsman confirmed that Shir-
ley's original admission application to Western, and all other docu-
ments, indicated the curriculum in which she was presently enrolled,
and not the curriculum which she thought she had designated on her
admission application. The Ombudsman also determined that Shirley's
application missed the deadline for admission into her desired cur-
iculum by four days, assuming she had correctly indicated her cur-
iculum choice.

The Ombudsman advised Shirley to not pursue the matter any
further, as the evidence pointed to her mistake. The Ombudsman also advised Shirley to consider transferring to another university, depending on her sincerity to enroll in the curriculum, or to apply early to Western's graduate program in the same curriculum. The Ombudsman's advice to Shirley was justified on the basis of the curriculum being closed for admission, with good probability it would remain closed for some time into the future.

After Ombudsman. Shirley accepted and acknowledged her mistake in designating the wrong curriculum on the admission application. She was thankful to the Ombudsman "for clearing-up the mystery." She also "felt better" because the Ombudsman had presented her with alternatives. Shirley expressed the concern: "Being a transfer student, I really had no one specified to me that I could talk to." Someone had suggested to Shirley that she consult with two different offices on campus. She discovered one office was dedicated toward more "personal counseling," contrasted to her need for academic advisement. Shirley telephoned the office suggested, but could not obtain an appointment until one week prior to the end of the semester. As Shirley stated: "The appointment would have been too late for me to make any decisions."

Shirley indicated she would return to the Ombudsman and recommend him to other students with problems. At the close of the case interview, Shirley suddenly remembered a friend had completed her admission application and evidently designated the incorrect curriculum. Embarrassed, Shirley said goodbye and made a quick exit.
Case No. 8 - Sue (Problem category - Academic miscellaneous)

Before Ombudsman. Sue, a junior at Western, had indicated a specific curriculum choice on her admission application when making application to Western Michigan University. She had made application while a senior in high school. During Sue's freshman and sophomore years at Western, she had remained in the curriculum, but as yet had not taken any course work specifically designated for the curriculum. Sue had been occupied with completing general education requirements during her first two years.

Permission to take course work in Sue's chosen curriculum required that she successfully complete her first two years of work and then make additional application for admission into the curriculum. Sue had met all the requirements.

On the day of registration for classes, Sue reported to the appropriate department office to obtain a "C" card granting her permission to enter a particular course of her chosen curriculum. Sue was among the first twenty students waiting in line, but was refused the "permission-to-enroll" card by the department secretary. Sue requested the record of her application for admission be checked, but the department secretary refused her request. Annoyed by this experience, Sue contacted a University staff member who was a friend of Sue's family. The staff member recommended the Ombudsman to Sue.

During Ombudsman. Sue telephoned for an appointment and arranged to see the Ombudsman the same day. After listening to Sue's
explanation of her experience, the Ombudsman telephoned the department head having responsibility for Sue's desired curriculum, and explained Sue's situation. The department head requested Sue to be sent to him immediately, as he would "take care of her." The Ombudsman requested Sue to let him know of the outcome of her meeting with the department head.

Hearing no further word from Sue or the department head, the Ombudsman made two unsuccessful attempts to contact Sue. A week later, the Ombudsman telephoned the department head who explained he could not admit Sue to the curriculum of her choice, but perhaps could admit her to a similar curriculum within the same department. A two-hour conversation ensued between the Ombudsman and department head. Because of an unprecedented increase in enrollment and budgetary limitations, the department had been forced to place a restriction on the number of students to be accepted. The department head informed the Ombudsman of Sue's choice of another curriculum outside of his department.

After Ombudsman, Sue was completely satisfied with her new choice of curriculum. She was grateful to the Ombudsman and his efforts to provide her "the opportunity to see the right person." Sue expressed concern about the department's ability to "handle its own affairs." Sue felt she had not experienced a "clear explanation" as to how to apply for admission into the curriculum. Sue commented: "I only wish I could have talked with someone earlier about my choice of curriculum."
Case No. 9 - Edna (Problem category - Financial problems and complaints)

Before Ombudsman. Edna, a junior at Western, owed the University $648. Because her father had been seriously ill in the hospital for a year with a kidney ailment, Edna was unable to pay the bill and clear her financial obligation to the University. Edna's father did have disability insurance to account for the family's living expenses.

Because Edna remained at home during the summer to assist her family, she arrived on the Western campus for "late registration" for the fall semester. Knowing that she still had the financial obligation to the University, Edna had made application for a guaranteed student loan of $700 through her home town bank. Although the loan had not been completely processed, Edna's bank gave her a letter verifying her application for the loan and its probable acceptance.

Having a "hold" on her registration because of the financial obligation, Edna could not register until she paid the bill to the University. Edna went to the appropriate office to present her loan verification letter, hoping the University would allow her to then register for fall semester classes. Once she cleared the $648 obligation, Edna was then eligible for a loan through the University to pay for her tuition, room and board for the coming academic year. This loan had already been processed and was waiting for her. All she needed was to clear the $648 obligation.

The office Edna originally contacted was very reluctant to accept
her loan verification letter. Edna asked the office to telephone the
bank officer at her hometown bank, but the office refused. The
office would not accept the loan verification letter as a substitute
for the final, signed loan papers from Edna's bank.

Edna went to a staff member of the University who was familiar
with her problem. The staff member recommended that Edna see the
Ombudsman.

During Ombudsman. Edna was able to see the Ombudsman immediately.
Upon hearing Edna's explanation the Ombudsman contacted the appro-
priate office to explore the possibilities of removing the "hold" on
Edna's registration. The office was reluctant to remove the "hold."
The office suggested the Ombudsman send Edna to another office.

The Ombudsman sent Edna to the second office suggested. Two
days later the Ombudsman telephoned the second office to find out the
decision concerning Edna. The second office contacted permitted
Edna to register for classes.

After Ombudsman. Edna felt "really good" about the Ombudsman and
the second office: "This experience convinced me that the University
really does care for the individual." Edna remarked concerning the
staff member of the second office contacted: "I didn't have to
prove anything. He took my word for it."

Edna almost decided to quit school and go back home. She indi-
cated: "This was the turning point in continuing my education." She
now realized that problems "can be worked out." Edna will not forget
her experience of having money come from one loan which she could
not get because she could not register, and she could not register because she could not get the University to recognize her loan to pay her financial obligation.

**Case No. 10 - Hazel (Problem category - Housing)**

*Before Ombudsman.* Hazel, a first semester senior at Western, had previously seen the Ombudsman concerning a financial obligation which she had accrued. She had found out about the Ombudsman through conversations with a friend.

Hazel and her three roommates had lived for a year in an apartment complex located off campus. Upon returning to the same apartment after summer vacation, Hazel and her roommates were faced with a raise in rent from $67.50 to $76.50 per person. They were also required to pay the first and last month's rent in advance. The students had no knowledge of these procedures prior to leaving the apartment for summer vacation, and all had previously signed a lease in the month of May for the following school year. The resident manager of the apartments informed Hazel of the new rent payment procedure, as the owner resided in Florida and was never seen.

Faced with an immediate housing problem, Hazel and her roommates decided to pay the rent increase and the first month's rent. However, after discussing their problem, the students decided to contact someone concerning the owner's possible violation of the wage-price freeze in effect at that time. Hazel, representing herself and her roommates, chose to contact the Ombudsman.
During Ombudsman. Hazel saw the Ombudsman's full-time assistant who handled housing problems. The assistant referred Hazel to the appropriate housing office of the University.

After Ombudsman. The office to which the assistant referred Hazel made an inquiry to the manager of the apartment complex, but was unable to be of assistance. Hazel and her roommates were able to negotiate a six-week extension in paying the last month's rent. Hazel's father suggested she inquire with the appropriate federal agency for possible violation of the wage-price freeze.

The federal agency needed signed rent-payment receipts and depositions from several tenants from the apartments. A representative from the federal agency proceeded to interview Hazel and her roommates at the apartment complex. The resident manager determined what was happening and blamed Hazel and her roommates for the federal agency's inquiry. Two of Hazel's roommates acquired teaching positions and were forced to sub-lease their portion of the rent. The manager would agree to this if the two roommates would remove their names from the "violation claim." The roommates did and the manager made their lease void.

At the time of the case interview, Hazel was still pursuing the matter with the federal agency. The agency's investigation was concluded and scheduled to come to court soon. Hazel felt "a great deal of intimidation from the manager," and was planning to move at the end of the current semester.

Regarding the Ombudsman's efforts, Hazel expected more assistance from the Ombudsman than a referral to another University office.
She remarked: "Why didn't the Ombudsman know the procedure to follow in contacting the appropriate federal agency?" Hazel felt the University should "have some responsibility for the student." However, Hazel also expressed: "I would not want the University to interfere with my life off campus, only when I have a problem."

Case No. 11 - Joanne (Problem category - Auto use and police)

Before Ombudsman. Joanne, a senior, resided in married-student housing which was separated from the main campus by a four-lane, heavily traveled highway. For the year prior to her seeking assistance from the Ombudsman, all residents of the married-student housing complex had been issued a W, Y, or Z parking sticker which allowed the residents to park in any of the student designated parking lots on the main campus. For the current year, however, the residents were issued a parking permit for their own apartment parking lot only. This presented a problem for the residents. Many of the married couples had small children to be taken to the child day-care center on the main campus, as both husband and wife were attending daytime classes. The bus service was considered inadequate by the residents, so they relied heavily on the convenience of parking reasonably close to their classes, once their children were left at the day-care center.

Many of the residents had made inquiries to the appropriate University office concerning the non-issuance of the W, Y, or Z parking permits, but to no avail. Joanne had read about the Ombudsman in
the campus newspaper. The married-student residents selected Joanne to consult the Ombudsman about their problem.

**During Ombudsman.** Joanne consulted the assistant to the Ombudsman who in turn telephoned the appropriate University office. A staff member of the office informed the assistant of two parking lots available to the married students, both on the opposite side of the main campus. The residents could also lodge their complaint before a committee designed to hear such problems. Joanne had left the Ombudsman's Office before the assistant to the Ombudsman was able to contact the appropriate office. The assistant telephoned Joanne later in the day and informed her of the possibilities. Joanne indicated she would talk with the other residents, but would probably take their grievance to the committee.

**After Ombudsman.** Joanne could not renew the interest among the other residents to pursue the parking matter, so she decided to pursue the problem on her behalf only. She presented her problem to the committee and the committee granted her a Y parking sticker. Joanne's problem had been somewhat resolved.

Joanne later learned that residents of another married-student complex on the main campus had been issued the W, Y, and Z permits for the current school year. Joanne was not happy with this information, since the other married-student complex was located on the main campus and enjoyed regular bus service.

Joanne had initially thought the Ombudsman would be able to secure the W, Y, and Z permits for the residents, or at least discover why they had not been or could not be issued by the University.
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Instead, she had discovered another "injustice." Joanne indicated she would "probably return" to the Ombudsman, should she have another problem.

**Case No. 12 - Brock (Problem category - Student employment)**

**Before Ombudsman.** Brock, a junior at Western Michigan, was hired for the fall semester by one of the offices of the University, only to be released two weeks later due to the "rush period" being ended. Brock had quit his job off campus to take the job with the University. A friend suggested to Brock that he consult the Ombudsman to inquire as to the possibilities of student employment opportunities on campus.

**During Ombudsman.** The assistant to the Ombudsman, who initially handled student employment problems at the direction of the Ombudsman, discussed Brock's employment problem and referred him to several offices on campus which might be seeking employees.

**After Ombudsman.** Approximately four months later (at the time of the case interview), Brock had not been successful in securing a job on campus. None of the referrals the assistant to the Ombudsman had suggested to Brock had resulted in employment.

Brock felt he had not "communicated" his "problem correctly" to the assistant to the Ombudsman. He had hoped the Ombudsman would contact the staff member who hired him, and attempt to determine why he had been dismissed. Brock exclaimed: "I would like the opportunity to pursue the situation again, but now it is too late." Brock
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said he would consult the Ombudsman again.

**Case No. 17 - Glenn (Problem category - University facilities and services)**

**Before Ombudsman.** Glenn, a sophomore at Western Michigan University, was the financial officer of a chartered student organization on the Western campus. Glenn's organization wished to hold a pop concert in a University building. The pop concert was to feature a currently popular band and be held in conjunction with a talent show the organization had presented annually in a University building. Glenn and his organization were refused permission to hold the pop concert because of a University policy forbidding any student organization to hold pop concerts on a competitive basis with the University cultural and entertainment programs. After receiving a "no" answer via the telephone from the committee responsible for events held in University facilities, Glenn decided to contact the Ombudsman.

Glenn had consulted the Ombudsman previously and viewed the Ombudsman as an "impartial, friendly person." Although the Ombudsman had not agreed with Glenn concerning his previous problem (housing contract), Glenn still decided to seek assistance on clarification of the University policy, with an "outside chance" that he may gain an exception to the policy, or an actual change in the policy.

**During Ombudsman.** The assistant to the Ombudsman had originally directed Glenn to the committee responsible for scheduling such events. Nineteen days later Glenn arranged an appointment to see the
Ombudsman. The Ombudsman contacted a member of the committee six days and three phone calls later concerning Glenn's problem. The committee member explained to the Ombudsman that student organizations were not permitted to hold pop concerts except for three occasions during the academic year. The three occasions were recognized campus-wide celebrations. Competition was not allowed at other times because the University buildings needed the income generated by University sponsored events. Further explaining the reasons for the policy, the committee member indicated that generally, in the past, student organizations had not been responsible in meeting financial obligations when presenting a pop concert event. The Ombudsman suggested to the committee member that a review of the University policy may be appropriate at this time, and the committee member agreed. The committee member explained that students were well represented on the committee.

Twelve days later the Ombudsman telephoned Glenn and left a message for him to call back. Glenn returned the call the same day. The Ombudsman explained to Glenn his conversation he had with the committee member. Glenn indicated his working with the student government and was considering a petition drive to force a change in the policy. The Ombudsman suggested Glenn speak with the committee about a possible review of the current policy.

After Ombudsman, Glenn's organization took the issue to the student government with the purpose of obtaining student petitions to apply pressure to the committee. Glenn claimed the cultural events
presented by the University were "geared for the City population and not the students." Glenn felt the University existed for the City, i.e., revenue to the City from student parking violations and type of events scheduled in University facilities. Glenn stated: "There hasn't been any good music concerts on campus for students. They won't attend the University sponsored events." Glenn wished he knew the "many contributions that students make to the city and business establishments."

Glenn was "unsure" about taking another problem to the Ombudsman; however, he would "see the Ombudsman first to at least relieve frustration before picking up a brick and going into the streets."

Glenn further commented: "If we didn't have an office like the Ombudsman, I am sure we would have students rioting at Western."

Glenn recognized that "changes occur slowly." Glenn indicated: "I want to be a lawyer when I grow up."

Case No. 14 - Bob (Problem category - Student activities and organizations)

Case No. 14 represents a "fictional situation" at Western Michigan University. The events which took place are real, but the nature of the problem, allocation of money, has been substituted for the actual problem to preserve the confidentiality of those persons actually involved.

Before Ombudsman. Bob, serving as an officer of a student organization, requested clarification of the use of University funds
granted to his organization. Bob was responsible for the allocation of the money to other student organizations, and had asked a University official for a clarification as to how the money could be used by these organizations. Bob also wanted to know his organization's interrelationship with the other organizations on campus, since these organizations were responsible to him. In Bob's words: "No sense starting a car for driving purposes if it has two flat tires." Bob would not allocate the money to these other organizations until the University satisfied his request for clarification of the use of funds.

University officials viewed Bob's request as a "stall tactic." A University official wrote Bob a letter requesting that Bob allocate the funds soon or he would be forced to make the allocations through some other procedure. A day later the Ombudsman also wrote Bob a letter indicating he would be forced to expose Bob's refusal to allocate the money, since the various student organizations could not function without the funds.

During Ombudsman, Exactly forty-three days passed since the University official had requested Bob to make the necessary allocations. On the forty-fourth day after the official's initial request, the Ombudsman hand delivered a letter to Bob requesting him to make the allocations in the next twelve days, or he would be forced to release the contents of the letter to the campus newspaper. The Ombudsman's concern, and primary reasoning behind his letter to Bob, focused on the fact that many student organizations had previously
made financial commitments which they had to honor in the near future.

After Ombudsman. Bob respected the Ombudsman's letter to him because of his prior contact with the Ombudsman. Bob viewed the Ombudsman's involvement as a "responsible and competent University officer doing his job." He, therefore, accepted the Ombudsman's recommendation to allocate the funds no later than twelve days from the date of the Ombudsman's letter.

In addition, Bob viewed the Ombudsman's involvement as a "pressure tactic to speed-up the process." He admitted the Ombudsman's involvement took the "punch" out of his "stall tactic." Bob remarked: "The Ombudsman got the University off the hook from something that could have been a real issue had the University actually allocated the money through another method. Bob was still unsure about "the worthwhileness of succumbing to immediate pressure for the sake of a few student organizations, in contrast to gaining more meaning for total financial structure of all student organizations."

Case No. 15 - Elaine (Problem category - Personal, non-academic and non-employment)

Before Ombudsman. Elaine and a girl friend were shopping in a downtown department store. Elaine's friend slipped a pair of slacks into Elaine's purse, unnoticed by Elaine until the two of them were stopped on their way out of the store and accused of shoplifting.
Elaine was fined $21 and spent four hours in jail. Her girl friend finally admitted to the police of putting the merchandise in Elaine's purse, which resulted in a fine of $29 for the girl friend who spent no time in jail. Elaine was concerned about the possibility of her parents being notified of her misdemeanor through the University. Elaine's mother recently had experienced two nervous breakdowns and for this reason Elaine did not want her parents notified. Elaine consulted with a staff member of the University who referred Elaine to the Ombudsman.

During Ombudsman. The staff member called the Office of the Ombudsman to arrange an appointment for Elaine. The Ombudsman indicated he would talk with Elaine immediately. The Ombudsman directed his assistant to telephone the student government office to check if the attorney for students had been appointed. The Ombudsman also directed a graduate assistant to contact the appropriate University office and the appropriate county agency to acquire the following information: (1) to seek legal assistance for Elaine, in case she needed such assistance immediately; (2) to clarify the University's role in cases such as Elaine's, i.e., misdemeanor placed on a University record, social probation, parents notified by the University; and (3) to explore the possibilities of having Elaine's misdemeanor removed and thus eliminate a police record. The telephone calls produced the needed information. An attorney for students was to be hired in the next two weeks. Regarding the removal of the misdemeanor, since Elaine was not yet eighteen years of age, she could apply in two
years to have her police record removed. She was to consult an attorney on the procedure for removing her record. The University did not maintain such records, and her parents would not be notified.

After Ombudsman. Elaine only hoped for "this school year to end." She regretted the experience, but was grateful for the assistance from the Ombudsman. She "would not hesitate to see him again." Elaine remarked: "I was surprised at the immediate attention given to me."

Case No. 16 - Tami (Problem category - Faculty and staff employment)

Before Ombudsman. Tami, an employee of the University, had recently been granted a salary increase, but, as yet, had not received an official notification from the University. Tami was concerned about the accuracy of her records, since she had been divorced and remarried within the past year and a half. Upon checking with the appropriate University office, Tami discovered the notification form had been sent to the incorrect address. The form reflected the name change, but not the correct address. Tami had processed a name and address change immediately after her remarriage. The salary checks she received through campus mail also reflected the correct name.

Being well acquainted with the assistant to the Ombudsman, Tami decided to seek assistance from the Ombudsman's Office.

During Ombudsman. The assistant to the Ombudsman made a total of seven telephone calls to determine the accuracy of Tami's name and
address. The following represents the information obtained as a result of the seven phone contacts.

1. The first contact determined that Tami should have received a salary notification.

2. The second contact in the same office as the first contact, determined that Tami's record indicated the proper name and address.

3. The third contact to a different office determined the notification had been sent to the old address.

4. The fourth contact made to another office reflected the correct name and address. A clerk in this office speculated that the change of name had been keypunched correctly for machine-processing, but not the change of address. The assistant to the Ombudsman suggested that new information, once keypunched, be sent to the employee for verification before the information is placed into the system.

