

1965

Administrative Agencies as Formulators of Legislative Policy in Minnesota

James A. Seitz
University of Minnesota

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Seitz, J. A. (1965). Administrative Agencies as Formulators of Legislative Policy in Minnesota. *Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science*, Vol. 32 No.3, 216-222.

Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas/vol32/iss3/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science by an authorized editor of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Administrative Agencies as Formulators of Legislative Policy in Minnesota¹

JAMES A. SEITZ²
University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT — An investigation to determine the significant influence of administrators on the formulation of legislative policy, in the State of Minnesota, during the 1963 Session of the Minnesota Legislature. While it is claimed that not all bills were developed by administrators, the hierarchical process of those bills formulated by the bureaucracy of state government deserved special attention. Once personnel developing legislation were identified within each department as being part of the informal process, some selected attitudes of administrators toward their bills and the legislative process were examined through the use of a questionnaire.

In *Policy and Administration*, Paul H. Appleby observed that Administrators . . . formulate recommendations for legislation, and this is a part of the function of policy making, even that policy making which can be done fully only at the legislative level. Both administrative change and legislative change grow out of the popular scene, grow out of reactions to conditions as they have developed, reactions to what has been legislated, to what is being administered and the way it is being administered. Citizen reactions flow to the legislative body directly, and through the executive branch, and both currents are essential to the final product. As the current of citizen reaction moves through the executive branch, it is given a certain organization. It gains also contributions growing out of administrative and expert considerations (Appleby, 1949:7-8).

In this study, it was proposed to examine the role of administrative agencies as formulators of legislative policy during the 1963 Session of the Minnesota Legislature. Two methods were used. First, nonstructured interviews were held with the commissioners or deputy commissions of the 24 departments of the state government to ascertain the process by which legislative policy was developed within their departments.³ Second, a survey was made of the attitudes of chief policy developers to learn how they viewed the success of departmental legislative policy in the legislature.

Hierarchical Development of Legislative Enactments

This section of the analysis is based upon nonstructured interviews within the various departments. The findings are an account of how the administrative hierarchy—the departments and the governor—developed legislative enactments for the 1963 Session of the Minnesota Legislature.

¹This study is part of an unpublished masters thesis prepared by the writer, under the direction of Professor George A. Warp, as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Public Administration.

²B.A. in Political Science, Willamette University, 1961. M.A.P.A. in Public Administration, University of Minnesota, 1965. Presently, graduate student and teaching assistant in the Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota.

³The 24 departments are those described by the Minnesota Department of Administration in *Executive Branch of Minnesota State Government: Organization by Functional Area*, 1960.

Departmental Level. In the analysis of the 24 departments of the state government, it was found that only the Highway Department used a formal⁴ committee to draft departmental legislative proposals. The committee, established by departmental regulation, was composed of all major division heads and certain key, staff officers, thus affording a thorough review of the over-all planning for departmental sponsored legislation. Possessing both responsibility and control, the formal committee probably was in a better position to examine contemplated legislation in a department that was large in function, staff, and personnel.

In the other 23 departments, the informal method of developing legislative enactments was used in which commissioners usually took active roles. Sometimes, part of the work was delegated to subordinates, usually the deputy commissioner, but at the commissioner's discretion. The cabinet, used by most departments, usually met each week throughout the year to serve as a top-level planning and analyzing body for the department as well as a legislation-proposing body. In the Civil Service Board, the State Board of Education, and the State Board of Health, the administrative board had ultimate approval of legislation originating in those departments. An administrative board is a hierarchical arrangement to gain public sentiment and reaction in a particularized function of government. In some cases, the board will appoint the commissioner or director, and in other cases, the commissioner will be appointed by the governor. In all cases, the commissioner is responsible in some way to the board.

In the departments using the informal method, every division head was given the opportunity to submit proposals concerning his division by going through channels of communication that reached to the top of the hierarchy within the department. Most commissioners pointed out that divisional subordinates, in their everyday work, had a practical knowledge of the laws they administered and, thus, were able to determine how a law should be changed to improve its administration. They brought proposals for improving such laws to the attention of the division head who, in turn, referred them to the person in the department entrusted with handling legislation.

⁴For an adequate discussion of the terms formal and informal, see Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson (1950:55-110).

The matter, then, was ultimately discussed in the cabinet meeting of department officials. (Departmental cabinets were composed of all division and staff officers.)