5. A day later the assistant to the Ombudsman made a fifth contact to the same office to which the fourth contact was made. The office agreed with the assistant that a verification check by the employee would be a good idea. The office was not sure if the procedure would be possible. They would "have to check with another department to see if it would be possible, and if the expense of the procedure would be too great." The office would "check it out" and let the assistant know.

6. Three days after the fifth contact, the assistant contacted Tami to determine if she had received her salary notification. Tami had not received the notification.
7. Three days after the sixth contact, the assistant contacted Tami again. Tami indicated she had received the notification.

After Ombudsman. Tami was confused and still not sure she would receive her withholding statement at the correct address. The assistant to the Ombudsman was not sure if the verification procedure that was suggested was put into effect. Six months later, at the time of the case interview, the office had not yet informed the assistant as to the outcome of the suggested change in procedure.

Case No. 17 - Marjorie (Problem category - Faculty and staff employment)

Before Ombudsman. Marjorie had been employed by the University for approximately one and a half years. She had been performing general clerical duties with much of her time spent doing bookkeeping work and working with numbers. Marjorie had felt somewhat uncomfortable and unsure of herself in her present position. She perceived her "boss" as not personally liking her and had requested a job transfer through the department. Six months after Marjorie initiated the transfer request, a notice of termination was sent to her by her boss, with copies to the appropriate offices. Marjorie was perplexed as to why her transfer request had not been processed. She was also concerned about the termination from a department preventing any future transfer. Marjorie knew the assistant to the Ombudsman and decided to consult the Office for assistance.
During Ombudsman. Marjorie was able to see the assistant to the Ombudsman the same day she made the initial contact. The assistant contacted the department by telephone to inquire about other job possibilities. The department indicated the listing was for intra-office use only and was not available to employees of the University.

The assistant then telephoned another person in the same department and requested that he assist Marjorie in securing another position in the University. The staff member agreed to assist Marjorie. Five phone calls and two interviews later, the staff member was able to secure for Marjorie, a temporary position within the University, and the possibility that it might lead to a permanent position.

After Ombudsman. Marjorie was "very grateful" to the assistant to the Ombudsman and the staff member. Marjorie explained: Because of being older and having a termination on my work record, I was very afraid I would not be able to get another job."

Regarding Marjorie's attitude toward the Office of the Ombudsman, she remarked: "I carry a news clipping in my purse explaining what the Ombudsman does. I also posted the same clipping on a bulletin board so students can find out." Marjorie cited several examples during the case interview of "sharing" her experience with other employees of the University.

Case No. 18 - Dean (Problem category - Faculty and staff policy and procedural questions)

Before Ombudsman. Dean had assumed chairmanship of a University
committee which had directed him to obtain an opinion from the Ombudsman concerning a specific University procedure.

**During Ombudsman.** Dean telephoned the Ombudsman and the following observations were made by the Ombudsman:

1. The Ombudsman identified various levels of procedure which faculty and staff had available to them.

2. A special University task force was considering specific recommendations regarding the review of the existing procedure.

3. Certain alternatives, if they become a fact at Western Michigan University, may affect the existing procedures.

4. The Ombudsman posed the following question to Dean: "Do the present mechanisms work?" The Ombudsman indicated he thought they did when they were used. The Ombudsman reasoned that a new procedure would, no doubt, not prove to be any better than existing procedures if faculty and staff did not use them. However, he also indicated: "If they are not working, then there is a good basis for action."

In opposition to the Ombudsman's viewpoint, Dean felt the present procedures were not used and that persons were not knowledgeable as to their use. Dean also thought many faculty and staff view the present procedures as exhausting, or fearful to use because of the possibility of intimidation.

**After Ombudsman.** Dean decided not to pursue the possibility of a new procedure. He felt the Ombudsman's recommendations were "sound," but would like to see the Ombudsman act as a "change agent"
in this case. Dean stated: "If the procedures are not working, investigate and recommend change."

Dean had indicated to the committee the idea of consulting the Ombudsman because he respected him as a person, and not the office.

Case No. 19 - Bill (Problem category - Faculty and staff policy and procedural questions)

Before Ombudsman. Bill, a faculty member in his first year at Western Michigan University, had previous contacts with the Ombudsman and had read about the Office in the campus newspaper. He referred a student to the Ombudsman because the student wished to take an independent study course from Bill, but was prevented from doing so by an academic department. The department claimed that the student needed a course to satisfy a departmental requirement, and Bill was not a member of that particular department. Therefore, the student would have to enroll in a course offered by a member of the department.

During Ombudsman. The student telephoned to make an appointment with the Ombudsman, but then telephoned the following day to cancel the appointment and indicated "everything had been worked out."

After Ombudsman. The student reported to Bill that the department had reconsidered and would allow him to take the course from Bill. Bill had thought the Ombudsman had "persuaded" the department to give consent to the student.

Regarding the Ombudsman, Bill said he would send students to
see the Ombudsman even though his previous contacts with the Ombudsman had not been satisfactory. Bill was "unhappy" concerning a complaint a student had against him. The student had consulted the Ombudsman, and instead of contacting Bill first, the Ombudsman went directly to the department head. Bill stated: "I would have preferred the Ombudsman to contact me first."

Case No. 20 - Burke (Problem category - Miscellaneous faculty and staff problems)

Before Ombudsman. Burke, a member of the faculty at Western, was upset concerning the procedure and manner used by an off-campus agency on the Western campus. Burke was in conference with the student when they were interrupted without warning by a representative of the off-campus agency. Also accompanying the agency representative was a staff member of the University. Burke's objection to the situation involved the lack of courtesy afforded him as a professional member and employee of the University. Burke expressed concern about the image the agency representative portrayed to other students who were outside Burke's office.

Since Burke had known the Ombudsman as a member of the faculty, he decided to talk with the Ombudsman. Burke wanted advice as to how he should proceed to "correct the situation" or "prevent an incident of this type occurring again."

During Ombudsman. After six telephone calls involving Burke and the Ombudsman, a University official and a staff member familiar with
the procedures of the off-campus agency, met with Burke to discuss his concern. The Ombudsman had suggested to Burke that he express his concern to the appropriate University official. The Ombudsman had expressed Burke's concern via the telephone to both the University official and the staff member.

After Ombudsman, Burke indicated that he consulted the Ombudsman to "more or less share his feelings on the matter" because he knew the Ombudsman as a personal friend. Burke was interested in informing the off-campus agency of the University's objection to these kinds of incidents occurring on campus.

In regard to the meeting, Burke felt "alone in a rather non-supportive atmosphere." He indicated that perhaps his "own actions were being questioned." However, Burke did have a "good feeling" about the meeting, in that the procedures used by the off-campus agency were explained, plus it was indicated that two rather inexperienced representatives were involved.

Burke would have preferred the University to issue a "stronger statement" to the agency denouncing the incident. Burke indicated: "I would have felt more comfortable in the meeting, as I now look back on it, had the Ombudsman been present."
Case No. 21 - Jeff (Problem category - Miscellaneous faculty and staff problems)

Before Ombudsman. Jeff, a University staff member, had been on the receiving end of the Ombudsman's investigative efforts. One day during lunch with the Ombudsman, Jeff mentioned the problem of securing information on behalf of an organization of which Jeff was an officer. The Ombudsman asked if Jeff desired to make his problem a formal request to the Office of the Ombudsman. Jeff decided he would on behalf of his position as an officer of the organization. Jeff had made several inquiries around campus as to where he might secure such information.

During Ombudsman. Since the information was not available through any office on campus, the Ombudsman's Office made extensive inquiries to determine whether or not the information was public. The information Jeff had requested was found not to be public information.

After Ombudsman. Jeff was satisfied the particular information he sought was not available. He decided not to pursue the matter any further.

Since Jeff had been on the "receiving end" of the Ombudsman pursuing student problems involving Jeff, he questioned the Ombudsman's "degree of zealously in pursuing faculty and staff cases as compared to pursuing student cases." Jeff posed the question: "What are the circumstances or considerations that determine whether or not the Ombudsman pursues an issue more zealously than another?"
Jeff indicated respect for the Ombudsman as a "person for whom you better have answers."

Data Analysis of the Seven Research Questions

Research Question No. 1 - What are the types of problems that are brought to the attention of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University?

The SCO and SBS groups. Students who consulted the Ombudsman (SCO group) were asked to indicate the general nature of their problem each had taken to the Ombudsman. Also, students who had not consulted the Ombudsman (SBS group) were asked to indicate the general nature of a problem they might have taken, or would consider taking to the Ombudsman. Table 7 presents a comparative rank order based on the frequency and percentage of the responses of the SCO and SBS groups. Each group was offered the same listing of seventeen types of problems and was instructed to indicate one or more types of problems.

The rank order of types of problems reported in Table 7 for the SCO group represent problems which were actually taken to the Ombudsman, while the SBS group problem ranking represents types of problems indicated in terms of their potential, i.e., which students would have taken, or possibly would take to the Ombudsman. Students in both the SCO and SBS groups indicated most frequently, "grade grievance" types of problems, a rank order of one for both groups.
TABLE 7
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPES OF PROBLEMS
INDICATED BY THE SCO AND SBS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>SCO Group (N=438)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SBS Group (N=513)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>SCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Admission and registration</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of instruction</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grade grievance</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic record</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic requirements</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic status</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Financial problem</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Housing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Automobile regulations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Campus safety and security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Use of facilities and services</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Student activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Needed information only</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Personal problem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The problems of "admission and registration" appeared as the second most frequent type of problem indicated by the SCO group, while problems concerning "academic requirements" appeared as a close third. In contrast, the SBS group viewed themselves as potentially consulting the Ombudsman about problems related to "quality of instruction," their selection which appeared the second most frequent.

A striking contrast which appeared between the SCO and SBS groups involved the third most frequent choice of the SBS group, "Automobile regulations" occupied the third rank position for the SBS group in contrast to occupying the twelfth position for the students who actually brought such a problem to the attention of the Ombudsman. Potentially, "automobile regulations," along with "grade grievance" and "quality of instruction" (a second position ranking for the SBS group), represented additional problems yet to be dealt with by the University, and perhaps the Ombudsman specifically.

Another type of problem indicated most frequently by students consulting the Ombudsman (SCO group) was "admission and registration," which occupied the second position of frequency. "Admission and registration" types of problems occupied a fourth position for the SBS group.

It is interesting to note that students at Michigan State University who had seen the campus ombudsman, also identified most frequently the problem areas of "grades," "registration and admission," and "academic requirements" (See Rowland, 1969, Table 11, p. 150-1). In terms of the three problem categories most frequently indicated, Rowland's
survey of 214 students who had consulted the Michigan State University Ombudsman reflect the same findings as this study.

Bottom (1970) also used similar problem categories when he surveyed sixty-five students who had consulted the Ombudsman at the Claremont Colleges. Bottom (p. 118) criticizes Rowland for attempting "to capture the Ombudsman role for faculty personnel" and for failing to recognize the importance of a graduate student or undergraduate student occupying an ombudsman position. However, Bottom's survey results do not support his criticism in terms of the types of problems that may be most frequently the concern of students. Although the problem area of "grades" was included in Bottom's questionnaire (See Bottom, 1970, Appendix E, p. 246, item C. 1), none of the sixty-five students surveyed by Bottom indicated this problem area (See Bottom, 1970, Table 13, p. 160). This study, as well as Rowland's, indicates to the contrary of Bottom, "grades" or "grade grievances" was the most frequent problem category selected by students who consulted the ombudsman (MSU and WMU), and also by students who had not consulted the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Perhaps if the position of Ombudsman at the Claremont Colleges would become available to faculty and staff people, instead of a graduate student (See Bottom, 1970, Section IV., p. 261), more students at the Claremont Colleges would seek assistance from the Ombudsman concerning grades and academic problems in general. It would be interesting to research further the effectiveness of a graduate student ombudsman pursuing a student's grade grievance problem with a faculty member,
as opposed to a faculty or staff ombudsman pursuing the same grade grievance circumstance.

Since the problem categories represented general areas of problems, one can only speculate as to their specific meaning. A closer analysis of the specific kinds of problems within each of the general categories may prove worthwhile as an area for future research. However, a more detailed analysis of the "other" category of types of problems for the SCO group does lend some insight into the specific nature of problems brought to the Ombudsman. Table 8 presents the comments offered by fifty-nine students of the SCO group who selected the "other" category.

TABLE 8
FREQUENCY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONSES TO THE "OTHER" CATEGORY OF TYPES OF PROBLEMS AS INDICATED BY FIFTY-NINE STUDENTS OF THE SCO GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Response</th>
<th>Number of SCO Students Indicating Problem (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4. Problem of State of Michigan residency requirement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scholarship - No more applications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bookstore - Refund on unused book</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $50 refund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Burglary of games area safe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Library fine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Investigation of professor and off-campus expedition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructor attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Investigation of instructor and his teaching and grading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of SCO Students Indicating Problem (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Was dismissed from a class (i.e., kicked out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Extension of drop/add date due to change of instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Opinions of faculty evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Personality dispute with a professor and a resulting unfair grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Accused falsely of cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My grade was penalized because I spent last two weeks of course in hospital, but was never given chance to do make-up work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted an incomplete which my professor was hesitant to give me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Make-up exam grievance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Problem with requirement of a required course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Class requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Problem with an instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Failure of instructor to turn (my) his class grades in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Course policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Arrange interview with a professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Attitude of a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In trouble with Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. WMU responsible for over $200 damage to my car and wouldn't pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Parking problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Drops and adds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I lost my registration money for field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. No late registration procedure for &quot;emergency&quot; problems, car breaks down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-37. Obtaining needed classes for special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Readmittance to WMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Minimum fee request for admission that was not in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-42. Lost credit hours in transferring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Doctoral committee formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Student teaching assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Was granted a substitution of class, then refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Physical education requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Response</th>
<th>Number of SCO Students Indicating Problem (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Ph.D. residence requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I failed the one course needed to graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Administration facsim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Dorm telephone situation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Visitation violation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Getting a camera—Kalamazoo prosecuting attorney was holding mine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Refund from Evelyn Wood Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Defunct counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Racial situation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. University bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Unauthorized release of information by University staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-59. Legal advice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 59

The FSCO and FSS groups. Comparisons of problem-type selection between faculty and staff consulting the Ombudsman (FSCO group) and faculty and staff not consulting the Ombudsman (FSS group) are presented in Table 9. In terms of frequency of selection, the problem of faculty and staff having a "question or complaint about University policy and procedure" occupied the first rank-order position for both the FSCO and FSS groups. The second most frequent problem category selected by members of both groups was "academic problem concerning a student." In terms of frequency selected, the seven types of problems arranged themselves almost identically in the same rank order position for both groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>FSCO Group (N=64)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FSS Group (N=281)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>FSCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic problem concerning a student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-academic or personal problem concerning a student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment problem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Question or complaint about University policy and procedure</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of University facilities and services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal problem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, as was the case for the students who consulted the Ombudsman, the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman chose the "other" category in sufficient number for this category to occupy a third rank-order position. Table 10 presents the description of the problems as specified by the FSCO group.

**TABLE 10**

**FREQUENCY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONSES TO THE "OTHER" CATEGORY OF TYPES OF PROBLEMS AS INDICATED BY TWELVE FACULTY AND STAFF MEMBERS OF THE FSCO GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Description of Response</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff Indicating Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4. Information giving</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In relation to method of my administrator, department policies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7. Activity of a colleague</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. As chairman of the department I was &quot;taken&quot; to the Ombudsman by students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I needed personal advice from a friend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It was something which had nothing to do with the University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. We wanted advice from the Ombudsman about the function of a specific University committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students consulted Ombudsman, not me</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 12

Students and faculty and staff who had not seen the Ombudsman were asked to give some indication as to their intentions of consulting the Ombudsman about a problem. As Table 11 indicates, 68 percent
of the students indicated they "would consult the Ombudsman," 25 percent said they "would not," and 7 percent were uncertain. For faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman, 63 percent indicated they "would consult the Ombudsman," 10 percent said they "would not," and 27 percent were uncertain. The high percentage of both students and faculty and staff indicating they would consult the Ombudsman tends to reflect favorably on the attitude of the University community toward the Ombudsman.

TABLE 11
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF SBS AND FSS GROUP RESPONSES AS TO THEIR INTENTION OF CONSULTING THE OMBUDSMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SBS Group (N=510)</th>
<th>FSS Group (N=278)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would consult the Ombudsman</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>68.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not consult the Ombudsman</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>24.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two persons in the SBS Group failed to respond to Item 12.

*Three persons in the FSS Group failed to respond to Item 7.

Research Question No. 2 - Who among the University community at Western Michigan University brings problems to the Ombudsman's attention?
The SCO group. From a total of 515 SCO questionnaires returned, 488 were able to be processed for analysis, or 65 percent of the total number of 715 questionnaires originally mailed. Eight students claimed not to have seen the Ombudsman, and the remaining nineteen questionnaires were incomplete and not processed. Selected characteristics of 488 students who consulted the Ombudsman are found in Table 12A through Table 12I. Comparisons of these selected characteristics are made with those found by Rowland (1969) and Bottom (1970).

As found in the Rowland and Bottom surveys, all classes and age groups also appear to be represented at Western Michigan University (Table 12A). At Western, juniors and seniors (29 percent and 32 percent) were the largest group of respondents, this being the largest at Michigan State 23 percent and 28 percent) to respond to Rowland's survey. Bottom's largest group of respondents at the Claremont Colleges were freshmen and sophomores (22 percent and 20 percent). Sophomores at Western Michigan comprised 19 percent of the total group, a very similar percentage to the Claremont survey of 20 percent. Freshmen at Western Michigan consisted of approximately 6 percent of the total group. While graduate students at both Michigan State and the Claremont Colleges constituted 17 percent of the total respondents, only 11 percent of the total group at Western Michigan were graduate students, with 9 percent of these being master degree level students. Obviously there are many variables which could account for the difference between the low percentage of graduate
students at Western Michigan University and the higher percentage of
graduate students responding to the Michigan State and Claremont Col-
leges surveys. Although Bottom (1970, p. 145-6) speculates that
graduate students are "better able" to use the ombudsman, the results
at Western Michigan University would tend to negate this type of
logic. The reasoning suggested by Bottom on the basis of sampling
percentages cannot lend insight to the specific reasons why a par-
ticular group may seek assistance from the ombudsman more frequently
than another group.

Two other designations of student classification were included
in this study. No "guest students" responded to the survey, and
"unclassified" students totaled only 2 percent. The guest student
classification is unique to the State of Michigan, with the parent
institution granting permission to a student to take course work at
another institution within the State. The "unclassified" designation
is unique to Western Michigan University, the meaning of which varies
depending upon whether the student is a graduate or undergraduate.

The age category (Table 12D) of 19 to 21 years appeared as the
highest percentage, with 54 percent of the respondents at Western
Michigan University falling into this age category. This percentage
correlates closely with the 55 percent found by Bottom in the 19 to
21 years category and that of Rowland's 51 percent. Age category
percentages reported in this study for students beyond twenty-one
years of age were slightly higher than those reported by Rowland and
Bottom. Students at Western twenty-two years and older comprised
approximately forty percent of the total respondents, while Bottom (1970, p. 147, Table 6) and Rowland (1969, p. 139, Table 4) reported approximately thirty-four percent and thirty-seven percent. Approximately half as many eighteen-year-olds responded to the Western Michigan survey (5 percent) as did the eighteen-year-olds at Michigan State (9 percent) and the Claremont Colleges (11 percent).

In terms of legal residence (Table 12B), the majority of respondents were decidedly from the State of Michigan (89 percent). Both Bottom (1970, p. 147, Table 6) and Rowland (1969, p. 139, Table 4) report high percentages for California and Michigan, with both surveys also reflecting higher percentages (23 percent and 23 percent) for out-of-state residents than Western Michigan (9 percent).

Male students consulting the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University were the majority (56 percent, Table 12C) responding to the survey. Females made up 44 percent of the total SCO group. These findings were consistent with that of Rowland's (69 percent) and Bottom's (54 percent).

Fifty-six percent (Table 12I) of the students consulting the Ombudsman had attended another college, university, or vocational school in addition to Western Michigan University. Bottom (1970, p. 146) reported thirty-seven percent for his survey at the Claremont Colleges. Rowland did not report any findings concerning other schools attended. Other selected characteristics of SCO respondents concerning marital status, college enrolled, accumulated grade point average and student residence are reported in Table 12 E, F, G, and H respectively.
### TABLE 12
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WHO CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (THE SCO GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Student Classification (N=486)(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two students failed to indicate their student classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B) Legal Residence (N=486)(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two students failed to indicate their legal residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(C) Sex (N=479)(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Nine students failed to indicate their sex
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**TABLE 12—Continued**

(D) Age (N=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>53.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eight students failed to indicate their age*

(E) Marital Status (N=482)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>74.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Six students failed to indicate their marital status*

(F) College Enrolled (N=477)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>48.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eleven students failed to indicate their major field of study*
TABLE 12—Continued

(F) College Enrolled—Continued

Students were asked to indicate their "major field of study." The frequency and percentages of their responses were then placed within the appropriate Colleges at Western Michigan University to determine the totals indicated in the above table.

(G) Accumulated Grade Point Average (N=479)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accumulated G.P.A. (^b)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 4.00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 to 3.49</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 to 2.99</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>37.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 2.49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (1st term student)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Nine students failed to report their grade point average

\(^b\) The WMU grade scale: A = 4.00, B = 3.00 to 3.99, C = 2.00 to 2.99, D = 1.00 to 1.99, and E = Below 1.00

(H) Student Residence (N=474)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>28.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married student housing (On campus)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus housing</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>57.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents or relatives</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Fourteen students failed to indicate their student residence
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### TABLE 12—Continued

#### (I) Transfer or Native (N=487)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer or Native b</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total native (attended WMU only)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>43.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transfer</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>56.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Under 500 enrollment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*500-3,500 enrollment</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3,500-5,000 enrollment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5,000-10,000 enrollment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10,000-20,000 enrollment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Over 20,000 enrollment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOne student failed to indicate if he was a transfer or native student

bTransfer referred to in the study included any student that attended another college, university, or vocational school other than WMU. A native student is one that has attended WMU only.

*(NOTE: Number and percentage of enrollment breakdown of college, university, or vocational school constitutes total transfer student data of 274 and 56.263.)*

---

**The FSGO group.** One hundred and twenty-five questionnaires were originally mailed to faculty and staff who had consulted with the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Of this number, eighty-two or 66 percent were returned, and sixty-four or slightly more than 50 percent were able to be used for analysis. Fourteen of the eighty-two faculty and staff returning their questionnaires claimed not to have consulted with the Ombudsman, and the remaining four questionnaires were incomplete.
Selected characteristics of faculty and staff appear in Table 13A through Table 13F. In terms of highest percentages indicated by the respondents, a member of the FSCO group had the greatest probability of being a male member of the teaching faculty, married, between the ages of 36 and 45, employed by the University for at least one to three years, with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. as the highest level of education attained. With the exception of Bottom (1970, p. 147, Table 6) reporting a greater percentage of staff than faculty responding to his survey, no comparisons can be made to the Bottom and Rowland surveys. For Rowland, it would perhaps be impossible, since Michigan State's Ombudsman at the time of this study serves only the student population.

**TABLE 13**
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY AND STAFF WHO CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (THE FSCO GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty with administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or technical staff of an academic department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or technical staff of the administration or other non-academic or service areas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* All sixty-four faculty and staff indicated their position with the University.
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TABLE 13—Continued

(B) Years Employed by University (N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Employed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sixty-four faculty and staff indicated their number of years employed by the University

(C) Sex (N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sixty-four faculty and staff indicated their sex.

(D) Age (N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sixty-four faculty and staff indicated their age
TABLE 13—Continued

(E) Marital Status (N=63)\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}One member of the faculty and staff failed to indicate his marital status.

(F) Highest Level of Education (N=63)\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated, licensed, or apprenticeship beyond high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to four years of college - no degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree from a junior college</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Ed.D.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}One member of the faculty and staff failed to indicate his highest level of education.

Research Question No. 3 - What are the circumstances which caused members of the University community to have a problem?

The following discussion identifies general categories of circumstances which caused persons to consult the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. Student, faculty, and staff circumstances are
represented by summary statements of the twenty-one cases and selected comments students, faculty, and staff chose to make in response to a questionnaire item. A general analysis of the cases and comments then follows. It should be recognized that the descriptions of the circumstances reflect the opinion and observations of students, faculty, and staff who actually consulted the Ombudsman.

Student circumstances. Cases one through eight are examples of student academic problems. Pete (Case No. 1), having to face past academic failure in one course in his master degree work, suddenly found this one failure having far-reaching implications for his admission to further graduate study. Linda (Case No. 2), experiencing difficulty in communicating with her teacher, found the refusal of her teacher to repeat the explanation of a required assignment preventing her from receiving an acceptable course grade. Ken (Case No. 3) sought the same opportunity to drop a course for himself as was granted to other students in the same course. Ramona (Case No. 4) and Matt (Case No. 5) were faced with suddenly having to justify their transfer credit to the appropriate academic departments. The circumstances involved differing views in terms of course equivalency between two different institutions of higher learning. Ramona and Matt considered these differing views as an injustice for which they could not be held responsible.

Chet (Case No. 6) considered his experience as a violation of his individual rights resulting from first an offer, then a refusal on the part of University officials to honor a financial commitment.
Shirley (Case No. 7) and Sue (Case No. 8) also felt the University had made commitments to them regarding admissions to a particular program of study.

Cases 9 through 15 are examples of student non-academic problems. Edna (Case No. 9) seemingly found herself in a maze of red tape when she had money coming from other loans which she could not get, because she could not register for classes. She could not register because she could not obtain the money to pay her obligation which prevented her registration in the first place.

Hazel (Case No. 10) viewed her rights as being violated in an off-campus housing situation, yet considered the University, in part, as the appropriate agency responsible to assist her. In contrast, Joanne (Case No. 11) lived in on-campus University housing, yet perceived the University as attempting to disregard her problem, or show little concern. A situation which Joanne considered irresponsible on the part of the University.

Brock (Case No. 12) experienced similar circumstances to that of Chet (Case No. 6). Brock considered his rights as being violated as the result of his being hired by a University staff member, only to be dismissed soon afterward for reasons he did not understand. Glenn (Case No. 13) also viewed the University as being in violation of his rights; not of the individual, but of the rights of a chartered student organization.

Although a possible exception to the norm of circumstances causing a student to become involved with a campus ombudsman, Bob (Case
No. 14) found himself defending a position he chose to assume as an official of a student organization. Bob's circumstance resulted in the Ombudsman consulting him, instead of Bob consulting the Ombudsman.

Elaine (Case No. 15), perhaps a victim of circumstance, found herself faced with far-reaching implications. What began as a friendly shopping endeavor with a friend, suddenly threatened her record as a law-abiding citizen.

**Student comments regarding circumstances.** In addition to the circumstances represented by the twenty-one case studies, students consulting the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University offered various observations related to the reasons for consulting the Ombudsman. The students commented in response to the following questionnaire item: "Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to on this page or separate sheet of paper" (See Appendix I, SCO Questionnaire, Item No. 49). The following comments are considered appropriate for lending insight into the circumstances causing students to seek assistance from the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University.

- The proper persons needed to become aware of an instructor who both academically and ethically violated his profession.
- Western's pervading air of apathy.
- Get rid of busy work classes that do not have a thing to do with your major or minor.
- He (the Ombudsman) was the only member of Western's staff that I felt took the slightest bit of interest in us since my transfer.
Students who need and are entitled to social services are often denied these services (food stamps, child care, etc.). The off-campus housing situation is also critical.

I recognized the hassle of battling with a professor to change a grade, so I gave up.

"______________" should take a course in constructive human relationships.

Administrators and to a certain degree faculty members usually give the pat answer that "nothing can be done about it."

To bring such policies to the notice of some official is often hard, and most often fall on deaf ears.

I had, and still do have long hair. In other words point blank discrimination.

It's necessary he (the Ombudsman) be granted much more power to bend, if necessary, outdated rules.

I went to several administrators in the school.

I was sent scurrying from campus to campus with no progress in sight.

My problem stemmed from the fact that only one advisor was available in my dept.

The University has gotten too large for a student to feel that he has any hope of solving a problem.

When I had a housing problem this fall, I was glad to have someone I could go to who would listen to my problem, and not just repeat the University policies, as if they were programmed tape-recorders.

Each instructor should be required to set up criteria for grading students.

My particular grade grievance was almost two-years-old. Previously I had talked to many other officials and was repeatedly told that there was nothing that could be done.

There has to be someone to help the students when they are up against the bureaucracy of the University.
The whole problem consists of student and faculty apathy.

There's no more lonely feeling than the feeling of being cheated and no one to turn to.

Some of the heads of departments think what they say goes, whether it is right or not.

I needed my transfer credit where I was told it would not apply - When it actually did - My thanks for help.

Too many faculty members just think they're so high and mighty and won't give in to or help a "lowly student."

I think that it is very poor policy for extension teachers to give no grade higher than B.

Faculty and staff circumstances. Tami (Case No. 16) and Marjorie (Case No. 17) are examples of faculty and staff employment problems. Tami, concerned about her salary notification being sent to the incorrect address, sought assistance from the assistant to the Ombudsman to prevent any personal embarrassment to herself or her former husband. Being an older employee of the University, Marjorie was fearful she would not be able to secure another position with the University, or any other employer.

Dean (Case No. 18) simply sought advice from the Ombudsman on behalf of a committee concerning University procedures. Even though Bill (Case No. 19) was not necessarily pleased with his past experience with the Ombudsman, he was willing to send a student to the Ombudsman for what he considered an unjustifiable departmental policy. Both Dean's case and Bill's case are examples of faculty and staff policy and procedural questions.

Burke (Case No. 20) experienced a rather unusual circumstance. Because he had experienced what he considered inappropriate treatment
by an off-campus agency, Burke sought assistance from the Ombudsman as to how future incidents of this kind might be prevented. Representing an organization, Jeff had casually mentioned to the Ombudsman over lunch a problem of obtaining information he thought should be available through an on-campus office. Both of these cases are examples of the miscellaneous kinds of circumstances which caused faculty and staff to seek assistance from the Ombudsman.

Faculty and staff comments regarding circumstances. The following comments were offered by faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman. They, too, responded to the questionnaire item: "Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to on this page or separate sheet of paper" (See Appendix I, FSCO Questionnaire, Item No. 44).

I went for advice and received it.

University policy should be made clear to all faculty.

There is a great deal of unfair treatment in the University.

The Ombudsman contacted me which turned out to be an unjustifiable complaint on the part of a colleague.

I know some faculty who went to the Ombudsman when they weren't promoted, didn't get a sabbatical or research grant. Ombudsman provided another place to let off steam.

I should note that I consulted with the Ombudsman as chairman of my department to resolve a conflict between a student and my department where the student considered his treatment by the department unjust.

Current functionaries of the University seem to be preoccupied at the extremes of the spectrum of social units involved, i.e. the individual vs. the system. I consulted the Ombudsman as a representative of a
smaller unit or group concerned with a particular issue.

General analysis of circumstances. As a result of an interview with the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, Dr. Milton Brawer, concerning the twenty-one case studies, the following observations by the writer seem relevant regarding the circumstances or reasons why a student, faculty or staff member may seek assistance from the Ombudsman.

(1) A member of the University community may feel he or she has exhausted all avenues of redress of a particular grievance. In an attempt to find a suitable answer or explanation to the problem, the grievant may have experienced unpleasant treatment by another member of the University, or experienced what the grievant considered to be an inadequate explanation.

(2) Some may think it necessary to consult the Ombudsman, only to discover through a more careful analysis that the original problem had not been properly identified, and therefore may not be a problem at all. However, in most cases, it appears that the problem identification process is a necessary process which the Ombudsman automatically pursues with each person seeking assistance.

(3) Circumstances arise within the University community which represent a definite violation of an individual's rights such as Chet's circumstances (See Case No. 6).

(4) The inability of the University to explain adequately, or make available the various policies and procedures seem to cause various members of the University to seek assistance from the Ombudsman.

(5) Various students, faculty, or staff members may seek assistance from the Ombudsman for the purpose of seeking someone to assume a supportive role or relationship in their efforts to
resolve a problem. This situation may be legitimate as viewed by the Ombudsman, or it may not be legitimate as viewed by the Ombudsman.

(6) Some circumstances are the result of individuals experiencing an emergency or some sort of trauma such as case study numbers 15 and 20 seem to indicate.

The case studies presented and the comments offered by students, faculty, and staff represent a wide variety of circumstances which cause individuals to seek assistance from someone such as the Ombudsman. In some instances, it is a lack of communication between two parties which causes one of the two parties to become a grievant. Many of the circumstances which students experience seemed to be centered around academic kinds of concerns, especially as indicated by their comments in response to Item 49 of the SCO questionnaire. Faculty and staff comments appear to be centered around policy and procedural questions, involving a student, another colleague, another department, employment concerns, or the University in general. Comments of all members of the University community allude to their discouragement resulting from what the grievant considers inhumane or unfair treatment by various individuals or agencies—the student versus the instructor regarding grades or methods of instruction, and the faculty or staff member versus the University regarding employment problems, or policy and procedure definition and clarification.

To the extent that the twenty-one case studies and student, faculty, and staff comments are representative of all the circumstances
which cause persons to seek assistance from someone such as the
Ombudsman is questionable. The previous presentation simply repre-
sents an attempt to secure some insight into these circumstances.

Research Question No. 4 - As a result
of the Campus Ombudsman investigating
a problem, what are the implications
for institutional change, policy and
procedures at Western Michigan Uni-
versity and higher education insti-
tutions in general?

The twenty-one cases together with student, faculty, and staff
comments are not presented in the following discussion with the claim
they represent all of the policy and procedural implications possible.
The purpose of the analysis is to bring attention to the possibility
of change or improvement as a result of the Ombudsman's investigation.
The implications for policy and procedure presented in the following
discussion do not infer that such changes or improvements are neces-
sarily appropriate, feasible or practical, or even justifiable for
Western Michigan University or any other institution of higher learn-
ing.

The twenty-one case studies. Pete's problem (Case No. 1)
evolved from the fact that he had repeated a course successfully with
a "B" grade, but his accumulated average to be considered for admis-
sion to a doctoral program would also include the first attempt, or
the failing grade of "E." The efforts on the part of the Ombudsman,
the academic department, and the graduate school represent consider-
able additional time and effort to seek special consideration in lieu
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of the rule concerning the computation of grade point averages for
doctoral program admission. Perhaps it would be more efficient and
accountable in terms of cost and effort, and more equitable in terms
of recognizing individual student effort, if the computation of
grade point average for admission consideration purposes included
only the second grade achieved in repeated course work. Thus, a
general rule could be applied to all and exclude the possibility of
a student seeking exception to the rule because of one failure. The
recommendation often suggested, "If at first you don't succeed, try,
try again," becomes a reality and operational as an educational claim,
and would perhaps cease to remain unsubstantiated in higher educa-
tion.

Linda and Ken (Cases No. 2 and 3) received seemingly equitable
treatment as a result of the Ombudsman's assistance. Both cases
seem to point up the need for University employees to pay more atten-
tion to procedural matters of the University, and especially to their
own personal organization habits. Linda's teacher was not readily
willing to repeat the explanation of a particular assignment. Per-
haps both Linda and the teacher failed to communicate adequately to
each other.

The responsibility to provide opportunity for a student to
understand a particular assignment is surely a cooperative effort on
the part of the student and the teacher. The debatable question to
be recognized, of course, is what constitutes sufficient opportunity
and assistance for a particular student to understand a specific
assignment. Certainly this should never be assumed by any educator, no matter what the nature of the explanation happens to be. All of the above reasoning assumes that the student, such as Linda, is also responsible and sincere.

Ken's case is an example of inadequate pre-planning. Again, it points up the necessity for members of the University community to be cognizant of University procedure. Had Ken's teacher been able to establish the guidelines for dropping the course at the beginning, the problem of determining who should be allowed to drop, and who should not be allowed to drop, would perhaps not have been a problem at all. Inattention to a seemingly small procedural matter resulted in the alienation of a student such as Ken. Considerable effort on the part of the Ombudsman, two department heads, a secretary, and a University committee was necessary for the problem to be resolved.

Cases No. 4 and 5 (Ramona and Matt) perhaps have to be questioned in terms of the legitimacy of their grievances with the University. In both cases, the Ombudsman explained the policy of the University concerning the transfer of credits and did provide Ramona and Matt with alternatives. Ramona and Matt claimed to have extenuating circumstances which they both viewed as being legitimate to cause exceptions to University policy. In Ramona's case, the community college must bear part of the responsibility. The University communicated the transfer policy to the community college in time, but according to Ramona, the community college did not inform her of the non-transferability of the course. Ken's situation involved the
question of course equivalency between two senior institutions. Is course equivalency decided upon through a rather arbitrary means, or is the decision based on systematic procedure and adequate knowledge? The grievances, legitimate or not, simply point to the continued importance and efforts which should be directed toward the articulation process between junior and senior (or senior to senior) institutions. Although a costly and complex procedure, academic departments and other appropriate members of the junior and senior institutions need to continually regard the articulation process as a joint effort in helping students to move as smoothly and swiftly through various academic programs as possible.

Case No. 6 (Chet) represents the ultimate in responsible University administration. The investigation initiated by the Ombudsman resulted in fair and equitable treatment of an individual within a large University such as Western Michigan. Chet's situation points to the importance of a smooth transition of knowledge and understanding which must take place when one person's University position is assumed by another. Procedures need to be present to allow proper documentation of transactions which have occurred in the past. Although time consuming, proper documentation of contacts with students allows for recall of past events and conversation. Documentation involves the understanding and awareness of both parties involved, and an agreement on what business has been transacted. In a sense, it can be a contract.
Cases 7, 8, and 9 (Shirley, Sue, and Edna) bring attention to the need for clearly defined procedures, whether the procedure involves application to specific academic programs within the University, as in the cases of Shirley and Sue, or the removal of a financial obligation such as was Edna's problem. Certainly, Shirley's sense of responsibility has to be questioned. She not only failed to complete her own admissions application, but she failed to indicate this fact to all the members of the University community who were attempting to assist her. However, it would appear that policy and procedures are never too well defined and clarified. Painstaking efforts and creative devices to communicate various procedures and policies need to be constantly devised to minimize misunderstanding. Until she contacted the Ombudsman, Shirley claimed to have not received an adequate explanation as to why she was not enrolled in her curriculum. Perhaps additional effort in the form of an adequate explanation offered initially by the appropriate department would have prevented Shirley from having to contact the Ombudsman. It must also be recognized that the most creative efforts on the part of all will not eliminate the problem of an individual's inattention or non-acceptance of established and clearly defined policy procedures.

Shirley and Sue were both provided with acceptable alternatives which seemingly corrected the original misunderstanding with the respective departments. The departmental efforts after-the-fact are good examples of the University's willingness to solve individual
problems. These problem-solving efforts were very complex and time consuming, not to mention the possible frustration and tension that may have been experienced by all those persons involved.

Edna's case is an acute example of how disregard for the individual and his problem, however unplanned or unintentional, can become quite obvious and inherent in a large University such as Western Michigan.

Although the responsibility to clear a financial obligation must rest with the individual incurring such obligation, it seems logical that every attempt should be made to allow the individual to be successful in removing the obligation by providing adequate procedures. The University has every right to determine the means by which a financial obligation is to be removed. In Edna's case, it appears that one University staff member judged Edna as a poor risk, while another member simply made a decision based on faith. It seems unreasonable to pass an individual from one office to another, or from one subordinate to a superior, when with proper instruction and training, a decision could be made at the lowest possible level of authority. In contrast, it also must be recognized there are those individuals who are never satisfied, regardless of the adequacy or appropriateness of a particular decision at any level of the hierarchy. Perhaps these individuals seek only an advocate of their position and have complete disregard for any and all policies and procedures.
Case No. 10 (Hazel) involves a very controversial issue. Although Hazel chose to live in off-campus housing, she still sought assistance from the University when she had a problem with the manager of the off-campus housing complex. Hazel did not want the University to interfere with her "life outside the classroom," yet viewed the University as having some responsibility in assisting her with the off-campus housing problem. Hazel was, in fact, a student enrolled at the University. The University housing office did make an inquiry to the manager of the off-campus housing complex which does indicate some interest and assistance on the part of the University. Two additional efforts on the part of any college or university in situations such as Hazel seem evident: (1) Every attempt should be made to clarify the institution's position and responsibility by offering an adequate explanation to students; and (2) a follow-up effort by the appropriate office should be made for the purpose of indicating to the student that the University is interested in the outcome of the problem. For example, perhaps the Ombudsman, or better yet, the appropriate University housing office should make attempts to mediate and negotiate differences which arise between off-campus student tenants and their landlords. Hazel did seek assistance and information from the University. Perhaps many students living off campus would not. Since Hazel was a student at the University, the fact she sought assistance from the University was a great opportunity to practice a form of University public relations. Who knows, Hazel may have decided to return to on-campus
housing and thereby fill a vacant residence hall space. The University Ombudsman did remark in discussing Hazel's case: "Follow-up procedures by the Ombudsman's Office is now an automatic procedure." It is quite possible there is good reason for follow-up procedures in every office.