One important factor that was stressed by many commissioners was that legislative development is a continual process in the departments of Minnesota state government. Departments are given to administer a law by the legislature and are charged with carrying out the legislative intent of the law. In practice, some provisions may prove to be unworkable or undesirable. Sometimes, of course, it is possible for a department to make administrative policy changes within the framework of the law. The possibilities of administrative correction are discussed and acted on in cabinet meetings. Sometimes, however, such changes are not possible, and the cabinet decides a bill embodying the needed changes is necessary. The proposed bill is usually circulated among the division heads, and if the proposed changes may affect more than one department, it is discussed among the division heads of the other departments, as well. After the bills are drafted and approved in form by the Revisor of Statutes, they are sent to the governor for analysis.

The preceding discussion is typical of the informal method used in large departments. In the 14 smaller departments that have comparatively small staffs and limited functions, no organizational machinery for legislative policy development could be identified. Each commissioner knew the capabilities of certain individuals within his department and would entrust some proposals to specific individuals or assign all the ramifications of one item of legislation to the staff to investigate. The duties of such departmental personnel, of course, were greater during the legislative session. The conclusion reached on small departments is that the commissioner is generally responsible for the drafting of legislation, and the direction of the preparation of statistical data and the necessary arguments to support the bill.

Seventeen of the 24 departments in the nonstructured interview were concerned with the supportive role that lobbyists played in the formulation of departmental legislative policy. A department will generally encourage external support through the use of nongovernmental organizations. Of the 17 departments, 11 held meetings with nongovernmental organizations to discuss proposed legislation. Six departments expressed the view that one of the department's tasks was to organize nongovernmental support for their bills. The same six departments indicated that such support was necessary to support their legislation because any disagreement between the department and a nongovernmental organization before a legislative committee could mean failure of the proposed departmental bill.

The 17 departments held frequent meetings with nongovernmental organizations to further proposed legislation, both prior to and during the legislative session. The commissioners and deputy commissioners justified their department's role in securing nongovernmental aid and support with the following arguments:

1. It was necessary to use the expertise of certain

lobby organizations when their departments were understaffed.

2. Many of the departments had good working relations with lobby organizations and provided information on the contemplated legislative goals of the lobby organizations.
3. Some commissioners characterized their roles as acting as a "clearing house" for lobby-initiated legislation within their areas of concern. In a few cases, it was admitted that the department might introduce a combined lobby and departmental bill as a departmental bill.

The departments gave considerable attention to informing the various legislators on proposed legislation. All departments surveyed in the nonstructured interviews had information programs for legislators from both houses to discuss, informally, basic issues relating to their bills. By way of illustration, the Department of Agriculture, in addition to meeting with legislators during the session, sent each legislator a resumé of the laws enacted by the session and noted the Agriculture Commissioner's approval or disapproval of the bills passed. The legislative resumé served several purposes: It provided a means of highlighting the over-all program of the department, indicated possible bills for the next session, and informed the legislator of the pattern that the new legislation could serve in the over-all program of the department.

The nonstructured interviews also indicated that departments were vitally concerned with their standing in the legislature. Many departments noted that they did not introduce all proposed bills as they did not want to give legislators the impression that they were "flooding" the session with unimportant proposals. The objective, indicated by most departments, was to develop a package of bills that was consistent, important, and necessary. Minor changes of the laws were saved for future sessions when major changes could encompass the small ones. The Department of Public Examiner, for example, did not propose any legislative change in the 1963 Session. The acting commissioner indicated that the department preferred to wait for the next session rather than burden with proposed minor changes an already overburdened legislature.

Personnel in all departments were engaged in legislative work that took a number of forms. Usually, the most important was the "watcher" who noted how the department's bills were advancing in the legislative process so that the commissioner or authorized representative could present arguments for and against bills in formal committee meetings as well as informally.

All departments of state government kept active and current records of bills before the legislature that concerned their departments. These records were usually discussed at the regular departmental cabinet meetings. In smaller departments, the commissioners called together the personnel at various times to discuss the progress of bills. Supportive reasons for departmental bills were prepared in advance, but local bills and those bills initiated by the legislators themselves often needed sup-

portive reasons also. Supportive reasons were needed by the legislative authors and when the commissioner was called before the legislative committee on a bill pertaining to his department.