Joanne's (Case No. 11) problem of securing adequate parking on the main campus for the convenience of herself and other residents in the married-student housing complex is a problem which Western Michigan and other colleges and universities continually must face. Perhaps campus parking facilities are never in sufficient number, or "close enough" to work and classes.

There appear to be certain efforts which a college or university can attempt in combating the parking problem. Some colleges and universities establish a special committee to hear problems and complaints concerning parking and traffic situations (such a committee has recently been established at Western Michigan University). While perhaps necessary and worthwhile, such committees seem geared toward "throwing water on the fire," as opposed to "preventing the fire" in the first place. In terms of policy and procedural implications, it seems necessary for the college or university to first admit that a parking problem exists. Beyond the identification of who has a car on campus and determining the total amount of cars on campus, is the necessity of a detailed analysis as to when these cars are on campus, and where or how, geographically, do they approach the campus to park, and for what purposes. The purpose for having an automobile on campus
and its relation to parking facilities is an interesting issue. If, for example, most of the students enrolled are commuting students, then it is quite possible there should be less emphasis by the college or university regarding separate parking facilities for employees and for students. Realizing that such an issue could start a "third world war," a painstaking analysis of the problems inherent in such a change would be necessary. Obviously, such an arrangement would require a monumental task to secure the cooperation of all members of the university community—students, faculty and staff—and may not be at all feasible. However, open parking would provide better equity on a first-come, first-serve basis. Eight o'clock classes would suddenly become more popular with students and faculty alike. Open parking, tried on an experimental basis, may be found more equitable and practical.

Joanne's parking problem points to another situation that has appeared in some of the other cases. Attention has to be directed toward an attempt to provide an adequate explanation of the reasons for a policy or procedure. Dr. Milton Brawer, University Ombudsman at Western, has inferred that in many situations, all a client is really looking for is an adequate explanation of the policy or procedure which he failed to obtain from the appropriate office. It perhaps is wrong to assume that a member of the university community, such as a student, is incapable of understanding a well-clarified explanation of a particular policy or procedure.

Brock's situation (Case No. 12) brings attention to the need for all members of the university community to identify properly and
correctly, the problem which may exist. Inability to do so may lead to frustration, and even alienation toward the college or university. Brock was upset because he had been hired for the semester (so he thought) by a department at Western only to be dismissed to make room for another student. Brock failed to communicate his situation accurately to the assistant to the Ombudsman. As a result, the assistant sent him around campus seeking job opportunities. It is quite possible that the real situation involved a violation of Brock's rights, or the failure of the department to communicate the problem to Brock. If, in fact, the department had to hire a student that was currently on a federally assisted financial program of the University, then the mistake in Brock's case should be admitted and other assistance offered. Although the apparent injustice to Brock seemingly is not corrected by an adequate explanation of the department's problem; again, the time and effort taken to explain the reasoning may go a long way to reduce the alienation Brock may have toward the University. For example, a phone call or personal contact by the department to explain the situation to Brock's off-campus employer, from whom Brock resigned his job to take the University position, may have resulted in a successful solution.

Cases 13 and 14 (Glenn and Bob) involve situations between student organizations and University policy. Glenn's organization disagreed with University policy concerning the holding of pop concert events in a University facility. Bob's situation, perhaps unique in that the Ombudsman initiated the contact with Bob, involved
a clarification as to how student organizations could use the money officially allocated to them by the University. Since Bob was responsible for delegating the allocation, he seemingly was asking the University for additional guidelines so that he could do a better job. It also has to be noted that Bob’s intention was that of a "stall tactic" which he admitted to, and which the University was quick to perceive.

The policy implications represented by Glenn’s and Bob’s situation all too clearly point to the importance of assistance a college or university needs to give to student organizations and student government in general. As with Bob’s situation, University officials and the Ombudsman were no doubt justified in applying pressure to Bob to allocate the money. What about the follow-up to such incidents? Disregarding the "stall tactic" used by Bob, and its inappropriateness, was, or is there a need for clarification and improvement of the role of student organizations on campus? As with Glenn’s organization, should a college or university consider it important to assist a student organization in sponsoring such events as pop concerts. The committee claimed that student organizations have been previously irresponsible in their efforts to sponsor such events. It may be important for the University to assist student organizations to become responsible, financially or otherwise. For example, treat an outside-the-classroom experience as meaningful and perhaps as important as an academic endeavor. Give status and attach importance to assisting student organizations and student government to be successful.
Again, the problem of adequately explaining the reasoning behind the policy seems to become evident. Although Glenn went to the Ombudsman seeking a change in the existing policy concerning student sponsored events, the Ombudsman obtained for Glenn the reasoning behind the policy. At the time of the interview, Glenn appeared to accept the adequate explanation much more readily than he did the "no" answer he received from a committee member via the telephone.

In Bob's case, if the University made efforts to clarify the use of student organization money to Bob, then the University reacted responsibly. There has been follow-up. If no follow-up has occurred, then the problem or question might arise again, and sufficient and meaningful communication will not have taken place.

Elaine's (Case No. 15) situation provides little in the way of policy or procedural implications. Her situation does represent a very acceptable role the University assumes in similar incidents which occur off campus. The University took no official action against Elaine or other students caught in such circumstances off campus. Elaine's problem does raise the much debated issue of the extent of the college or university responsibility in a student's life outside the classroom, or off campus. Since this particular issue is not the focus of the study, it is appropriate to simply indicate, that, in this case, the University was able to dispel Elaine's fears through the inquiries made by the Ombudsman.

One question which does have possible implications for change as a result of Elaine's case is the following: Why did the staff
member refer Elaine to the Ombudsman instead of perhaps a more appropriate office? Although this writer made no attempt to ask the particular staff member the reason, this one fact raises opportunity for speculation concerning the Ombudsman. The following questions are worth noting:

(1) Was the staff member a personal friend of the Ombudsman?

(2) Is the Ombudsman to be trusted perhaps more than other appropriate offices on campus?

(3) Did the staff member view the Ombudsman as having more information?

(4) Since the Ombudsman had to make inquiries to other offices on and off campus to acquire the necessary information, could not the staff member make the same kinds of inquiries?

As mentioned before, one can only speculate as to the reasons for referring Elaine to the Ombudsman, but Elaine's case points out a pattern which exists in most of the cases presented so far in this section. The Ombudsman seems to have performed tasks and attempted to solve problems which seemingly could more appropriately be dealt with by other departments, offices, or staff members of the University. Certainly, this situation is not a negative reflection on the Ombudsman. It may very well be a negative reflection on how well a particular college or university is capable of performing its various functions through its offices and employees.

Tami's problem (Case No. 16) represents what frequently happens in a large institution, educational or otherwise, concerning the maintenance of accurate records of its employees. The implication
for procedure that seems evident in Tami's case is the necessity for
the appropriate office, assuming it is the office's responsibility,
to be in a position to resolve the problem, rather than referring
the grievant to a variety of offices. It took the assistant to the
Ombudsman no less than five telephone calls to three separate
offices to determine the source of Tami's incorrect address. A mem-
ber of the University community may experience an "exhausting" proc-
ess to obtain the correct explanation. Such an experience discour-
gages, and perhaps alienates, an individual and his attitude toward
the University. Each office and its members should be as well
informed as possible, especially concerning their own affairs.

It is perhaps true that the presence of an ombudsman causes
others to do a better job. Marjorie's situation (Case No. 17)
seems to be an example of such a phenomenon. Not until the Ombuds-
man's Office initiated the investigation of Marjorie's dilemma,
did a staff member of the appropriate office take action. Marjorie's
case is a perfect example of why an Ombudsman may be necessary, to
minimize or correct the disregard shown toward the individual and
his problem. The policy implication involved focuses directly on
the need and tenure of a campus ombudsman on any campus. Perhaps the
ombudsman is created on a college or university campus to guard
against injustice to the individual. If there is no improvement on
the part of the various campus offices and departments to deal effec-
tively with individuals and their problems during the ombudsman's
tenure, then the presence of the campus ombudsman may promote the
circumstances which caused his presence. The ombudsman will continue to perform the work that should be accomplished by the other offices and departments already present on campus.

Dean (Case No. 18) was concerned about a specific University policy and the accompanying procedure. Dean claimed the present procedures were not being used by faculty and staff and sought an opinion from his friend, the Ombudsman. Dean pursued the matter no further because the Ombudsman had presented a sufficient reasoning contrary to Dean's claim. It is quite possible the issue represented by non-use of the procedure may be an eroding factor to the general morale of the faculty and staff. The implication simply involves the necessity of formal or informal review of a particular policy or procedure where warranted by sufficient conflicting information or evidence.

"Satisfactory procedure worked out between the teacher and his student, and another department" is a headline appropriate for Bill's problem (Case No. 19). Although Bill referred his student to the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman really never entered the "picture." Based on the description of the case, it would be speculation to assume that the mere presence of the Ombudsman caused a solution to the problem, but it is nevertheless an interesting thought. Problems can and should be solved at the lowest possible level of the institutional hierarchy, and, hopefully, without the assistance of the Ombudsman.

On occasion it is necessary for various outside agencies to
make contacts with members of the university community while performing their duties on campus. As Burke's case (No. 20) seems to point out, care should be taken by a college or university and especially the outside agency to determine the appropriateness of the on-campus contact. Incidents such as Burke experienced can and perhaps should be prevented by adequate and prior communication between both parties. Guidelines established by the University concerning such contacts should be made evident to the proper outside agencies that may have cause to conduct, for example, necessary investigations on campus.

Jeff's problem (Case No. 21) was similar to Tami's (Case No. 16). He, too, could not obtain the desired information from the appropriate office. As a result of the Ombudsman's investigation it was determined that the information was, in fact, not available. The implication for procedure that is evident involves the inability of the appropriate office to provide an adequate explanation as to why the information was not available. Although it is possible Jeff might have pursued the issue to the highest possible authority immediately available to him, it is also possible that he may have been satisfied had an adequate explanation been initially offered by the appropriate office.

Student comments regarding policy and procedural implications. The following comments of students who consulted the Ombudsman were obtained in response to the questionnaire item: "Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to make on this page or separate
Students ought to be able to know what others think of an instructor before registration.

I believe that the University already has an adequate complement of rule enforcers—the Ombudsman should be a rule bender, justifying his actions by reference to norms of rationality and fairness, not to norms presented in the University’s rule books.

Once it was finally determined I was honest and led astray in a small University requirement, it was waived almost immediately.

The Ombudsman is in an excellent position to temper the seeming indifference of a bureaucratic system.

I was trying to get G.S. credit for a course I transferred from the J.C. I attended. The Ombudsman turned me down—it was later okayed by the G.S. advisor I talked to.

Mere recommendations are not enough to dislodge the petty rules, hostile bureaucrats who believe in vested interests rather than service, and mindless restrictions.

They (the Ombudsman’s Office) seemed to get good action for my problem with a landlord whom I had called repeatedly.

If I would have had to repeat one course in “________” just to graduate from WMU, it would have meant one more semester on campus, because of a rule.

I was concerned that the requirement of picture I.D.’s, with a copy going to some office in the University, would be used against the students, a quick means of identifying students at a demonstration.

It’s (the Ombudsman’s Office) probably Western’s biggest step toward recognizing the individual God-given dignity of the student—for once.

I would like to add that the University officials I spoke with were most offensive and cared more about the University’s pocketbook than what was proper.
I could have sued the University itself for being rude, showing negligence and callousness.

Several previous calls to the instructor and his department (by me) had done absolutely no good.

Went away feeling that I had been able to state my case before someone who actually listened and then gave me the information and the reasons for the particular policy in question.

For some reason the Office of "______________" has always seemed to function for the few students who were members of campus "______________"—something of a closed shop.

No one else would listen or aid me in solving my problem.

Many problems could be solved without referral to another bureaucratic office, where often only further delays are encountered.

He (the Ombudsman) advised the "______________" Center to take measures to alleviate misunderstanding.

It wasn't like the usual thing at Western—going to supposedly the right office—then being sent to all different kinds of offices and speaking to people who weren't capable of answering you.

I didn't have any idea of where I might go to resolve my problems after being given a run-around by my first sources.

I never found out if there was any action on my complaint or not.

It is my opinion that students are the best judge of a teacher's ability to lead and instruct. We as students are in the position day after day to see good teachers at work, and bad ones.

The "______________" department required "_______" 100 for all majors in the department, even though we have no use for "_______"

Faculty and staff are more interested in their pay checks than anything else and forget their position
in the University is to provide a place for higher learning.

They (faculty and staff) become so engrossed in bureaucracy and the status quo that they didn't have the courage or desire to interpret regulations in a reasonable fashion.

It (the Ombudsman's Office) should serve a source of assistance to students and others when faced with the red tape of bureaucracy, and the dehumanized, mechanical employees of the University.

The faculty helped me more than he (the Ombudsman) did.

All the work of problem solving must not fall on the Ombudsman.

The Ombudsman keeps the University from becoming too impersonal.

Ombudsman cannot deal effectively with problems of women, especially in areas of sex discrimination, and less obvious institutionalized sexism.

Some classes are offered only once a year.

The University as a whole, is a faceless, unfeeling entity.

The University needs more legal aid procedures.

I again talked to the teacher and the problem was resolved as a result.

Faculty and staff comments regarding implications for policy and procedure. The following comments of faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman were made in response to the questionnaire item: "Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to on this page or separate sheet of paper" (See Appendix I, FSCO questionnaire, Item No. 4).

He (the Ombudsman) is doing the job numerous of other highly paid faculty, staff and administrators were hired for. I'm tired of the overlapping of responsibilities and salaries. I see a waste of money on a
man, office supplies, secretaries, etc., to do the job others are paid to do.

It is my personal feeling that if faculty and staff is playing an important part in the academic life of the University; it is unbelievable that 1,200 legitimate interviews would have ever taken place.

I hope I never have to use Mr. Brawer's services again. With my employees as they are, I'm sure I never will.

All faculty should take every opportunity to make policy clear to students.

It is unfortunate that the Ombudsman has to have special powers to bring disputants together.

Since I know "channels" I believe any problem of mine in the future could be resolved there.

Basically I don't see the Ombudsman as one to resolve faculty and administrative problems, but primarily for students.

General analysis of student, faculty, and staff comments. A "common strand" seems to persist throughout the comments of students, faculty, and staff, as well as the twenty-one cases; that of the failure on the part of various members of the University community to communicate with one another, or to take the time and effort to allow the communication process to happen. Many who consulted the Ombudsman seemed to be looking for someone to listen and offer explanation of a particular policy or procedure. The claim that the Ombudsman is doing the jobs that others are being paid to do is an important one. I believe the question, "Why are they not doing the job," if true, is an important question that should receive attention. Perhaps the most important implication for change in policy and procedure as a result of the case analysis and presentation of
comments, is the renewed attention and importance that should be directed toward in-service training programs covering problem identification, problem-solving techniques, and the matter of human relations and communication. Those members of the University community who have the most exposure in dealing with students, faculty and staff should especially be the recipients of such in-service training.

Research Question No. 5 - What methods and procedures does the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University use in attempting to solve the problem?

Rowland (1969, p. 165) reported that the Michigan State Ombudsman uses "face-to-face contact more than any other form of communication." Although Rowland did not specifically analyze the methods or procedures used by the Michigan State Ombudsman, he did indicate that Rust (the Ombudsman at Michigan State University) "brings about changes in institutional policies and procedures as a result of his investigations and recommendations" (p. 166). Rust also may state his views to the persons involved in the case, or their superiors, and can appeal directly to the president of the institution. Rowland indicates that the ombudsman's power "rests in his personal prestige and persuasive ability" (p. 166).

Bottom (1970) also did not treat specifically the methods and procedures used by the Ombudsman of the Claremont Colleges, but does mention the possibility of "investigating " or "taking to task" those whose activities are questionable (p. 158). Bottom does not
specifically note how the Claremont College Ombudsman may conduct his activities, or what procedures he may use to achieve his goals. One of the negative comments which Bottom presents as a result of his surveying faculty and staff at the Claremont Colleges, eluded to the ombudsman not thoroughly checking out details, writing "pre-emptory letters," or neglecting to consult those persons who know the answers (p. 178).

To attempt to provide an answer as to the methods or procedures used by the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, seven methods (defined in the questionnaire item as "tools an ombudsman can use to accomplish his goals") were identified by the writer as being available for use by the Ombudsman. The seven methods or "tools" identified are as follows:

1. Inquiry or investigation
2. Negotiation
3. Persuasion
4. Criticism
5. Public exposure
6. Status within the University
7. Opportunity to appeal directly to the President of the University

In the description of the twenty-one cases, the most obvious method was that of an official inquiry by the Ombudsman or an assistant via the telephone to the appropriate office or person(s) involved with the problem, preceded by an attempt to clarify and define the actual problem with the client. For example, as a matter of routine procedure, the Ombudsman's Office at Western Michigan University requests each client to describe his problem in writing. The Ombudsman then reads and reviews with the client to ascertain the accuracy
of the written description. This seems to assist both the Ombudsman and the client in determining if the problem is, in fact, what the client claims it to be. (As a graduate assistant in the Ombudsman's Office for a semester, the writer observed the Ombudsman and his assistant spending a considerable amount of time with the client in determining what each problem actually involved.) Dr. Brawer indicates that the problem-identification process is of most importance in order to determine later, what proper contacts are to be made. Matt's case (No. 5) is a perfect example of the inappropriateness of contacting a higher authority first, before checking at the departmental level where the original involvement took place. Bill (Case No. 19) also remarked in the case interview with the writer, that he would have appreciated the Ombudsman contacting him first, instead of the department head.

With the exception of Cases 10, 12, 18, and 19, the Ombudsman or his assistants, made an inquiry or investigative effort to the appropriate office, department, or person(s) involved in the case. The most frequent vehicle of inquiry used by the Ombudsman was the telephone and the individual interview.

The use of the methods of negotiation, persuasion, and criticism are difficult to determine, since only the client was interviewed in the case studies. Judging from the Ombudsman's comments on the case sheets concerning his involvement, and the clients' reviews of the cases, it appears that some negotiation may have
existed in Cases 2, 6, 8, and 9. Persuasion, on the part of the Ombudsman, was used in Cases 6, 8, and 9. Criticism was used by the Ombudsman in Cases 6, 8, and 17, and especially Case 14 (Bob's failure to allocate student organization funds). The interplay between, and the lack of specific definition of negotiation, persuasion, and criticism in this study, prevents any concrete conclusions being drawn. A more detailed analysis needs to be provided before inferences can be made.

The method of public exposure was threatened by the Ombudsman in Case No. 14 (Bob). The possibility of the Ombudsman exposing the issue to the campus newspaper evidently spurred Bob to make his allocations of money to the student organizations.

The method of investigative efforts or inquiry on the part of the Ombudsman seemed to permeate all the cases described in this study, as does the fact that the Ombudsman has status within the University. For example, Dean and Burke, as members of the faculty, sought assistance from the Ombudsman because of their prior respect and contact with the Ombudsman as a former "status" member of the faculty (once you become an Ombudsman, it is debatable that faculty, in general, still consider you as a colleague; an observation made by Western's Ombudsman).

As with the methods of negotiation, persuasion, and criticism, the influence of status as a method in assisting the Ombudsman to pursue his work is difficult to ascertain from the case descriptions. Some additional insight into all of these as influencing factors is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
better provided in the later discussion of Table 14, the perceptions of various members of the University community and what they consider to be the most effective "tools" an ombudsman should use.