Governor's Relation to Hierarchical Development. Minnesota had a unique situation during the 1963 Legislative Session. The November election was not finally settled until March, 1963. Governor Elmer L. Andersen was in office until that date and then was succeeded by Governor Karl F. Rolvaag. Governor Andersen stated in an interview that he proceeded under the assumption that the election contest would be decided in his favor. Since departmental legislation had been developed prior to the beginning of the 1963 Legislative Session, all departmental legislation was introduced prior to March of 1963. Consequently this analysis of the governor's relation to hierarchical development is confined to the Andersen administration.

The governor's role in legislative policy exceeded the formal powers, such as, formal messages, the veto, and the special session. Professor Malcolm E. Jewell has described the role of the governor in the legislative process as a positive one.

The governor in the past has not always played such an important role as the initiator of legislation. The growing multitude and complexity of governmental problems have put a premium on expertise; the poorly staffed, part-time legislators are seldom prepared to initiate major statewide legislative programs. So obvious is the need for executive initiative that it would probably have developed without any constitutional excuse; nevertheless, the provisions for a gubernatorial message provided a useful seed from which the modern program of administration has grown. . . . The point cannot be too strongly made that in the American states today the governor holds the initiative; he proposes and the legislature disposes. It is rare that an important legislative measure is passed that has not been initiated by the executive (Jewell, 1962: 107-108).

The governor's office began actively to develop a legislative program four months prior to the beginning of the session. The governor was primarily concerned with legislation to support the program initiated during his campaign. The first type of legislation was proposed by the governor and was communicated downward in the hierarchy for development. Depending on the subject matter, the department concerned drafted the gubernatorial legislation. The second type of legislation was the bills submitted for approval by the departments to the governor. The governor made selections from these bills for his "package program."

In some cases, bills were selected that did not fit into this "package program." The reasons for the selection of these bills remain uncertain. A possible explanation is that the conservatives in the legislature were of the same ideological party as the governor, and therefore, it may have been thought that more influence could be exerted by the governor on key legislators. However, this was not substantiated by the survey of the chief policy developers.

The subordinates within the hierarchy of state government initiated the development of administration bills. The same persons who drafted bills within the governmental hierarchy also drafted an explanatory statement and supportive reasons for each bill that was sent to the governor.

During the three-day statutory period the governor has for the consideration of bills after they are passed by both houses of the legislature, the bills went through a very careful process of scrutinization in which the departments played a very important part. After the governor received the bills, he sent them to the particular department concerned. The departments analyzed the bills in terms of idea, program, and amendments, and considered constitutionality. Then the bills were sent from the department where they had been analyzed to the Department of Administration.⁵ The deputy commissioner of administration examined the bills in terms of over-all program. Memoranda were written by both departments—the one that analyzed the bill and the Department of Administration—and the bill was returned to the governor's office for final review.

Governor Andersen relied strongly on the expertise within the departments of the state government. The administrative process allowed each bill to be analyzed to the fullest extent possible and reduced the number of errors in program development and legislative policy.

Attitudes of Chief Policy Developers

What were the attitudes of the chief policy developers—those persons who made the decisions on departmental legislation? A survey was made of such attitudes to investigate the views of the chief policy developers on the success of departmental legislative policy in the legislature. Attitudes toward the following matters were investigated:

1. The important factors determining legislative votes on departmental bills;
2. the important factors in the securing of support on departmental legislation;
3. the important factors in the selection of authors;
4. the important factors in the securing of legislative approval; and,
5. the origination of ideas for departmental legislation.

Each of the policy developers was asked to rank his

⁵The Department of Administration had many legislative functions. The Commissioner of Administration, during and before the 1963 Session, not only prepared the budget, but was responsible also for coordinating the costs of the new programs proposed by the various departments of state government. A general rule used was that all departments had to submit bills asking for sums of money prior to their introduction. On many occasions, legislative committees asked the Commissioner of Administration to appear before them on proposed bills that asked for funds. The question usually asked was how the programs would be financed.

Another very important aspect of the Commissioner of Administration's task in the legislative process, was the giving of valuable assistance in coordinating the governor's legislative program.

answers according to the importance of the variables, and to number all alternatives. In the tabulation, if all the alternatives were not numbered on a given question, the questionnaire was not counted. If an alternative was changed or modified, it was not used either as the matrix would thus be unequal for the checking of the tabulation.

There were very few such changes or modifications, however.