The Ombudsman referred Burke directly to a higher authority for a solution, which is the only circumstance of the twenty-one cases presented that comes close to representing the method of appealing directly to the President of the University. As with the status phenomenon, the fact that an appeal made directly to the President is always a possibility with the Ombudsman, and ever-present, may assist the Ombudsman in accomplishing his goals in all situations. The Ombudsman's opportunity to appeal to the President is seemingly different from any other member of the University community, in that the Ombudsman is officially responsible only to the President.

Other methods used by the Ombudsman, as represented by the case descriptions, included explanation and information giving, advice-giving, and direct referrals to the appropriate office or department, or person within that office or department. Glenn (Case No. 13) was asking for an explanation of a University policy regarding the use of facilities for a pop concert. Although Jeff did not obtain what he wanted, he was asking for information only. The Ombudsman gave advice to both Shirley and Sue (Cases 7 and 8), since they could not secure admission to their chosen curriculum. Brock was directly referred to various campus offices to secure a job. Hazel was directly referred to the appropriate office for assistance with her housing problem.
Analysis of the twenty-one cases for the purpose of determining the methods and procedures used by the Ombudsman provides only a small hint as to the potential the Ombudsman may have to accomplish his goals, or solve problems. Table 14 indicates the importance that the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups attach to the five methods or "tools" an ombudsman could use in order to accomplish his goals.

Each of the persons surveyed was asked the following question: "Read the following list of 'tools' an Ombudsman can use in order to accomplish his goals. Mark a '1' beside the one you consider the Ombudsman's most effective 'tool.' Mark a '2' beside the one you consider the second most effective, a '3' beside the third most effective." Table 14 presents the results of the responses regarding the importance attached by the four groups to the effectiveness of each of the five "tools," referred to as methods earlier in this discussion. The percentages which appear in Table 14 reflect the frequency with which each of the five "tools" listed was chosen as one of the top three most effective "tools."

In terms of rank order position, based on the frequency with which the four groups included the "tools" among their first three choices, "criticism" and "public exposure" occupied the first two positions for all four groups. "Persuasion" occupied the third rank order position for three groups, the exception being the FSCO group where "status within the University" occupied the third position. "Persuasion" occupied the fourth position for the FSCO group. With the exception of the FSCO group, "status within the University"
### Table 14

Frequency and Percentage of Response of the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS Groups as to What They Perceived to Be the Most Effective "Tools" an Ombudsman Could Use in Order to Accomplish His Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Tools&quot;</th>
<th>SCO Group N=488</th>
<th>FSCO Group N=64</th>
<th>SBS Group N=513</th>
<th>FSS Group N=281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry or investigation</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>68.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>93.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public exposure</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>84.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status within the</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to appeal</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly to the President of the University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Description of method or strategy to be used by Ombudsman
occupied the fourth or fifth position for the other three groups. "Negotiation" and "Inquiry or investigation" occupied the sixth and seventh positions respectively for all four groups.

Although all four groups surveyed selected "criticism" and "public exposure" most frequently and regarded these "tools" as being the most effective the Ombudsman can use, nothing can be said as to whether or not these four groups would consider these two methods as being appropriate, just effective. Although these results may seem to indicate that the Ombudsman may want to consider using these "tools" more often, caution would have to be taken in their use to allow for individual differences. None of the members of the four groups may have regarded them as effective, should they have been on the receiving end.

It should be noted that "negotiation" and "inquiry or investigation" do not speak to action-oriented kinds of methods, which could account for their lower ranks by the four groups. Appearing alone without definition, each of the two represents a nebulous phenomenon.

Research Question No. 6 - Are the solutions satisfactory to all those involved with a problem?

In an attempt to determine the degree of effectiveness of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, students, faculty, and staff who consulted the Ombudsman (the SCO and FSCO groups) were asked to indicate the extent to which their problem was solved and their degree of satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled their
problem. The following two questions were asked of the members of the SCO and FSCO groups:

(1) To what extent is the problem you took to the Ombudsman now solved? (Item No. 15 on the SCO questionnaire and item No. 10 on the FSCO questionnaire - See Appendix I)

(2) How would you describe your degree of satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled your problem? (Item No. 16 on the SCO questionnaire and item No. 11 on the FSCO questionnaire - See Appendix I)

"All those involved with a problem" refers only to those students, faculty, and staff who actually sought assistance from the Ombudsman, the members of the SCO and FSCO groups. Each person was asked to (1) indicate on a scale from one (completely solved) to six (problem is worse than it was before), the extent he considered his problem solved; and (2) indicate on a scale from one (totally satisfied) to seven (totally dissatisfied), his degree of satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled his problem. Tables 15 and 16 provide the analysis of the responses to the two "Ombudsman effectiveness variables" (1] extent solved and [2] degree of satisfaction).

Approximately 79 percent of the students who consulted the Ombudsman indicated to some degree that their problem was solved by the Ombudsman. Of the 79 percent who considered their problem solved, 56 percent indicated their problem "completely solved," 9 percent indicated "solved to a high degree," 8 percent "solved to an average degree," and 6 percent "solved to a low degree." Bottom
TABLE 15  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SCO AND FSCO GROUPS REGARDING THE EXTENT THEY CONSIDERED THEIR PROBLEM SOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Consulting the Ombudsman</th>
<th>Completely Solved</th>
<th>Solved High Degree</th>
<th>Solved Average Degree</th>
<th>Solved Low Degree</th>
<th>Not Solved</th>
<th>Problem Worse Than Before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO Students (N=484)a</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>56.198</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.884</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO Faculty &amp; Staff (N=63)b</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.032</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.635</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Four students failed to indicate the extent to which their problem was solved by the Ombudsman.

b One faculty or staff member failed to indicate the extent to which his problem was solved by the Ombudsman.
(1970, p. 157, Table 12) also reported that approximately 79 percent (students and staff) considered their problem solved to some degree by the Claremont Colleges' Ombudsman. Approximately 44 percent considered their problem "completely solved," 19 percent "more than half," 13 percent "half solved," and 3 percent "less than half."

Rowland (1969, p. 146, Table 9) reported that approximately 65 percent of the students at Michigan State University indicated their problems solved to some degree. Of the 65 percent, approximately 48 percent considered their problem "completely solved," and 17 percent "partially solved."

Approximately 19 percent of the students at Western indicated their problem "not solved," and 1 percent indicated their problem was worse than before. Twenty-one percent (Bottom 1970, p. 157, Table 12) of the students and staff at the Claremont Colleges indicated their problem "not solved at all," and none indicated their "problem had worsened" (p. 153). Rowland (1969, p. 146, Table 9) reported that approximately 33 percent of the students at Michigan State considered their problem "not solved at all," and 9 percent considered their "problem is worse."

Comparisons to the effectiveness of the three Ombudsmen at Western, Michigan State, and the Claremont Colleges are difficult to make due to the fact that Bottom's percentages are based on an extremely small sample (fifty-six students, seven faculty and staff, and one "other"), and Bottom includes faculty and staff percentages within the total percentages reported. (For example, deleting the
six staff and faculty from the totals of those indicating their problem "completely solved" at the Claremont Colleges, results in approximately 36 percent of the students indicating their problem "completely solved" instead of the 44 percent indicated earlier in this section.

Rowland (1969) does not allow for the extent of individual differences in the scaled responses for "degree of problem solved" as the six-point scale allows for in this and Bottom's (1970) study. However, more meaningful comparisons can be made to Rowland's study. Both the Ombudsman at Michigan State and Western's Ombudsman deal with academic problems such as "grade grievances." It would appear that Western's Ombudsman is somewhat more "effective" than Michigan State's Ombudsman in terms of how students perceive the extent to which their problem was solved (Approximately 19 percent at Western considered their problem not solved or worse than before [1 percent] as compared to 33 percent not solved at Michigan State and 9 percent worse than before). Based on reasons mentioned earlier, this writer hesitates to make similar comparisons to Bottom's study.

Approximately 81 percent of the faculty and staff who consulted Western's Ombudsman considered their problem solved to some degree, and approximately 16 percent considered their problem "not solved," with 3 percent indicating the problem was worse than before. The Western faculty and staff percentages correspond closely with the Western student percentages of 79 percent solved to some degree, 19 percent "not solved," and 1 percent "worse than before." No comparisons
can be made to Rowland's study, since the Michigan State Ombudsman handles student problems only. The fact that Bottom reported only seven faculty and staff in his sample prevents any meaningful comparisons. The students, faculty, and staff who consulted the Ombudsman, and who made up the total sample of 548, agreed to the extent their problems were solved or not solved by Western's Ombudsman. The Ombudsman seemed to be just as "effective" with faculty and staff as he was with students.

Table 16 provides data concerning the degree of "satisfaction" that students, faculty and staff had with the "way the Ombudsman handled their problem." Each member of the SCO and FSCO groups was asked to indicate his "degree of satisfaction" on a one (totally satisfied) to seven (totally dissatisfied) point scale.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SCO AND FSCO GROUPS REGARDING THEIR DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH THE WAY THE OMBUDSMAN HANDLED THEIR PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Consulting the Ombudsman</th>
<th>Totally Satisfied</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO Students (N=484)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>49.380</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21.074</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 16—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Consulting the Ombudsman</th>
<th>Totally Satisfied</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO Faculty &amp; Staff (N=63)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.079</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages for students reported in Table 16 regarding some degree of "satisfaction," approximately 75 percent, compared to the 79 percent from the data in Table 15 regarding the
"extent problems solved," were very similar, such was not the case for faculty and staff. A greater percentage of faculty and staff (approximately 92 percent) were satisfied to some degree with the "way the Ombudsman handled their problem," than considered the "extent to which their problem was solved" (Table 15, approximately 81 percent). Evidently, some faculty and staff were "satisfied to some degree," with the manner the Ombudsman handled their problem, even though their problem was "not solved." Neither Rowland (1969) nor Bottom (1970) asked for "degrees of satisfaction" in their surveys of persons consulting the Ombudsman at Michigan State and the Claremont Colleges. This study considered the "satisfaction" factor important for two reasons:

(1) The additional item regarding "satisfaction" was considered important to check the validity of persons regarding the extent they considered their problem solved or unsolved. A problem solved assumes some degree of satisfaction on the part of the client, provided the Ombudsman and the client agree as to how the problem was solved.

(2) "Satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled the problem" speaks to the relationship that existed between the client and the Ombudsman during the problem-solving process. For example, it appears that even though the Ombudsman was not able to solve some problems for faculty and staff, they were nonetheless "satisfied" with the way he conducted his efforts.

A comparison of the arithmetic means was made to determine if there were any significant differences between the students (SCO group) and the faculty and staff (FSCO group) regarding the "extent
they considered their problems solved" and their "degree of satisfaction." A mean score was obtained for each member of the SCO and PSCO groups, and a t test was utilized to determine any significant difference between the mean scores. A mean score of 1.00 for a member of either group indicated his problem being "completely solved" and "totally satisfied" with the way the Ombudsman handled his problem. A mean score of 6.00 indicated for a member of each group that his problem was "worse than before," and a mean score of 7.00 would indicate he was "totally dissatisfied" with the way the Ombudsman handled his problem. Table 17 presents the data for the comparisons, students versus faculty and staff.

Regarding the "extent to which they considered their problem solved," no significant differences between students and faculty and staff were found to exist. However, a significant t ratio of 2.998 (significant at the .01 level) was found to exist between the students and the faculty and staff in terms of their "degree of satisfaction" with the way the Ombudsman handled their problem. Noticing the direction of the mean scores in Table 17, 2.382 for students and 1.651 for faculty and staff, it can be seen that the faculty and staff indicated a "greater degree of satisfaction" than did the students. No attempt was made in this study to account for the difference in satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled the problems. It could mean that students have more difficult problems to solve, or that faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman were personal friends of the Ombudsman prior to his assuming the position of Ombudsman.
TABLE 17

A COMPARISON OF ARITHMETIC MEANS OF SCALED SCORES OF THE SCO AND FSCO GROUPS REGARDING (1) THE EXTENT THEIR PROBLEM WAS SOLVED, AND (2) THEIR DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH THE WAY THE OMBUDSMAN HANDLED THEIR PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Variable and Group</th>
<th>Consulting Ombudsman</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>t Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO (students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>2.766</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.344(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO (faculty and staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO (students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>1.873</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2.998(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO (faculty and staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) t ratio indicates no significant differences between the means.

\(^b\) t ratio indicates a significant difference between the means at the .01 level.
Too many variables are unaccounted for, leaving one only to speculate as to the reasons for the difference. However, it is interesting to note the difference. Both groups lean heavily toward the positive side of "1" on the scale, that of having their problems "solved completely" or "to a high degree," and "totally satisfied" or "mostly satisfied" with the way the Ombudsman handled their problems. On the basis of these two variables then, students and faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University appear to be very satisfied with the solutions obtained to their problems.

Research Question No. 7 - What is the attitude of the University community at Western Michigan University toward the Office of the Ombudsman?

To attempt to provide an answer to Research Question No. 7, a comparison of attitude-score means of the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups was made. Members of each of the four survey groups were asked to respond to a group of items (items 24 to 47 on the SCO and SBS questionnaires and items 19 to 42 on the FSCO and FSS questionnaires) on a 1 (agree very strongly) to 6 (disagree very strongly) scale. Certain items were reversed where a "disagree very strongly" reflected a scale score of 6 and "agree very strongly" reflected a scale score of 1. For purposes of analysis, using a One Way Analysis of Variance and an F test, a scale score of 6 was interpreted as a very positive attitude toward the Ombudsman, and a scale score of 1 was interpreted as a very negative attitude toward the Ombudsman.
Table 18 presents the data for the comparison of the attitude-score means among the SCO, FSCO, SBS, and FSS survey groups.

To provide further comparisons, a t test was utilized to determine if any significant differences existed for all possible comparisons between the attitude-score means of the four groups. Presented in Table 19 is the data for all possible comparisons (six comparisons - SCO vs. SBS, SCO vs. FSCO, SCO vs. FSS, SBS vs. FSCO, SBS vs. FSS, and FSCO vs. FSS).

The data for selected characteristics of students and faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University (SBS and FSS survey groups) is provided in Tables 20 and 21. Selected characteristics of students, faculty and staff who had consulted the Ombudsman (the SCO and FSCO survey groups) were presented in Table 12 (p. 115) and Table 13 (p. 119) earlier in this chapter. The selected characteristics data for the SBS and FSS groups are presented at this point in the chapter for comparison purposes with the SCO and FSCO groups. Selected attitudes of all four groups are then presented in Table 22. Comparisons of the responses to the following selected attitudes are made among the four survey groups:

1. Who should the Ombudsman be?
2. Who should select the Ombudsman?
3. Where should the Ombudsman's Office be located?
4. The Ombudsman is whose "man"?
5. What are the most important traits an Ombudsman should possess?
6. What is the most important role and function the Western Michigan University Ombudsman should assume?

Analysis of the attitude-score means. The F analysis shown in
Table 18 indicated significant statistical differences among the four survey groups at the .01 level. Although all four groups recorded a mean attitude-score in the "4" scale range, which indicated a positive attitude toward the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, significant differences were found to exist between certain paired groups. As the *t* test analysis in Table 19 shows, when students, faculty and staff who actually consulted the Ombudsman were compared with students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman, significant differences (beyond the .01 level) occurred. The SCO and FSCO groups (those who consulted) reflected a more positive attitude toward the Ombudsman than did the SBS and FSS groups (those who had not consulted the Ombudsman). The SCO and FSCO groups did not differ significantly from each other in their attitude toward the Ombudsman. Likewise, the SBS and FSS groups did not differ significantly from each other in their attitude toward the Ombudsman.

The reasons for the difference in attitude-score means for those who consulted the Ombudsman and those who did not consult the Ombudsman could be many. A great percentage of those who consulted the Ombudsman expressed satisfaction as to the "extent their problems were solved" and "the way in which their problems were solved" (See the discussion between pages 158 and 164 and Tables 15 and 16). This reason alone could account for the SCO's and FSCO's more favorable attitude toward the Ombudsman. Another factor contributing to the difference may include the possibility of the SBS and FSS group not being as "familiar" with the Ombudsman; since, at the time of the
Survey, they had not found cause to seek assistance from the Ombudsman. The SBS and FSS groups might be considered more neutral in their attitude toward the Ombudsman, since they possibly had not encountered problems that were seemingly unable to be solved.

Regardless of the significant differences found by comparing mean attitude scores of the SCO group (4.427) and FSCO group (4.478) with the mean attitude scores of the SBS group (4.115) and FSS group (4.094), all four groups indicated a positive attitude toward the Western Michigan University Ombudsman.

**TABLE 18**

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTITUDE SCORE MEANS AMONG THE SCO, FSCO, SBS, AND FSS SURVEY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Attitude Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>4.427</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCO</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.478</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.094</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>34.572</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.524</td>
<td>48.102</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>320.549</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19

Six t Test Comparisons of Attitude Score Means Between the Survey Groups—
(1) SCO vs. SBS, (2) SCO vs. FSCO, (3) SCO vs. FSS, (4) SBS vs. FSCO, (5) SBS vs. FSS, and (6) FSCO vs. FSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group Comparison</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean Score Comparison</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>t Score</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) SCO vs. SBS</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>4.427 vs. 4.115</td>
<td>.521 vs. .400</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>10.643</td>
<td>Beyond .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) SCO vs. FSCO</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>4.427 vs. 4.478</td>
<td>.521 vs. .608</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) SCO vs. FSS</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4.427 vs. 4.094</td>
<td>.521 vs. .545</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>6.358</td>
<td>Beyond .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) SBS vs. FSCO</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>4.115 vs. 4.478</td>
<td>.400 vs. .608</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>6.396</td>
<td>Beyond .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) SBS vs. FSS</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>4.115 vs. 4.094</td>
<td>.400 vs. .545</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) FSCO vs. FSS</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4.478 vs. 4.094</td>
<td>.608 vs. .545</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>Beyond .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of selected attitudes. Selected characteristics for the SBS and FSS survey groups are presented in Tables 20 and 21. Data for these selected characteristics were found to occur in the SBS and FSS groups with the approximate same frequency and percentages as were found for the SCO and FSCO groups. Presentation of characteristic data for the SBS and FSS groups is considered appropriate at this point in the discussion for the purpose of comparing the responses of all four groups regarding selected attitudes.

TABLE 20
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS WHO HAD NOT CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (THE SBS GROUP)

(A) Student Classification (N=513)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Legal Residence (N=512)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>93.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another state</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another country</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One student failed to indicate his legal residence*
### TABLE 20—Continued

#### (C) Sex (N=512)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>51.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>48.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOne student failed to indicate his (her) sex*

#### (D) Age (N=512)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>50.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOne student failed to indicate his age*

#### (E) Marital Status (N=510)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>71.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>26.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThree students failed to indicate their marital status*
TABLE 20—Continued

(F) College Enrolled (N=497)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>41.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Sixteen students failed to indicate their major field of study.

\(^b\)Students were asked to indicate their "major field of study." The frequency and percentages of their responses were then placed within the appropriate Colleges at Western Michigan University to determine the totals indicated in the above table.

(G) Accumulated Grade Point Average (N=513)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accumulated G.P.A.(^a)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 4.00</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 to 3.49</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>30.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 to 2.99</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>29.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 2.49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.00</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (1st term student)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The WMU grade scale: A = 4.00, B = 3.00 to 3.99, C = 2.00 to 2.99, D = 1.00 to 1.99, and E = Below 1.00.
### TABLE 20—Continued

#### (H) Student Residence (N=505)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married student housing (On campus)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus housing</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>50.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents or relatives</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Eight students failed to indicate their student residence

#### (I) Transfer or Native (N=513)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer or Native(^a)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total native (attended WMU only)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>52.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transfer</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>47.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Under 500 enrollment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*500-3,500 enrollment</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3,500-5,000 enrollment</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5,000-10,000 enrollment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10,000-20,000 enrollment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Over 20,000 enrollment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Transfer referred to in the study included any student that attended another college, university, or vocational school other than WMU. A native student is one that has attended WMU only.