In Tables I and II, the chi square (X^2) test was deemed suitable for analysis of data. X^2 is used to test whether there is a significant difference between F_{ob} (observed frequency) and F_t (theoretical frequency) based

TABLE I. Ranking by Chief Policy Developers of Factors Important in Departmental Bills

<i>A. Factors Important in Legislative Voting on Departmental Bills.</i>						
(N=95, or 75.4% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)						
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	X^2	Prob.
A bill labeled as "agency bill"	36	16	14	29	14.01	.001
Constituency	26	34	20	15	8.26	.02
Caucus Support	18	29	20	28	3.90	X*
Governor's Support	15	16	41	23	18.30	.001
X^2	11.14	10.46	17.71	5.16		
Prob.	.02	.02	.001	X*		
<i>B. Factors Important in Securing Support of Departmental Bills.</i>						
(N=98, or 77.8% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)						
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	X^2	Prob.
Choice of Authors	57	17	14	10	63.14	.001
Bill labeled as "Supported by Department"	20	19	31	28	9.36	.05
Lobby Support	13	29	30	26	7.55	.10
Governor's Support	8	33	23	34	17.84	.001
X^2	65.92	7.32	7.30	17.35		
Prob.	.001	.05	.05	.001		
<i>C. Factors Important in Selection of Authors by Departments on Minor Bills.</i>						
(N=84, or 66.7% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)						
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	X^2	Prob.
Committee Chairman	39	27	10	8	30.95	.001
Committee Member	13	33	21	17	11.61	.01
Respected Legislator	23	18	31	12	9.24	.05
"Favorite" Legislator	9	6	22	47	49.81	.001
X^2	26.48	19.70	10.57	44.86		
Prob.	.001	.001	.05	.001		
<i>D. Factors Important in Selection of Authors by Departments on Major Bills.</i>						
(N=96, or 76.2% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)						
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	X^2	Prob.
Committee Chairman	53	29	11	3	59.50	.001
Committee Member	3	36	33	24	27.76	.001
Respected Legislator	27	18	32	19	5.59	X*
"Favorite" Legislator	13	13	20	50	6.76	.10
X^2	57.18	11.92	13.76	47.59		
Prob.	.001	.01	.01	.001		
<i>E. Factors which Aid in Securing Legislative Approval.</i>						
(N=96, or 76.2% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)						
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	X^2	Prob.
Legislators Themselves	62	27	6	1	89.92	.001
Lobby Groups	6	37	38	15	32.09	.001
Other Agencies	5	4	28	59	83.42	.001
Agency's Own Support	23	28	24	21	1.09	X*
X^2	82.58	24.76	22.34	76.84		
Prob.	.001	.001	.001	.001		

Factor Important in:	SELECTION OF CHOICES**			
	1st. Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice
Legislative Voting on Departmental Bills	A Bill Labeled as an "Agency Bill"	Constituency	Constituency Caucus Support	A Bill Labeled as an "Agency Bill"
Securing Support for Departmental Bills	Choice of Author	Governor's Support	Bill Labeled as "Supported by Department"	Governor's Support
Selection of Authors for Minor Bills	Committee Chairman	Committee Member	Respected Legislator	"Favorite" Legislator
Selection of Authors for Major Bills	Committee Chairman	Committee Member	Committee Member	"Favorite" Legislator
Securing Legislative Approval	Legislators Themselves	Lobby Groups	Lobby Groups	Other Agencies

* X means that there is no significant difference between the F_{ob} and F_t .

** The methodology used in selection of choices was based upon the largest number of replies within each choice. This does not mean, however, that the other replies within each choice vertically are not significant.

TABLE II. Ranking by Chief Policy Developers of Origin of Legislative Ideas

(N = 84, or 66.7% of the Total Number of Chief Policy Developers)								
	Number of 1st Choices	Number of 2nd Choices	Number of 3rd Choices	Number of 4th Choices	Number of 5th Choices	Number of 6th Choices	X ²	Prob.
<i>Ideas Originating from</i>								
Nongovernmental Organizations	10	35	18	5	15	1	51.70	.001
Personnel within the Department	72	10	0	1	0	1	633.28	.001
Local Governments	0	24	20	17	12	11	25.27	.001
Other State Agencies	0	5	19	29	21	10	42.27	.001
Governor	1	10	17	18	28	51	127.56	.001
X ²	633.28	60.70	21.27	35.70	34.42	124.84		
Prob.	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001		

SELECTION OF CHOICES					
1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice	6th Choice
Personnel within the Department	Nongovernmental Organizations	Local Governments	Other State Agencies	Governor	Citizens

upon a null hypothesis. The X^2 was computed for the vertical columns to indicate whether or not a significant difference existed between the replies for each choice. It was also used to note the significant difference among the number of choices for each response horizontally. A probability of .05 indicates little chance that the replies are not significant. A probability of .10 or more indicates that the significant difference between F_{ob} and F_t based upon a null hypothesis is meaningful but not definitive.