\*NOTE: Number and percentage of enrollment breakdown of college, university, or vocational school constitutes total transfer student data of 244 and 47.563.
### TABLE 21

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY AND STAFF WHO HAD NOT CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN (THE FSS GROUP)

#### (A) University Position (N=279)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>41.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty with administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or technical staff of an academic department</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical or technical staff of the administration or other non-academic or service areas</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two faculty and staff members failed to indicate their position with the University.

#### (B) Years Employed by University (N=281)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Employed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)All 281 faculty and staff indicated their number of years employed by the University.
### (C) Sex (N=281)<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>60.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All 281 faculty and staff indicated their sex.

---

### (D) Age (N=276)<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Five faculty and staff failed to indicate their age.

---

### (E) Marital Status (N=278)<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>78.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Three members of the faculty and staff failed to indicate their marital status.
Table 22A shows comparative data of the four groups regarding who the Ombudsman should be. Except for the SBS group, a "faculty member without teaching responsibilities" was the most frequent selection of the SCO (27.88% percent), FSCO (36.50% percent), and FSS (28.88% percent) groups. A "counselor" was the most frequent selection of the SBS group (32.40% percent), followed then by a "faculty member without teaching responsibilities" as the second choice (21.86% percent). The SCO group indicated "lawyer" as their second choice (18.44% percent), while the FSCO group and FSS group indicated a "faculty member with teaching responsibilities" as their second choice. As might be expected, the faculty and staff overwhelmingly chose a faculty member as the person who should be the Ombudsman, regardless whether he does or does not have teaching responsibilities. Examples of the "other" category as to who the Ombudsman should be.
included "student personnel worker," "department head," "legislator," "social worker," "professional union negotiator," "psychiatrist," and specific reference to names of people currently employed by the University.

Table 22B presents the data as to who should select the Ombudsman. All four groups indicated "administration, faculty, and students" as their first choice, with "students and faculty only" appearing as a more infrequent second choice.

Concerning the Ombudsman's Office location at Western Michigan University (Table 22C), those who had consulted the Ombudsman indicated the "student center building," the present location of the Ombudsman's Office, as their first choice, with the "student services building" and "anywhere, it doesn't matter" accounting for the second or third greatest percentages as to choice of location. It is interesting to note that the first choice of students who had not consulted the Ombudsman (SCO group) was the "student services building" (42.157 percent). This observation, together with the SCO's first choice of a "counselor" as to "who the Ombudsman should be," may imply a relationship. Although interesting to note because Western's Counseling Center is currently located in the Student Services Building, this writer hesitates to make any inferences based on this type of data.

The FSS group appeared to be indifferent concerning the location of the Ombudsman's Office. Their first choice of "anywhere, it doesn't
TABLE 22
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF SELECTED ATTITUDES OF THE SCO, FSCO, SBS, AND FSS GROUPS

(A) Who should the Ombudsman be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Responses</th>
<th>SCO Group(^a)</th>
<th>FSCO Group(^b)</th>
<th>SBS Group(^c)</th>
<th>FSS Group(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member with teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.966</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member without teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.883</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.627</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18.449</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus minister</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.417</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}N = 477\) \(^{b}N = 63\) \(^{c}N = 503\) \(^{d}N = 277\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Responses</th>
<th>SGO Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>O.S. Group&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FSG Group&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,659</td>
<td>24,118</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,747</td>
<td>24,118</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and faculty only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,747</td>
<td>24,118</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and administration only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, faculty, and</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 22—Continued

(C) Where should the Ombudsman's Office be located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Response</th>
<th>SCO Group(^a)</th>
<th>FSCO Group(^b)</th>
<th>SBS Group(^c)</th>
<th>FSS Group(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Center Building</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>40.329</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Building</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26.337</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a_N = 486\) \(b_N = 63\) \(c_N = 510\) \(d_N = 279\)

(D) The Ombudsman is whose "man"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCO Group(^a)</th>
<th>FSCO Group(^b)</th>
<th>SBS Group(^c)</th>
<th>FSS Group(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everybody's man</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>67.789</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty's man</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators' man</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.579</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' man</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>27.158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a_N = 475\) \(b_N = 64\) \(c_N = 504\) \(d_N = 271\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Response</th>
<th>SCO Group</th>
<th>FSCO Group</th>
<th>SBS Group</th>
<th>FSS Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>patience</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empathy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessibility</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impartiality</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of campus regulations and operations</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasiveness</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honesty</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well known on campus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to criticize</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willingness to listen</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^aN = 488 \quad ^bN = 64 \quad ^cN = 513 \quad ^dN = 281 \)
(F) What is the most important role and function the Western Michigan University Ombudsman should assume?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Response</th>
<th>SCO Group(^a)</th>
<th>FSCO Group(^b)</th>
<th>SBS Group(^c)</th>
<th>FSS Group(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solve off-campus problems of students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>65 13.32 6</td>
<td>3 4.69 7</td>
<td>52 10.34 7</td>
<td>6 2.14 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify patterns of grievances and act as a catalyst for reform</td>
<td>283 57.99 2</td>
<td>39 60.94 3</td>
<td>286 55.75 3</td>
<td>130 46.26 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve individual problems of students, faculty and staff</td>
<td>279 57.17 3</td>
<td>46 71.87 2</td>
<td>290 56.53 2</td>
<td>163 58.01 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be primarily an information and referral center</td>
<td>51 10.45 7</td>
<td>7 10.84 6</td>
<td>61 11.89 6</td>
<td>48 17.08 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve potentially disruptive crises</td>
<td>103 21.11 5</td>
<td>14 21.87 5</td>
<td>111 21.64 5</td>
<td>82 29.18 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22 (F)—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Response</th>
<th>SCO Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FSCO Group&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SBS Group&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FSS Group&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per-</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centage</td>
<td></td>
<td>centage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as an impartial investigator for the purpose of determining if a student, faculty or staff member has been treated fairly and justly</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>83.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist student government</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a diligent &quot;watchdog&quot; of University policies and procedures, recommending reform where needed</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub>N = 488</sub>  
<sup>b</sup><sub>N = 64</sub>  
<sup>c</sup><sub>N = 513</sub>  
<sup>d</sup><sub>N = 281</sub>
matter," in combination with the fact that "anywhere, it doesn't mat-
ter" was also the second choice of the other three survey groups may
indicate that the location of the Ombudsman's Office was really not
an important consideration as perceived by the various members of the
University community.

Table 22D shows the responses as to whose "man" the Ombudsman
should be. Care should be taken in interpreting this particular
attitude, since the responses may represent "what should be," or "how
the present Ombudsman is perceived." Nevertheless, in either case,
the overwhelming choice was that the Ombudsman is "everybody's man."
This response is considered important as an indication of the Ombuds-
man's impartiality in dealing with the various students, faculty, and
staff. Either the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University is not
considered an advocate of any special group, or the various members
of the University community consider it important for him not to be
an advocate of any special group. Both student survey groups (SCO
and SBS) attached more importance to an advocate role of the Ombuds-
man. "Students' man" appeared as the second most frequent choice for
the two student groups.

All four survey groups were asked to indicate their choice of
three "traits" they considered the most important for an Ombudsman to
possess (See Table 22E). "Knowledge of campus regulations and opera-
tions" and "accessibility" occupied the number one and two positions
for both the SCO and SBS groups. The third most frequent trait selec-
ted by these two student groups was "authority" for the SCO group,
and "impartiality" for the SBS group. "Impartiality," "honesty," and
"willingness to listen" also appeared frequently among the top three choices for the SCO group, as did "authority," "honesty," "experience," and "willingness to listen" for the SBS group.

"Impartiality" appeared as the most frequent first choice of the two faculty and staff survey groups. "Honesty" occupied the second position for the FSCO group. "Knowledge of campus regulations and operations," occupied the second position for the FSS group, and a close third for the FSCO group. "Accessibility," which was also considered important by both faculty and staff groups, occupied the third rank order position for the FSS group, and the fourth position for the FSCO group.

Table 22F presents the data regarding what role and function the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University should assume. All four survey groups indicated most frequently that the Ombudsman should "serve as an impartial investigator for the purpose of determining if a student, faculty or staff member has been treated fairly and justly." This choice was in agreement with the original charge given to the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University (See Appendix H). "Solving individual problems of students, faculty and staff" appeared as the second most frequent selection by the FSCO, SBS, and FSS groups, and as an extremely close third choice of the SCO group. This selection, too, followed the original purpose of establishing the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan. To "identify patterns of grievances and act as a catalyst for reform" occupied the second most frequent choice of the SCO group, and a
very close third choice for the other three groups. This reform role and function, together with the fourth most frequent choice of all four groups, that of "serving as a diligent watchdog of University policies and procedures, recommending reform where needed," may indicate that members of the University community may want the Ombudsman at Western to act more as a "change agent," or assert himself to a greater extent than what his original charge indicates. All four groups indicated as their fifth most frequent selection, for the Ombudsman to attempt to "resolve potentially disruptive crises."
CHAPTER IV

OBSERVATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTED MODEL

Observations

As a result of surveying by means of twenty-one case interviews and a questionnaire sent to students, faculty and staff who had consulted the Western Michigan University Ombudsman, and students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman, the following observations are considered appropriate.

Observations - Research Question No. 1

(1) Students, faculty, and staff consulting the Ombudsman indicated a wide variety of "types of problems." Students indicated most frequently "grade grievance" problems, problems of "admission and registration," problems of "academic requirements," problems concerning the "quality of instruction," and non-academic problems of "housing" and "financial problems." Faculty and staff indicated most frequently problems concerning "University policy and procedure" and "academic problems concerning a student."

(2) Students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman indicated a wide variety of "types of problems." "Grade grievance" problems received the most attention by students and "questions or complaints about University policy and procedure" received the most attention by faculty and staff.

(3) For all students surveyed, those who consulted the Ombudsman and those who did not, academic types of problems were more frequently selected than were non-academic types of problems.

(4) For all faculty and staff surveyed, those who consulted the Ombudsman and those who did not, "questions or complaints about University policy and procedure" were indicated the most frequently.
The majority of students (68 percent), faculty and staff (62 percent) who had not consulted the Ombudsman indicated they would consult the Ombudsman, should they need his assistance.

Observations - Research Question No. 2

(1) Of all possible student classifications at Western Michigan University, juniors and seniors were the largest group of students consulting the Ombudsman.

(2) In terms of age, the largest percentage (54 percent) of students consulting the Ombudsman was found to be between the ages of 19 and 21. The largest percentage (39 percent) of faculty and staff was found to be between the ages of 36 and 45.

(3) The majority of students (89 percent) who consulted the Ombudsman indicated the State of Michigan as their legal residence.

(4) More males (56 percent) and faculty and staff (79 percent) consulted the Ombudsman than did female students, faculty and staff.

(5) Fifty-six percent of the students consulting the Ombudsman had attended another college, university, or vocational school in addition to Western Michigan University.

(6) Seventy-four percent of the students consulting the Ombudsman were single and twenty-two percent were married. Twelve percent of the faculty and staff were single and eighty-two percent were married.

(7) Of students who consulted the Ombudsman, approximately 37 percent had earned an accumulated grade point average between a 3.00 and a 4.00, and 54 percent had earned between a 2.00 and a 3.00 grade point average.

(8) Sixty-seven percent of the students who consulted the Ombudsman made their residence off campus as opposed to twenty-nine percent living in on-campus housing.

(9) Forty-eight percent of the students who consulted the Ombudsman indicated a major field of study within the College of Arts and Sciences.

(10) Sixty percent of the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman were members of the teaching faculty, twenty-five percent were members of the administrative staff, and fifteen percent were clerical or technical staff.
(11) Forty-four percent of the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman had been employed by the University between one and six years; thirty-six percent between seven and fifteen years; eleven percent more than fifteen years; and nine percent less than one year.

(12) Eighty-three percent of the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman had attained at least a masters degree; ten percent had attended a college or university but had no degree; five percent had attained a high school diploma only; one percent a bachelors degree only; and one percent a certificated, licensed, or apprenticeship program beyond high school.

Observations - Research Questions
No. 3 and No. 4

As a result of interviewing twenty-one students, faculty, and staff who had consulted the Ombudsman, the following observations are considered appropriate.

(1) Students, faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman did so because one of the following circumstances was present:

a) They felt they had been a victim of unfair evaluation by a faculty member or administrator.

b) They felt that present policy or procedures were inadequately defined, devised, or explained, or that an exception should be granted due to special, individual circumstances.

c) They had experienced a traumatic situation, and sought advice to assist in their understanding of the experience.

d) Maladministration resulted in the Ombudsman consulting the person(s) responsible.

e) They and the person(s) originally contacted concerning the problem had failed to take the time or effort to communicate, properly define the problem, or attempt a follow-up on their own initiative.
f) Adequate documentation of what originally transpired between the grievant and the person(s) or office originally contacted was not present.

Observations - Research Question No. 5

(1) As a result of the case interviews and close examination of the case sheet documentation by the Office of the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman appeared to spend considerable time in attempting to first define the problem of the grievant adequately in a cooperative effort on the part of both the grievant and the Ombudsman; then proceed to contact the office or person(s) originally contacted by the grievant.

(2) The Ombudsman attempted to mediate or negotiate a settlement, agreeable to both parties, through an adequate explanation of the problem or policy and procedure involved. The Ombudsman did this by suggesting alternatives to the grievant or person(s) or office involved.

(3) The threat of public exposure and criticism by the Ombudsman caused immediate action on the part of the person receiving such criticism and threatened with such exposure.

(4) The extent of the influence that "status within the University" and "opportunity to appeal directly to the President of the University" had in assisting the Ombudsman to do his work was not determined as a result of this study.

(5) Both students, faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman and those who did not, regarded "criticism" and "public exposure" as the most effective "tools" an Ombudsman could use in achieving his goals.

Observations - Research Question No. 6

(1) Seventy-nine percent of the students and eighty-one percent of the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman considered their problems solved to some degree, ranging from completely solved to solved to a low degree.

(2) Seventy-five percent of the students and ninety-two percent of the faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman indicated a degree of satisfaction with the way the Ombudsman handled their problems.
(3) Faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman were "significantly" (.01 level) more satisfied with the way the Ombudsman handled their problems than were the students who consulted the Ombudsman.

Observations - Research Question No. 7

(1) Both students, faculty, and staff who consulted the Ombudsman and those who did not indicated a positive attitude toward the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University, as measured by a group of items soliciting a response on a scale from 1 (negative attitude) to 6 (positive attitude). All four survey groups achieved a mean attitude-score of 4.00.

(2) No significant differences were found between the mean attitude-scores of students who consulted the Ombudsman and faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman.

(3) Significant differences beyond the .01 level of significance were found to exist between the mean attitude-scores of students, faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman and students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman. The direction of the mean attitude-score indicated a more positive attitude on the part of those who consulted the Ombudsman than those who had not consulted the Ombudsman.

(4) The majority of faculty and staff who consulted the Ombudsman, and students, faculty and staff who had not consulted the Ombudsman indicated that the Ombudsman should be a faculty member. Students who had not consulted the Ombudsman most frequently indicated that the Ombudsman should be a counselor.

(5) The majority of students, faculty and staff members of all four groups surveyed overwhelmingly indicated that the Ombudsman should be selected in a joint effort by administration, faculty, and students.

(6) All four groups surveyed indicated a choice of the student center building, the student services building, or no preference as to the location of the Ombudsman's office.

(7) The majority of the members of all four groups surveyed indicated that the Ombudsman was "everybody's man," inferring that the Ombudsman was not the special advocate of any one group on campus.
(6) Knowledge of campus regulations and operations, impartiality, accessibility, honesty, authority, and willingness to listen appeared most frequently as the selection of "traits" considered most important by all four groups surveyed.

(9) To serve as an impartial investigator, solving individual student, faculty, and staff problems, and to serve as a diligent "watchdog" of University policies and procedures, identifying patterns of grievances, and recommending reform where needed was indicated by all four groups most frequently as the most important role and function of the Western Michigan University Ombudsman.

Limitations

The following limitations are considered appropriate as a result of this study.

(1) This study was limited to the Western Michigan University Ombudsman only, which hindered any inferences being made to other institutions and their ombudsmen. The fact that Western's Ombudsman serves the entire University community as opposed to serving only students or other campus groups hindered the opportunity for meaningful comparisons to be drawn. The fact that ombudsmen on college and university campuses are unique in their function and role to their individual campuses further hinders meaningful comparisons. Further studies need to be made comparing ombudsmen from various campuses.

(2) Inferences drawn from the twenty-one case studies must be interpreted with extreme care, since the student, faculty, or staff member consulting the Ombudsman was the only person interviewed as opposed to all persons involved with a particular case. A more detailed case study analysis must take place before definite conclusions can be drawn from this type of analysis.

(3) Although the majority of persons surveyed returned the questionnaire completed for analysis, those persons who did not respond to the survey may have caused different observations to be made.

(4) The attitude-scale items of the questionnaire may be a limiting factor, even though the reliability measures proved to be substantially high. The fact that the attitude portion of the questionnaire was used for the first known time, and was exploratory in nature, indicates that this attitude-scale portion may need to be continually revised. Further checks on the reliability of the questionnaire need to be made in future studies.
Suggested Model

Other researchers on the campus ombudsman, such as Rowland (1969) and Bottom (1970) have proposed models for campus ombudsmen. Since this study supports the fact that the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University is effective and successful in solving individual problems of student, faculty, and staff members, the following model of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University is suggested for use by all members of the university community rather than ombudsmen. The model suggested, has as its primary objective, the elimination of the need for campus ombudsmen in higher education. Following are the ingredients, perhaps goals, of the proposed model:

(1) All employees of a college or university need to accept, and embrace the concept that the institution exists for the students and their education, and not necessarily for the employees.

(2) Students need to realize that policies and procedures are necessary within a college or university. All members of the university community need to realize that from time to time various policies and procedures may need alteration, revision, and even elimination; or that special circumstances may warrant an exception to a policy or procedure. These special circumstances need to be defined by the appropriate offices and departments and publicised so that all may have the opportunity to become knowledgeable and achieve understanding. Special circumstances do not constitute a never-ending list, nor are they undefinable.

(3) Efforts in terms of time and interest on the part of all employees of the various offices and departments need to be taken to explain adequately, and perhaps even justify, existing University policy and procedures.

(4) All employees, but especially those who have the most exposure to students, faculty and staff on a day-to-day basis, need to conduct their business in a friendly, cooperative manner, accompanied with adequate and correct explanations.

(5) Proper and adequate documentation of interactions which occur on a day-to-day basis between a member of the university
community that has a problem, and the appropriate office or department attempting to deal with the problem, must take place to enhance and support the communication process. This, the Ombudsman appeared to be doing extremely well, and should serve as a model for other offices and departments.

(6) In-service training programs should be a continuous process to assure to a greater extent that all employees are knowledgeable about university policy and procedure. The ombudsman, be he as successful as Western's Ombudsman, could very well serve as coordinator of these in-service programs, or actually administer the programs. Upon identifying problem areas after a one or two-year period of his appointment, the ombudsman's time could be spent conducting in-service programs with the various offices and departments concerning problem-solving techniques, conflict resolution, and giving feedback as to the perceptions members of the university community hold of the various offices and departments.

In summary, the model suggested above does not treat the Ombudsman in terms of how he can be effective. Rather, as this study tends to support, it offers suggestions for all as to how and why the ombudsman is effective in solving problems. The fact that the ombudsman conducts his business in a friendly atmosphere, paying attention to detail and documentation, and giving status to interest and time in solving individual problems, is a model that all members of the university community can and should attempt to follow. The campus ombudsman may very well be an important, interim step in humanizing an institution such as a college or university. Perhaps it can be stated that the ombudsman does the work that others on campus should and could perform, provided renewed attention is given to the problems of the individual by all members of the university community.
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COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITH CAMPUS OMBUDSMEN
OR OMBUDSMAN-LIKE OPERATIONS

A Partial Alphabetical Listing

Compiled by Howard Ray Rowland, Director of Information Services,
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn.

Amherst College
Aquinas College (Michigan)
Arizona State University
Auburn University

Bradley University
Bronx Community College (New York City)
University of Buffalo

California State College, Dominguez Hills
California State College, Los Angeles
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of Chicago
City College of New York
Claremont Graduate School and University Center
Claremont Men's College
Cleveland State University
University of Connecticut
Contra Costa Junior College (California)
Cornell University
University of Cincinnati

Eastern Montana College

University of Florida
Fresno State College

Harvey Mudd College
Humboldt State College

University of Illinois
Kent State University

Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
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Macomb County Community College (Michigan)
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota

University of Nevada
New York University (College of Education)
Northern Illinois University

Pitzer College
Pomona College

University of Rhode Island
Roger Williams College (R.I.)