Factors in Legislative Voting. The chief policy developers ranked four alternatives on this question among the factors they believed to have the greatest influence upon the legislature vote on their agency's legislation.

Table IA indicates that a bill labeled an *agency bill* received the highest number of first choices. The chief policy developers, by their responses, reflected a strong confidence that their bills were in a better position to be passed when labeled an *agency bill*.

Constituency or the persons who a particular legisla-

tor represents in the legislature received the second highest number of responses in first choices and the greatest number of second choices. A probable reason why *constituency* did not receive the greatest number of first choices is that many departmental bills may only affect a certain part of the administrative process within the scope of the department. This limited scope of many departmental bills also limits the number of persons affected by the proposed bills. Other departmental bills may have greater significance and are broader in scope. As the scope of the bill broadens, more constituents are affected by the proposed bill. Through communications between the legislator and his constituents, a legislator learns of their desire on proposed departmental legislation. Non-structured interviews revealed that administrators thought that if constituency opposed their bills, certain failure could be predicted. To this end, administrators thought that *constituency* served as an important factor in legislative voting.

It is interesting to note on Table IA that the *governor and the caucus support* did not rate higher by the chief policy developers. The chief policy developers thought that their bills had more influence with the legislators than the governor or the caucus affiliation. However, in the hierarchical development of an agency's legislation, the bills were submitted to the governor prior to the final draft of the legislation. Thus, prior to introduction in the legislature the bill was given the governor's approval and, therefore, consideration of a bill labeled an *agency bill* included consideration of the governor's support.

Since an agency bill reflects the governor's support and, to some degree, the caucus support, when the governor and the majority of the legislators shared the same party and caucus affiliation, the categories of replies cannot be analyzed in terms of an *agency bill* versus the *constituency*. Results are inconclusive in terms of this dichotomy.

Factors Important in the Securing of Legislative Support. On this question, the factors that were important in the securing of legislative support were investigated. Table IB indicates that the response that received the greatest number of first choices was *choice of authors* for departmental bills. Most departments indicated that when a bill left their department, they generally relied upon legislators or lobbyists to support the bill in the legislature. The department, however, plays an important part in supporting bills in committee hearings. *Lobby support* received the second largest number of first choices and the second largest number of second choices. Once the bill was introduced into the legislature by a selected author, the lobbyists played an important role in securing legislative support. The governor received the largest number of second choices.

Factors Generally Important in Selection of Authors. It was necessary to divide the types of department bills submitted to the legislature into two main categories: major and minor legislation. Table IC and ID give the choices of the chief policy developers in response to the question of factors. An insight into the definition of the two main categories came from the nonstructured interviews: a major bill was considered generally as legislation that was new in idea and that affected a great number of citizens; a minor bill was considered legislation that changed existing laws or which did not affect a great number of citizens. On major legislation committee chairmen were favored as authors. One may readily confirm this response by examining the major bills introduced in the 1963 Session, in which the chief authors were generally committee chairmen. On minor legislation, too, the chief policy developers agreed that the bills were best introduced by committee chairmen.

Among the second choices for factors influencing major legislation, the chief policy developers thought bills should be introduced by a member of the committee to which the bill was logically referred. This enabled administrative departments to educate the legislator on the necessary essentials of the bill. It should also be noted

that members of the committees received the highest number of third choices as bill sponsors. Sometimes minor legislation was important to the department's administrative operation within the framework of the law, and, therefore, it became necessary for the department to ensure the passage of minor bills affecting areas of its functions.

Each department had its "favorite" legislators who were interested in working primarily within certain areas of administration. Bills sometimes were given to these favorites to introduce into the legislative process. It should be noted from Table IC and ID, however, that the favorite legislator was the fourth choice as author of departmental bills.

Origination of Legislation. The responses found in Table II may give some insight into the origin of departmental legislation. It is only an indication perceived by the chief policy developers. The largest number of ideas originated within the administration itself, i.e., the majority of the chief policy developers took an active part in initiating legislation.

The second highest number of first choice responses were ideas from nongovernmental organizations. This reply demonstrated the possibility of certain legislation coming from nongovernmental organizations—a possibility indicated also in the nonstructured interviews. The responses further suggested interaction between the administrative departments of government and lobby organizations. From the development of the nonstructured interview, it was apparent that administrative departments worked closely with nongovernmental organization in order to gain broader insights, secure support for bills, and obtain a variety of analyses and criticisms.

Ideas for legislative policy that come from the governor rated low among the chief policy developers, seeming to indicate that ideas on departmental legislation flow more from the bottom of the hierarchy to the top than from the top of the hierarchy down. This flow suggests the contention that the governor is a coordinator rather than an initiator of legislative policy within the administration. However, some explanation must be given here of the differences between numerical evaluation and importance of certain key legislation. In numerical evaluation, probably, more ideas did flow from the bottom to the top of the hierarchy. The important bills that had far reaching significance usually took more time, more direction, and involved more persons in their development. The governor's office, consequently, was more concerned with the key items of legislation.⁶

⁶ In the nonstructured interview, the role of the federal government was detected somewhat. If certain federal legislation proposed funds on a matching basis, the concerned department was the best source of knowledge of the proposal. Therefore, it seemed natural for departments to develop programs in terms of legislative enactments and to propose the necessary matching funds in a legislative bill. This is a factor in our analysis that cannot be overlooked since four chief policy developers noted the role of the federal government on the question concerning the origination of legislation.

Conclusion

This study has indicated that administrative development of proposed legislation made a significant contribution to the legislative process during the 1963 Session of the Minnesota Legislature. Logically, it follows that policy development tended to limit by departmental expertise the magnitude of alternatives for examination by the legislative branch prior to passage of a given bill. To present the governor as chief legislator would be misleading, for even the governor was limited to the alternatives presented by subordinates in the state hierarchy. Not only did subordinates write administrative bills, but they also suggested a framework of factual support for the bills. In the attitude study, chief policy developers noted that most of their ideas originated from personnel within the departments.

The communicative action flowed two ways within the hierarchy of state government. The governor initiated legislation for development and support by the departments. Departments initiated legislation and transmitted it to the top of the hierarchy with supportive reasons. Both subordinates and the governor carried the burden of suggesting legislation.

Further study must be done to understand how nongovernmental organizations influenced administrative departments. The conclusions reached here concerning nongovernmental organizations is that the departments sought their expertise and support.

Generally, the departments analyzed in this study used an informal hierarchical process in developing legislation. Existing hierarchical structures were assigned duties in developing ideas into proposed bills.

Further study needs to be done in analyzing the role of the commissioner in influencing subordinates to develop legislative policy. The commissioner directs all legislative matters within his department, but it is probable that subordinates present him with alternatives. What influences his choice of one alternative over another? Probable influences include members of his department, lobby organizations, other departments, and the governor's office.

Legislative processes within the various departments are continuous as legislation is not developed on the eve

of a legislative session. Policy development begins with an idea to correct existing legislation or to extend governmental programs into new areas.

The role of the governor is a positive one. The legislative process goes much deeper than the phrase "the governor as legislator." He relies upon the expertise of the administrative branch of government to develop and analyze bills passed during the legislative session.

An analysis of the attitudes of the chief policy developers reveals the following generalizations.

1. The chief policy developers reflected confidence in the bills initiated and drafted by their departments.
2. The chief policy developers believed the choice of authors was important for securing support for their bills.
3. In the choice of authors, the chief policy developers preferred the committee chairman for both major and minor legislation.
4. The legislators and the lobbyists were chosen as the strongest elements in securing support and approval for departmental legislation.
5. Most of the ideas for departmental legislation originated from personnel within the department.

Further research is needed since the conclusions reached here are based on one session of only one state legislature. Analyses are needed in terms of change to determine whether the role of administrators as legislative policy formulators varies from session to session and from state to state. This should create a stimulating area for future research.

References

- APPLEBY, P. H., 1949. *Policy and Administration*. University, University of Alabama Press.
- SIMON, H. A., SMITHBURG, D. W., and THOMPSON, V. A. 1950. *Public Administration*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Minnesota Department of Administration. 1960. Executive Branch of Minnesota State Government, Organization by Functional Area. Minnesota.
- JEWELL, M. E. 1962. *The State Legislature: Politics and Practice*. New York, Random House.