San Diego State College
San Fernando Valley State College
San Jose State College
Scripps College
University of South Carolina
Stout State University
Sullivan County Community College (New York)
Southern Illinois University

University of Texas

University of Washington
Wayne State University
West Valley College (California)
University of West Virginia
PARTIAL ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF OTHER KNOWN OMBUDSMEN

University of Alabama
Arizona Northern University
University of Arizona

Boston University
Brigham Young University

California State College, Fullerton
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of California, Santa Cruz
City University of New York
Costa College
Cuyahoga Community College

University of Denver

Florida Atlantic University

University of Hawaii

Long Island University

MacMurray College
University of Massachusetts
University of Miami
University of Michigan
Murray State University

University of North Colorado
University of North Iowa

Ohio State University
Ohio University

Sacramento State College
San Francisco State College
University of San Francisco
San Jose City College
State University of New York, Albany
State University of New York, Buffalo

Texas Tech University

Union College

Weaver State College
Western Illinois University
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF WMU OMBUDSMAN
THE UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN

The primary contribution the University Ombudsman makes to Western Michigan University is the confirmation that the University seeks to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. To achieve this goal at Western Michigan University, the University Ombudsman has the following prerogatives and responsibilities.

The Ombudsman is a presidential appointee chosen with the active participation of students, faculty and staff and confirmed by the Board of Trustees. Regardless of the present position of the proposed Ombudsman, it is imperative he be a competent, well-known and respected person on the campus and his role as Ombudsman be recognized by faculty, staff and students as one of importance. The appointment is to be for a two-year term with an option of one additional two-year reappointment.

The Ombudsman's ability to function effectively comes primarily from his skill in working with others to resolve difficulties and from the fact he acts under authority of the President of the University, to whom he reports. His role is to investigate and mediate grievances. He must be dedicated primarily to concerns of the individual as opposed to the power of the institution to impose its will. However, his position must be impartial rather than partisan. To be effective in dealing with students, faculty and staff, the integrity of the Ombudsman must be unquestionable.

The Ombudsman will assure simple and rapid procedures for hearing requests, complaints and grievances. He shall investigate such matters, and where he discovers there is a malfunction in the administrative process or an abuse of power, he shall assist the individual in accomplishing a quick and fair resolution of his problem. Some problems he may be able to remedy himself, but when appropriate, he will refer the person to other University members and/or offices. His office will be easily accessible and adequately furnished and staffed. He is authorized to make thorough investigations and shall have direct and prompt access to all University offices and relevant records. He will be alert especially to the chief causes for student concerns, and make recommendations for the elimination of these causes consistent with fundamental purpose of the University. He shall keep written confidential records consistent with University policy regarding records and make periodic reports on the work of his office.

July 1, 1970
APPENDIX C

DRAWER PROBLEM FORMAT (REvised)
BRAWER PROBLEM FORMAT (REVISED)

TYPE OF PROBLEM
STUDENT ACADEMIC PROBLEMS

Problems of Admission and Registration
Getting into courses
Getting into curriculum or program
(Undergraduate)
(Graduate)
Admission to the University
(Undergraduate)
(Graduate)
Late Registration
Miscellaneous

Problems Related to Instructor's Teaching
Teaching Responsibility, Meeting classes, etc.
Instructional Methods
Grading Methods
Course Content
Exams
Teacher's Classroom Behavior
   Lack of Communication
   Personal Conflicts
   Insults
   Vulgar Language
Graduate Assistants as Teachers
General Complaints about Teachers
Miscellaneous

Problems Related to Grading
Grade Grievances
Accused of Cheating
Requesting Incomplete Grade
Miscellaneous

Problems of Records
Course and Section Change
Transfer Credits
Transcript Request
Appeal for "W" Grades (late drops)
Removal of Incomplete Grades
Miscellaneous

Problems of Academic Requirements
University Degree Requirements
Program or Department Degree Requirements
Certification Requirements
Miscellaneous
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Problems of Academic Status
Probation Status
Dismissal from the University
Assistantship and Associateship Status
Withdrawal from University
Miscellaneous

Problems of Academic Advising and Counseling
Miscellaneous (Student Academic Problems)

STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC PROBLEMS
Financial Problems and Complaints
Refund to Students
Need for Financial Aid Scholarship
    and/or Loan Application refused
    or amount reduced
Scholarship or Loan Cancelled
Insufficient Funds to go to School
Owes Western Michigan University Money
Out-of-state vs. in-state residency fees
V.A. Educational Benefits
Theft of Student Property
Miscellaneous

Problems of Housing
On Campus
    Married Housing
    Residence Halls
    Food Service
Off Campus
Miscellaneous

Problems of Auto Use and Police
Permission for Car on Campus
Securing Parking Permit
Traffic and Parking Tickets
Accidents on Campus
Campus Security
Miscellaneous

Problems of Student Employment
Wage and Salary Problems
Tenure of Employment
Conditions of Employment
Needs Job
Termination
Miscellaneous
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Problems of University Facilities & Services

Use of Rooms for Meetings and Study
Bus Service
University Health Service
University Library
Bookstore
Obtaining Appointment with Staff
Release of Student Information (confidentiality)
Career Planning and Placement
Maintenance and Physical Facilities
Computer Center
Day Care Center
Student Insurance
Mistreatment by University Employee
Miscellaneous

Problems of Student Activities and Organizations

Personal Problems (Non-Academic/Non-Employment)
Emotional Problems
Legal Problems
Draft Problems
Financial Problems
Health Problems
Problems with Off-Campus Agencies
Disciplinary Action by University
Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous (Student Non-Academic)

Problems of Faculty & Staff Employment

Problems of Faculty and Staff Employment
Hiring
Tenure
Promotion
Termination
Conditions of Employment
Salary and Wage Questions
Fringe Benefits
Student Evaluations
Miscellaneous

Faculty and Staff Policy and Procedural Questions

Miscellaneous (Faculty and Staff Problems)

GENERAL PROBLEMS (entire University community)
Client requested information
Client supplied information to University Ombudsman
Miscellaneous (entire University community)
APPENDIX D

BRAWER PROBLEM FORMAT (ORIGINAL)
BRAWER PROBLEM FORMAT (ORIGINAL)

Type of Problem
STUDENT ACADEMIC PROBLEMS

Problems of Admission and Registration
- Getting into courses
- Getting into curriculum or program
- Admission to the University
- Late Registration
- Miscellaneous

Problems Related to Instructor's Teaching
- Teaching Responsibility, meeting classes, etc.
- Instructional Methods
- Grading Methods
- Course Content
- Exams
- Teacher's Classroom Behavior
  - Lack of Communication
  - Personal Conflicts
  - Insults
  - Vulgar Language
- Graduate Assistants as Teachers
- Miscellaneous

Problems Related to Grading
- Grade Grievances
- Accused of Cheating
- Miscellaneous

Problems of Records
- Course and Section Change
- Transfer Credits
- Transcript Request
- Appeal for "W" Grades
- Removal of Incomplete Grades
- Miscellaneous

Problems of Academic Requirements
- University Degree Requirements
- Program or Department Degree Requirements
- Certification Requirements
- Miscellaneous

Problems of Academic Status
- Probation Status
- Dismissal from the University
- Refusal of Admission to a Program
- Assistantship and Associateship Status
- Miscellaneous
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Problems of Academic Advice

STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC PROBLEMS

Financial Problems and Complaints
Bills sent by the University to Students
Refund not Received by Students
Need for Financial Aid
   Scholarship and/or Loan Application refused or amount reduced
   Scholarship or Loan Cancelled
Insufficient Funds to go to School
Owes Western Michigan University Money
Out-of-state vs. in-state residency and fees
V.A. Educational Benefits
Theft of Student Property
Miscellaneous

Problems of Housing
On Campus
   Married Housing
   Residence Halls
Off Campus
Miscellaneous

Problems of Auto Use and Police
Permission for Car on campus
Securing Parking Permit
Traffic and Parking Tickets
Accidents on campus
Campus Security
Miscellaneous

Problems of Student Employment
Wage and Salary Problems
Tenure of Employment
Conditions of Employment
Needs Job
Termination
Miscellaneous

Problems of University Facilities and Services
Use of Rooms for Meetings and Study
Bus Service
University Health Service
University Library
Bookstore
Obtaining Appointment with Faculty & Staff
Release of Student Info. (Confidentiality)
Career Planning and Placement
Maintenance and Physical Facilities
Problems of Student Activities

Personal Problems (Non-Academic & Non-Employment)
- Emotional Problems
- Legal Problems
- Draft Problems
- Financial Problems
- Health Problems
- Problems with Off-Campus Agencies
- Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous (Student Non-Academic)

PROBLEMS OF FACULTY AND STAFF
Problems of Faculty and Staff Employment
- Hiring
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Termination
- Conditions of Employment
- Miscellaneous

Faculty and Staff Policy and Procedural Questions

Miscellaneous (Faculty and Staff Problems)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

WMU OMBUDSMAN CASE SHEET
UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN

Name__________________________________________________ Date_______________________
Local Address______________________________________ Telephone_________________
__________________________________________________ Age _____ Sex: M__ F__

Check one If "Student": Curriculum __________
Student _____ Majör _________________
Faculty _____
Academic staff _____ Class: Freshman______ M.A. _____
Non-academic staff _____ Sophomore______ Spec._____
Other _____ Junior _______ Ph.D._____
I wish to consult the Ombudsman about:

I already have spoken to the following university person(s) about this
matter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>RBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

OMBUDSMAN COVER LETTER
INTRODUCING THE SURVEY
The establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University on July 6, 1970, was a confirmation that the University seeks to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. The Office of the Ombudsman has now been functioning for over a year. During this period of time, we have had approximately 1200 cases brought to us. While we have had a considerable amount of informal "feedback" about the operation of the office, up to this time there has been no systematic evaluation of the Ombudsman's Office by the University community.

Charles F. Hewitt is conducting a survey to provide a systematic evaluation of the Ombudsman's Office. Mr. Hewitt is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership, and is doing an internship in the Ombudsman's Office. Although Mr. Hewitt is conducting the survey independent of this office, we are giving him full cooperation.

You have been selected to participate in this survey. Enclosed is a questionnaire which I urge you to complete and return to Mr. Hewitt.

To insure full and free response from persons surveyed, Mr. Hewitt has devised a system whereby no one will be able to identify by name the individual respondents. So please do not hesitate to "tell it like it is" in the questionnaire. Your participation is needed and will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Milton J. Brawer
University Ombudsman

Enclosures
APPENDIX H

SURVEY FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Recently you were sent a questionnaire concerning the Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. I apologize for any inconvenience caused you from filling out and returning the completed questionnaire to me. However, your responses are needed and are essential to the study of the Ombudsman's Office.

Enclosed is an additional questionnaire for your convenience should you have lost the questionnaire previously sent to you. Please be assured that your name will not be revealed to anyone involved in this evaluation.

To return the completed questionnaire an envelope is provided for you. If you received the questionnaire at an off-campus address, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is provided. Otherwise, return the completed questionnaire through the campus mail.

Thank you for your assistance in making the study of the Ombudsman complete.

Sincerely yours,

Charles F. Hewitt

CFH:jh
Enclosures
APPENDIX I

OMBUDSMAN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

THE SCO QUESTIONNAIRE
THE FSCO QUESTIONNAIRE
THE SBS QUESTIONNAIRE
THE FSS QUESTIONNAIRE
THE SCO QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is being conducted by Charles F. Hewitt, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University. (Phone 383-6000)

OMBUDSMAN SURVEY AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Please Read This First: The Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University was established in a special meeting of the University's Board of Trustees on July 6, 1970. Dr. Milton Brawer was selected by a committee of students, faculty, and staff, and appointed by the President of the University to serve as Western's first Ombudsman. His function and role was to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. To date, no systematic effort has been made to obtain an assessment of the Ombudsman's Office. INFORMATION IS NEEDED FROM YOU TO PROVIDE AN EVALUATION OF THE OFFICE.

Important: This assessment of the Ombudsman's Office is not possible without your returning the completed questionnaire. Prior administration of the questionnaire has revealed that only ten or fifteen minutes is required to complete the questionnaire. No one will be able to identify by name the individual respondents. Please answer all the questions and notice carefully that QUESTIONS ARE CONTAINED ON BOTH SIDES OF EACH PAGE. For your convenience a return envelope is enclosed. If the questionnaire reached you at an off-campus address, a stamped, self-addressed envelope has been included. Otherwise, return the questionnaire through the on-campus mail using the return envelope.

A. INFORMATION ABOUT YOU: IN THIS SECTION, ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS AS THEY APPLIED TO YOU WHEN YOU CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN. PLACE AN ☐ BESIDE YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS.

1. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your classification was:
   ☐ (1) Freshman ☐ (4) Senior ☐ (7) Doctoral
   ☐ (2) Sophomore ☐ (5) Master ☐ (8) Guest Student
   ☐ (3) Junior ☐ (6) Specialist ☐ (9) Unclassified

2. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your legal residence was:
   ☐ (1) Michigan ☐ (2) Another state ☐ (3) Another country

3. Your sex is:
   ☐ (1) Male ☐ (2) Female

4. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your age was: __________ (In years)

5. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your marital status was:
   ☐ (1) Single ☐ (2) Married ☐ (3) Divorced ☐ (4) Widowed

6. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your major field of study was (Specify) _____________________________

7. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your over-all accumulated grade point average was:
   ☐ (1) 3.50 to 4.00 ☐ (4) 2.00 to 2.49 ☐ (7) None (1st term student)
   ☐ (2) 3.00 to 3.49 ☐ (5) 1.00 to 1.99
   ☐ (3) 2.50 to 2.99 ☐ (6) Below 1.00

If uncertain about your G.P.A., remember the WMU grade scale: A = 4.00, B = 3.00 to 3.99, C = 2.00 to 2.99, D = 1.00 to 1.99, and E = Below 1.00

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
8. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your student residence was:

- [ ] (1) In a residence hall
- [ ] (2) In on-campus married student housing
- [ ] (3) In off-campus housing
- [ ] (4) With your parents or relatives

9. When you consulted the Ombudsman, how many institutions of higher education other than WMU had you attended? Indicate the type and number of institutions.

- [ ] (1) Have attended WMU only
- [ ] (2) Two-year college
- [ ] (3) Four-year college or university
- [ ] (4) Private business school
- [ ] (5) Private technical school
- [ ] (6) Other (Explain) ____________________________

10. What was the approximate total enrollment of your high school?

- [ ] (1) Under 500
- [ ] (2) 500 - 1,000
- [ ] (3) 1,000 - 2,500
- [ ] (4) Over 2,500

11. If you attended another college, university, or private vocational school other than WMU, what was the approximate enrollment of the last school attended before coming to WMU?

- [ ] (1) Have attended WMU only
- [ ] (2) Under 500
- [ ] (3) 500 - 1,000
- [ ] (4) 3,500 - 5,000
- [ ] (5) 5,000 - 10,000
- [ ] (6) 10,000 - 20,000
- [ ] (7) Over 20,000

B. DISPOSITION OF YOUR PROBLEM

12. Indicate the general nature of the problem you took to the Ombudsman: (Check one, or more if necessary)

- [ ] (1) Admission and Registration
- [ ] (2) Quality of instruction
- [ ] (3) Grade grievance
- [ ] (4) Academic record
- [ ] (5) Academic requirements
- [ ] (6) Academic status
- [ ] (7) Financial problem
- [ ] (8) Housing
- [ ] (9) Automobile regulations
- [ ] (10) Campus Safety and Security
- [ ] (11) Employment
- [ ] (12) Use of facilities or services
- [ ] (13) Student activities
- [ ] (14) Academic advice
- [ ] (15) Needed information only
- [ ] (16) Personal problem
- [ ] (17) Other (Specify) ____________________________

13. To how many people in authority did you take your problem before consulting the Ombudsman?

- [ ] (1) None
- [ ] (2) One
- [ ] (3) Two
- [ ] (4) Three
- [ ] (5) More than three (Specify) ____________________________

14. How long did it take the Ombudsman to resolve your problem?

- [ ] (1) Remains unsolved
- [ ] (2) Less than 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

15. To what extent is the problem you took to the Ombudsman now solved?

- [ ] (1) Completely solved
- [ ] (2) Solved to a high degree
- [ ] (3) Solved to an average degree
- [ ] (4) Solved to a low degree
- [ ] (5) Not solved at all
- [ ] (6) Problem is worse than it was before
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16. 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) Hostily dissatisfied
- (7) Totally dissatisfied

17. If the Ombudsman could not help you attain the outcome you desired, did he adequately explain why?

- (1) The Ombudsman was successful; no explanation was required
- (2) Yes, he explained adequately
- (3) No, he did not explain adequately

18. The Ombudsman should be: (Check one)

- (1) A faculty member with teaching responsibilities
- (2) A faculty member, but without teaching responsibilities
- (3) An administrator
- (4) A counselor
- (5) A student
- (6) A lawyer
- (7) A campus minister
- (8) Other (Specify)

19. Which group or combination of groups should select the Ombudsman? (Check only)

- (1) Administration only
- (2) Students only
- (3) Faculty only
- (4) Students and Faculty only
- (5) Students and Administration only
- (6) Faculty and Administration only
- (7) Administration, Faculty, and Students
- (8) Other (Specify)

20. Read the following list of traits. Mark a "1" beside the most important trait an Ombudsman should possess. Mark a "2" beside the second most important trait, a "3" beside the third most important. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

- (A) Patience
- (B) Empathy
- (C) Accessibility
- (D) Impartiality
- (E) Knowledge of campus regulations and operations
- (F) Persuasiveness
- (G) Authority
- (H) Honesty
- (I) Well known on campus
- (J) Experience
- (K) Ability to criticize
- (L) Willingness to listen
- (M) Other (Specify)

21. The Ombudsman's Office should be located:

- (1) In the Student Center Building
- (2) In the Student Services Building
- (3) In the Administration Building
- (4) In a residence hall
- (5) In a classroom building
- (6) Anywhere, it doesn't matter
- (7) Other (Specify)

22. The Ombudsman is whose "man"?

- (1) Everybody's "man"
- (2) Faculty's "man"
- (3) Administrators' "man"
- (4) Students' "man"
23. Read the following list of "tools" an Ombudsman can use in order to accomplish his goals. Mark a "1" beside the one you consider the Ombudsman's most effective "tool." Mark a "2" beside the one you consider the second most effective, a "3" beside the third most effective. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

- (A) Inquiry or investigation
- (B) Negotiation
- (C) Persuasion
- (D) Criticism
- (E) Public exposure
- (F) Status within the University
- (G) Opportunity to appeal directly to the President of the University

The following statements represent thoughts and opinions concerning the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. For each statement indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement. If you agree, indicate your degree of agreement by: agree very strongly, or agree strongly, or just agree. If you disagree with the statement, then indicate by: just disagree, or disagree strongly, or disagree very strongly. BESIDE EACH STATEMENT INDICATE YOUR DEGREE OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT BY PLACING AN £ IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX.

24. The Ombudsman did all he could within the authority of his office to assist me with my problem.

25. I experienced unpleasant treatment by various persons as a result of the Ombudsman's investigation.

26. If I had another problem I could not handle through normal University "channels," I would return to the Ombudsman.

27. I would recommend the Ombudsman to other students, faculty or staff.

28. The services of the Ombudsman are widely known among students, faculty and staff.

29. The establishment of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University merely compounds the problems of institutional bureaucracy.

30. Because of the Ombudsman's faculty status, he is better able to deal effectively with academic matters than are members of the administrative staff.

31. The Ombudsman is just another potential bureaucrat.

32. Persons seeking assistance from the Ombudsman are in most cases using his office to circumvent University policy and procedures.

33. The Ombudsman should seek out and remove discriminatory practices.

34. The establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman is an indication of the failure of the faculty and staff to meet the responsibilities for equity and communication in an academic community.

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
35. Faculty and staff need more courage, conviction, and commitment to act as ombudsmen and be more for students.

36. The best that can be said about the Ombudsman is that he serves as a "traffic cop," routing an individual to the office responsible for dealing with his problem.

37. I see no permanent future for the Office of Ombudsman on the Western Michigan University campus.

38. The Ombudsman performs an adequate job of correcting the smaller neglects and defects within the bureaucratic structure of Western Michigan University.

39. The Ombudsman is just another "gimmick" devised by the "powers" of the institution.

40. The Ombudsman has influenced decisions primarily in favor of the individual seeking assistance, and not the institution.

41. There should be three ombudsmen on campus—one each for students, faculty, and staff.

42. No doubt many of the questions, complaints, or problems which come to the Ombudsman are the result of individuals not wanting to take the time to contact the appropriate office or person(s) in the first place.

43. Establishing the Office of the Ombudsman is an indication of the efforts of the institution to take additional interest in its students, faculty and staff and their problems.

44. Within a large institution such as Western Michigan University, the Ombudsman and his efforts give humanism the edge over bureaucracy.

45. An Ombudsman is not needed at Western Michigan University.

46. The Ombudsman is a threat to many faculty and staff.

47. The Ombudsman should have broad investigatory powers (access to all University records).

48. Read the following list of statements concerning the role and function of an Ombudsman. According to what you think the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University should be doing, rank order the three statements you consider the most important. Mark a "1" beside the function you consider the most important. Mark a "2" beside the second most important, a "3" beside the third most important. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

(A) The Ombudsman should direct his efforts toward problems which students, faculty and staff encounter off campus in the surrounding communities.

(B) The Ombudsman should identify patterns of grievances and issues and use this information as a catalyst for educational reform and development.

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
☐ (C) The Ombudsman should assist students, faculty and staff in solving their individual problems.

☐ (D) The Ombudsman should be primarily an information and referral center.

☐ (E) The Ombudsman should direct his attention toward resolving potentially disruptive crises.

☐ (F) The Ombudsman should serve as an impartial investigator for the purpose of determining whether or not the student, faculty, or staff member has been treated fairly and justly.

☐ (G) The Ombudsman should serve as an aid to student government, conduct a study, and make recommendations for a more contemporary kind of student government.

☐ (H) The Ombudsman should serve as a diligent "watchdog" of University policies and procedures, recommending reform where needed.

49. Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to on this page or separate sheet of paper.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
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THE FSCEO QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is being conducted by Charles F. Hewitt, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University. (Phone 381-6200)

OMBUDSMAN SURVEY AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Please Read This First: The Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University was established in a special meeting of the University's Board of Trustees on July 6, 1970. Dr. Milton Brawer was selected by a committee of students, faculty, and staff, and appointed by the President of the University to serve as Western's first Ombudsman. His function and role was to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. To date, no systematic effort has been made to obtain an assessment of the Ombudsman's Office. INFORMATION IS NEEDED FROM YOU TO PROVIDE AN EVALUATION OF THE OFFICE.

Important: This assessment of the Ombudsman's Office is not possible without your returning the completed questionnaire. Prior administration of the questionnaire has revealed that only ten or fifteen minutes is required to complete the questionnaire. No one will be able to identify by name the individual respondents. Please answer all the questions and notice carefully that QUESTIONS ARE CONTAINED ON BOTH SIDES OF EACH PAGE. For your convenience a return envelope is enclosed. If the questionnaire reached you at an off-campus address, a stamped, self-addressed envelope has been included. Otherwise, return the questionnaire through the on-campus mail using the return envelope.

A. INFORMATION ABOUT YOU: IN THIS SECTION, ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS AS THEY APPLIED TO YOU WHEN YOU CONSULTED THE OMBUDSMAN. PLACE AN X BESIDE YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS.

1. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your position with the University was as a member of the:
   - [ ] Teaching faculty
   - [ ] Teaching faculty with administrative responsibilities
   - [ ] Administration staff
   - [ ] Clerical or technical staff of an academic department
   - [ ] Clerical or technical staff of the administration or other non-academic or service areas.

2. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your approximate number of years employed by the University was:
   - [ ] Less than 1 year
   - [ ] 1 to 3 years
   - [ ] 4 to 6 years
   - [ ] 7 to 9 years
   - [ ] 10 to 15 years
   - [ ] More than 15 years

3. Your sex is:
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

4. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your age was: ________ (In years)

5. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your marital status was:
   - [ ] Single
   - [ ] Married
   - [ ] Divorced
   - [ ] Widowed

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
6. When you consulted the Ombudsman, your highest level of education was:

- [ ] (1) High school diploma or GED
- [ ] (2) Certificated, licensed, or apprentice-
  ship program beyond high school
- [ ] (3) One to four years of college level
  work - No degree
- [ ] (4) Associate Degree from a junior college
- [ ] (5) Bachelors Degree
- [ ] (6) Masters Degree
- [ ] (7) Ph.D. or Ed.D.

B. DISPOSITION OF YOUR PROBLEM

7. Indicate the general nature of the problem you took to the Ombudsman: (Check one, or more if necessary.)

- [ ] (1) Academic problem concerning a student
- [ ] (2) Non-academic or personal problem concerning a student
- [ ] (3) Employment problem
- [ ] (4) Question or complaint about University policy or procedure
- [ ] (5) Use of University facilities and services
- [ ] (6) Personal problem
- [ ] (7) Other (Specify)

8. To how many people in authority did you take your problem before consulting the Ombudsman?

- [ ] (1) None □  (3) Two □  (5) More than three
  (Specify)
- [ ] (2) One □  (4) Three □

9. How long did it take the Ombudsman to resolve your problem?

- [ ] (1) Remains unsolved □
- [ ] (2) Less than 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 □

10. To what extent is the problem you took to the Ombudsman now solved?

- [ ] (1) Completely solved
- [ ] (2) Solved to a high degree
- [ ] (3) Solved to an average degree
- [ ] (4) Solved to a low degree
- [ ] (5) Not solved at all
- [ ] (6) Problem is worse than it was before

11. 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

12. If the Ombudsman could not help you attain the outcome you desired, did he adequately explain why?

- [ ] (1) The Ombudsman was successful; no explanation was required
- [ ] (2) Yes, he explained adequately
- [ ] (3) No, he did not explain adequately
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C. YOUR ATTITUDES REGARDING THE OMBUDSMAN

13. The Ombudsman should be: (Check one)

☐ (1) A faculty member with teaching responsibilities
☐ (2) A faculty member, but without teaching responsibilities
☐ (3) An administrator
☐ (4) A counselor
☐ (5) A student
☐ (6) A lawyer
☐ (7) A campus minister
☐ (8) Other (Specify)

14. Which group or combination of groups should select the Ombudsman? (Check one only)

☐ (1) Administration only
☐ (2) Students only
☐ (3) Faculty only
☐ (4) Students and faculty only
☐ (5) Students and administration only
☐ (6) Faculty and administration only
☐ (7) Administration, faculty, and students
☐ (8) Other (Specify)

15. Read the following list of traits. Mark a "1" beside the most important trait an Ombudsman should possess. Mark a "2" beside the second most important trait, a "3" beside the third most important. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

☐ (A) Patience
☐ (B) Empathy
☐ (C) Accessibility
☐ (D) Impartiality
☐ (E) Knowledge of campus regulations and operations
☐ (F) Persuasiveness
☐ (G) Authority
☐ (H) Honesty
☐ (I) Well known on campus
☐ (J) Experience
☐ (K) Ability to criticize
☐ (L) Willingness to listen
☐ (M) Other (Specify)

16. The Ombudsman's office should be located:

☐ (1) In the Student Center building
☐ (2) In the Student Services building
☐ (3) In the Administration building
☐ (4) In a residence hall
☐ (5) In a classroom building
☐ (6) Anywhere, it doesn't matter
☐ (7) Other (Specify)

17. The Ombudsman is whose "man"?

☐ (1) Everybody's "man"
☐ (2) Faculty's "man"
☐ (3) Administrators' "man"
☐ (4) Students' "man"

18. Read the following list of "tools" an Ombudsman can use in order to accomplish his goals. Mark a "1" beside the one you consider the Ombudsman's most effective "tool." Mark a "2" beside the one you consider the second most effective, a "3" beside the third most effective. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

☐ (A) Inquiry or investigation
☐ (B) Negotiation
☐ (C) Persuasion
☐ (D) Criticism
☐ (E) Public exposure
☐ (F) Status within the University
☐ (G) Opportunity to appeal directly to the President of the University

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The following statements represent thoughts and opinions concerning the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. For each statement indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement. If you agree, indicate your degree of agreement by: agree very strongly, or agree strongly, or just agree. If you disagree with the statement, then indicate by: just disagree, or disagree strongly, or disagree very strongly. Beside each statement indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement by placing an X in the appropriate box.

19. The Ombudsman did all he could within the authority of his office to assist me with my problem.

20. I experienced unpleasant treatment by various persons as a result of the Ombudsman's investigation.

21. If I had another problem I could not handle through normal University "channels," I would return to the Ombudsman.

22. I would recommend the Ombudsman to other students, faculty or staff.

23. The services of the Ombudsman are widely known among students, faculty and staff.

24. The establishment of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University merely compounds the problems of institutional bureaucracy.

25. Because of the Ombudsman's faculty status, he is better able to deal effectively with academic matters than are members of the administrative staff.

26. The Ombudsman is just another potential bureaucrat.

27. Persons seeking assistance from the Ombudsman are in most cases, using his office to circumvent University policy and procedures.

28. The Ombudsman should seek out and remove discriminatory practices.

29. The establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman is an indication of the failure of the faculty and staff to meet the responsibilities for equity and communication in an academic community.

30. Faculty and staff need more courage, conviction, and commitment to act as Ombudsmen and be more for students.

31. The best that can be said about the Ombudsman is that he serves as a "traffic cop," routing an individual to the office responsible for dealing with his problem.

32. I see no permanent future for the Office of Ombudsman on the Western Michigan University campus.

33. The Ombudsman performs an adequate job of correcting the smaller neglects and defects within the bureaucratic structure of Western Michigan University.

34. The Ombudsman is just another "gimmick" devised by the "powers" of the institution.

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
35. The Ombudsman has influenced decisions primarily in favor of the individual seeking assistance, and not the institution.

36. There should be three ombudsmen on campus—one each for students, faculty, and staff.

37. No doubt many of the questions, complaints, or problems which come to the Ombudsman are the result of individuals not wanting to take the time to contact the appropriate office or person(s) in the first place.

38. Establishing the office of the Ombudsman is an indication of the efforts of the institution to take additional interest in its students, faculty, and staff and their problems.

39. Within a large institution such as Western Michigan University, the Ombudsman and his efforts give humanism the edge over bureaucracy.

40. An Ombudsman is not needed at Western Michigan University.

41. The Ombudsman is a threat to many faculty and staff.

42. The Ombudsman should have broad investigatory powers (access to all University records).

43. Read the following list of statements concerning the role and function of an ombudsman. According to what you think the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University should be doing, rank order the three statements you consider the most important. Mark a "1" beside the function you consider the most important. Mark a "2" beside the second most important, a "3" beside the third most important. DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

- (A) The Ombudsman should direct his efforts toward problems which students, faculty and staff encounter off campus in the surrounding communities.

- (B) The Ombudsman should identify patterns of grievances and issues and use this information as a catalyst for educational reform and development.

- (C) The Ombudsman should assist students, faculty and staff in solving their individual problems.

- (D) The Ombudsman should be primarily an information and referral center.

- (E) The Ombudsman should direct his attention toward resolving potentially disruptive crises.

- (F) The Ombudsman should serve as an impartial investigator for the purpose of determining whether or not the student, faculty, or staff member has been treated fairly and justly.

- (G) The Ombudsman should serve as an aid to student government, conduct a study, and make recommendations for a more contemporary kind of student government.

- (H) The Ombudsman should serve as a diligent "watchdog" of University policies and procedures, recommending reform where needed.

44. Make any additional comments or suggestions you may wish to on this page or separate sheet of paper.
Please Read This First: The Office of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University was established in a special meeting of the University’s Board of Trustees on July 6, 1970. Dr. Milton Brawer was selected by a committee of students, faculty, and staff, and appointed by the President of the University to serve as Western’s first Ombudsman. His function and role was to resolve grievances and provide justice for all members of the University community. To date, no systematic effort has been made to obtain an assessment of the Ombudsman’s Office. INFORMATION IS NEEDED FROM YOU TO PROVIDE AN EVALUATION OF THE OFFICE.

Important: This assessment of the Ombudsman’s Office is not possible without your returning the completed questionnaire. Prior administration of the questionnaire has revealed that only ten or fifteen minutes is required to complete the questionnaire. No one will be able to identify by name the individual respondents. Please answer all the questions and notice carefully that QUESTIONS ARE CONTAINED ON BOTH SIDES OF EACH PAGE. For your convenience a return envelope is enclosed. If the questionnaire reached you at an off-campus address, a stamped, self-addressed envelope has been included. Otherwise, return the questionnaire through the on-campus mail using the return envelope.

A. INFORMATION ABOUT YOU: PLEASE ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS BY PLACING AN ☐ BESIDE YOUR RESPONSE.

1. Your classification is:
   - ☐ (1) Freshman
   - ☐ (2) Sophomore
   - ☐ (3) Junior
   - ☐ (4) Senior
   - ☐ (5) Masters
   - ☐ (6) Specialist
   - ☐ (7) Doctoral
   - ☐ (8) Guest Student
   - ☐ (9) Unclassified

2. Your legal residence is:
   - ☐ (1) Michigan
   - ☐ (2) Another state
   - ☐ (3) Another country

3. Your sex is:
   - ☐ (1) Male
   - ☐ (2) Female

4. Your age is: _____ (In years)

5. Your marital status is:
   - ☐ (1) Single
   - ☐ (2) Married
   - ☐ (3) Divorced
   - ☐ (4) Widowed

6. Your major field of study is: (Specify) __________________________

7. Your over-all accumulated grade point average is:
   - ☐ (1) 3.50 to 4.00
   - ☐ (2) 3.00 to 3.49
   - ☐ (3) 2.50 to 2.99
   - ☐ (4) 2.00 to 2.49
   - ☐ (5) 1.00 to 1.99
   - ☐ (6) Below 1.00
   - ☐ (7) None (1st term student)

If uncertain about your G.P.A., remember the WMU grade scale: A = 4.00, B = 3.00 to 3.99, C = 2.00 to 2.99, D = 1.00 to 1.99, and E = Below 1.00.

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)
8. Your student residence is:
   (1) A residence hall
   (2) On-campus married student housing
   (3) Off-campus housing
   (4) With your parents or relatives

9. How many institutions of higher education other than Western Michigan University have you attended? Indicate the type and number of institutions.
   (1) Have attended WMU only
   (2) Two-year college
   (3) Four-year college or university
   (4) Private business school
   (5) Private technical school
   (6) Other (Specify)

10. What was the approximate total enrollment of your high school?
   (1) Under 500
   (2) 500 - 1,000
   (3) 1,000 - 2,500
   (4) Over 2,500

11. If you attended another college, university, or private vocational school other than Western Michigan University, what was the approximate enrollment of the last school attended before coming to WMU:
   (1) Have attended WMU only
   (2) Under 500
   (3) 500 - 3,500
   (4) 3,500 - 5,000
   (5) 5,000 - 10,000
   (6) 10,000 - 20,000
   (7) Over 20,000

B. YOUR ATTITUDE REGARDING THE OMBUDSMAN

12. Based on your experiences to date at Western Michigan University, if you had a problem that could not be resolved through normal University "channels," would you consult the Ombudsman for assistance?
   (1) Yes, for any kind of problem
   (2) Yes, but only for certain problems
   (3) Uncertain
   (4) No, I would not consult the Ombudsman

13. Please indicate the general nature of a problem you might have taken to the Ombudsman, or possibly would consider taking to the Ombudsman. (Check one, or more if necessary)
   (1) Admission and registration
   (2) Quality of instruction
   (3) Grade grievance
   (4) Academic record
   (5) Academic requirements
   (6) Academic status
   (7) Financial problem
   (8) Housing
   (9) Automobile regulations
   (10) Campus safety and security
   (11) Employment
   (12) Use of facilities or services
   (13) Student activities
   (14) Academic advice
   (15) Advice or information only
   (16) Personal problem
   (17) Other (Specify)

14. Would you take your problem to someone in an authority position before consulting the Ombudsman?
   (1) Yes, I would try normal University "channels" first.
   (2) No, I would consult the Ombudsman to avoid "the red tape."
   (3) Uncertain
15. How much time would you consider to be reasonable for the Ombudsman to resolve your problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timespan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) Probably would not solve the problem</td>
<td>(4) 1 day to 1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Less than 1 hour</td>
<td>(5) 1 week to 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) 1 hour to 1 day</td>
<td>(6) More than 1 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Regardless as to whether you are or are not acquainted with someone who consulted the Ombudsman, please answer the following questions: In your opinion, to what extent is the individual’s problem now solved by the Ombudsman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) I do not know of anyone who consulted the Ombudsman, or I have no opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Completely solved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) Solved to a high degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) Solved to an average degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5) Solved to a low degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) Not solved at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7) Problem is worse than it was before</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How would you describe the degree of satisfaction the individual holds as to the way the Ombudsman handled his or her problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) I do not know of anyone who consulted the Ombudsman, or I have no opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Totally satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) Mostly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) Slightly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) Slightly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7) Mostly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8) Totally dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The Ombudsman should be: (Check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) A faculty member with teaching responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) A faculty member, but without teaching responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) An administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) A counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5) A student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) A lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7) A campus minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8) Other (Specify) ______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Which group or combination of groups should select the Ombudsman? (Check one only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) Administration only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Students only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) Faculty only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) Students and faculty only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5) Students and administration only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) Faculty and administration only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7) Administration, faculty, and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8) Other (Specify) ______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Read the following list of traits. Mark a "1" beside the most important trait an Ombudsman should possess. Mark a "2" beside the second most important trait, a "3" beside the third most important. **DO NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(A) Patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(B) Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(C) Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(D) Impartiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(E) Knowledge of campus regulations and operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(F) Persuasiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(G) Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(H) Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(I) Well known on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(J) Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(K) Ability to criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(L) Willingness to listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(M) Other (Specify) ______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. The Ombudsman's Office should be located:

- (1) In the Student Center building
- (2) In the Student Services building
- (3) In the Administration building
- (5) In a classroom building
- (6) Anywhere, it doesn't matter
- (7) Other (Specify)

22. The Ombudsman is whose "man"?

- (1) Everybody's "man"
- (2) Faculty's "man"
- (3) Administrators' "man"
- (4) Students' "man"

23. Read the following list of "tools" an Ombudsman can use in order to accomplish his goals. Mark a "1" beside the one you consider the Ombudsman's most effective "tool" Mark a "2" beside the one you consider the second most effective, a "3" beside the third most effective. Do NOT MARK MORE THAN THREE.

- (A) Inquiry or investigation
- (B) Negotiation
- (C) Persuasion
- (D) Criticism
- (E) Public exposure
- (F) Status within the University
- (G) Opportunity to appeal directly to the President of the University

The following statements represent thoughts and opinions concerning the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University. For each statement indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement. If you agree, indicate your degree of agreement by: agree very strongly, or agree strongly, or just agree. If you disagree with the statement, then indicate by: just disagree, or disagree strongly, or disagree very strongly. BESIDE EACH STATEMENT INDICATE YOUR DEGREE OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT BY PLACING AN xd IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX.

24. The Ombudsman should do all he can within the authority of his office to assist individuals with their problems.

25. Individuals consulting the Ombudsman take the risk of experiencing unpleasant treatment by various persons as a result of the Ombudsman's investigation.

26. Assuming that I encountered additional problems other than the one I would have originally consulted the Ombudsman about, I would probably return to him for assistance.

27. I would recommend the Ombudsman to other students, faculty or staff.

28. The services of the Ombudsman are widely known among students, faculty and staff.

29. The establishment of the Ombudsman at Western Michigan University merely compounds the problems of institutional bureaucracy.

30. Because of the Ombudsman's faculty status, he is better able to deal effectively with academic matters than are members of the administrative staff.

31. The Ombudsman is just another potential bureaucrat.

32. Persons seeking assistance from the Ombudsman are in most cases using his office to circumvent University policy and procedures.

(PLEASE NOTE: QUESTIONS APPEAR ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE)