ABSTRACT
        The 3-year study examined the broad array of
practices colleges and universities employ to define their character
and determine future courses of action. Administrators at 256
institutions were surveyed regarding planning orientations and
perspectives. Additionally, site visits were made to 16 campuses,
where about 15 individuals were interviewed (e.g. trustee, chief
executive officer, administrator, and selected deans, department
chairs, and faculty). A few of the preliminary findings included:
current interest in planning has led nearly all of the campuses to
attempt formal planning processes over the past 15 years; and during
the past 10 to 15 years, 15 of the 16 institutions conducted or
initiated at least one formal activity designed to clarify mission
and goals and/or develop a clearer vision of their future. Some
preliminary speculations regarding the reasons planning did not
appear as successful as anticipated include: unrealistic expectations
about planning benefits; inaccurate assumptions about revealing
priorities and problems; and unrealistic reliance on predictions.
(SM)

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING:
Prescription vs. Practice

Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education
Atlanta, Georgia

November 5, 1989

Frank A. Schmidtlein

National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance
University of Maryland, College Park
Room 4114, CSS Building (224)
College Park, MD 20742-2411
(301) 454-1568

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A & M University
Department of Educational
   Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting
of the Association for the Study of Higher
Education held at the Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead
in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 1989. This
paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to
be of high quality and of interest to others
concerned with the research of higher education.
It has therefore been selected to be included
in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

14th Annual Conference • November 2-5, 1989

Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead • Atlanta, Georgia

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Prescription vs. Practice

For three years the Center's Institutional Planning Project has examined the broad array of practices colleges and universities employ to define their character and to determine future courses of action. The study included a survey of the planning orientations and perspectives of administrators at a sample of 256 institutions and site visits to 16 campuses, including four research universities (two public and two private), four independent colleges (two with a religious affiliation and two non-sectarian), four state universities or colleges and four public community colleges

Nature of the Study

Approximately 15 individuals were interviewed at each campus, including a trustee; the chief executive officer; chief academic, administrative, student services and development officers; institutional research/planning officer(s); and selected deans, department chairs and faculty. Project staff now are analyzing information collected during the study and preparing reports on their findings.

An initial review of literature on campus planning revealed
a high level of interest in the topic. However, the literature,
and practitioners comments, also suggested a gap might exist
between current beliefs about the merits of formal campus
planning processes and the availability of planning approaches or
guidelines with demonstrated usefulness. Most writings basically
were prescriptive advocacy for particular approaches based on
little or no systematic analysis of actual campus planning
environments and experiences. Generally, the literature
described proposed planning processes, little was written
evaluating the success of processes following their
implementation. One objective of the Center's study, therefore,
was to explore whether a gap between expectations and performance
existed, if it did why, and then to develop research-based
guidelines and recommendations for designing, implementing and
assessing campus planning processes. As evidence from the
project is being analyzed, some interesting findings are
emerging. A few of these findings are described below.

Interest in Planning

The site visits revealed that current interest in planning
had led nearly all of the campuses to attempt formal planning
processes over the past 15 years. The findings, however,
confirmed many of the doubts and concerns about higher education

planning. While all but one of the site visit campuses had tried
one or more formal campus-wide planning processes, none had
sustained a particular approach for more than two or three years.
More significantly, few interviewees could enumerate specific
outcomes or substantive benefits from the processes conducted at
their campuses. In fact, they were far more articulate when
discussing problems encountered in trying to plan and their
frustrations with burdens imposed by externally mandated
processes.

The Stimulus to Plan

The literature suggests planning is essential for
maintaining institutional health during times of changing
demographic and fiscal conditions. However, the reasons many
campuses undertook formal planning appeared considerably more
complex. In fact, two campuses most threatened by changing
trends and conditions, had devoted minimal attention to planning.
On the other hand two other campuses, both appearing vital and
well-situated to meet future challenges, recently had instituted
new planning efforts to avoid, as one president stated,
"complacency". At nine campuses current planning efforts could
be traced specifically to presidential initiatives. In
particular, new presidents tended to begin their tenure by
devoting considerable attention to formal planning activities.
Each of the four relatively new presidents were starting or

revising their planning efforts. External agencies were another
major impetus for planning, including state or district mandates,
Title III and other externally funded grant program requirements
and pressures from accrediting associations.

CHARACTER OF PLANNING PROCESSES

During the past ten to 15 years, 15 of the 16 institutions
had conducted or initiated at least one formal activity designed
to clarify their mission and goals and/or to develop a clearer
vision of their future. Furthermore, despite limited success
from most of these efforts, currently all but two of the campuses
were attempting some type of planning activity. Five campuses
had an administrative position that included "planning" in its
title and several additional campuses had designated planning as
a specific responsibility of a particular administrative officer.

Those interviewed identified formal institution-wide
planning processes as having taken place in the past, during the
terms of previous presidents or chancellors, at ten of the 16
campuses. Four of these planning efforts grew out of
requirements to obtain Title III grants. Two of them came about
because of multicampus system office planning requirements. In
four cases the planning processes were initiated by the current
presidents and in one case by a chief academic officer.

At the time of the interviews, all but two of the campuses were engaged in some type of institution-wide formal planning. In contrast to earlier efforts, five of these planning processes were in response to system requirements and nine were a result of presidential initiatives. One of these nine also was responding to accreditation requirements.

Role of the President in Planning

The presidents appeared to have a very influential role in initiating and determining the character of planning processes. There are difficulties and, perhaps, some dangers in trying to classify the roles of the presidents and their impacts on planning processes. One rather simplistic way to categorize them was by whether they were viewed by those interviewed as managing more in a collegial or in a paternalistic mode. Another was to classify them as to whether they were perceived to have a clear personal agenda for their institution or whether they appeared to form their agendas more in response to initiatives coming from others within or outside of their institutions.

Nine of the presidents were reputed to operate primarily in a collegial fashion. Seven of these presidents appeared to have a fairly well articulated sense of the directions in which they wanted their institution to proceed. Seven of the presidents generally were characterized as paternalistic. These two types

of presidential styles were divided evenly among the four types of institutions, except that three of the four state university presidents were considered generally to be collegial managers. Only two of the seven more paternalistic presidents appeared to have a clearly articulated sense of the directions in which their institution should be proceeding, both of them presidents of graduate research campuses.

The paternalistic presidents appeared to engage more frequently in operational or budget focused planning efforts and frequent complaints were encountered that they failed to address the more fundamental, strategic, issues confronting their institutions. Perhaps these presidents were more concerned about maintaining their influence in a highly decentralized and "loosely coupled" environment and, consequently, kept plans more to themselves to circumvent political opposition. By focusing on budget issues, budgets being a principal source of administrative power on most campuses, they probably were able to exert the most influence over their constituencies. The collegial presidents with an explicit agenda typically had their planning efforts coordinated through line officials, usually their chief academic officer. In most cases the chief academic officers used task forces or committees of various types to assist them. Campuses that had used representative committees, lead by faculty, to plan all found this approach to be unsuccessful.

When presidents left institutions the planning processes
employed during their tenures also soon ended. New presidents
all initiated new planning processes shortly after their arrival.
These processes sometimes appeared to serve both as a means for
them to learn about their new institutions and as a vehicle for
pursuing their visions for the campus.

Type of Planning

Institutional planning processes varied considerably both in
scope and process. They ranged from a presidential effort to
develop a "strategic vision" for the year 2010 to comprehensive
processes designed to produce detailed annual operational plans
to guide budget allocations. Participation in planning processes
also varied considerably with some campuses establishing broadly
representative committees while others relied heavily on the
president's staff, using information forwarded through existing
administrative structures. Some campuses used retreats to
clarify issues and directions. Some had substantial quantitative
information available and others had little. When planning was
geared primarily to meeting Title III or state agency demands,
institutional research officers, or other administrators,
generally took the major role in developing the documents, with
little involvement from other campus staff. Such "plans" did not
appear to have a significant role in internal campus decision
making.

The titles institutions used to describe their planning were not very indicative of what was taking place. The most common titles were long-range planning and strategic planning. Two campuses engaged in highly operational planning, to give guidance to budget decisions, but both termed their efforts strategic planning. Persons interviewed on these two campuses expressed frustration over the lack of attention given to more fundamental issues concerning the character of these campuses and the directions in which they were proceeding. One campus, going through the motions of system mandated planning, called it "master planning". The titles also did not reveal the considerable differences in how particular types of planning proceeded and were received.

The planning taking place at 12 of the institutions could be broadly characterized as strategic planning. They were addressing the missions of their campuses or enrollment and financial trends or were seeking areas of competitive advantage. One of these institutions also was implementing a three year rolling process of operational planning to guide development of budgets.

As noted earlier, the four relatively new presidents all were engaged in quite comprehensive planning processes. The presidents had articulated clearly their agendas and were making

1

extensive use of committees and task forces. In addition, one
other campus, with a president who had served six years and had a
well developed but not fully explicit agenda, was engaged in
comprehensive campus planning. However, this planning did not
have a separate structure, It took place through his chief
academic officer and deans and was decentralized. During his
presidency he reportedly had replaced at least ten deans with
persons who were reported to be committed to his style of
planning.

Two institutions, which were relatively financially secure
and had national reputations, both were engaged in new planning
initiatives aimed at avoiding complacency and risks of inaction.
One, a community college, was engaged in a campus-wide planning
project coordinated by a staff person working on her doctorate in
higher education with an emphasis on planning. The process
involved all campus units. At the other institution, a
graduate/research university, the president was discussing a
"vision" paper with his trustees and selected advisors prior to
releasing it for discussion with a broader campus audience. In
addition this campus had just revised its annual budget planning
process, creating a rolling three year operational planning
process designed to help set college and departmental budget
priorities. At three institutions their strategic planning was
largely pro forma responses to multicampus system requirements
for strategic plans. One of these campuses also was reacting to

accr .ditation requirements for evidence of planning. At another campus, which had failed to get a mission statement from a representative faculty committee that had toiled at the task for two and a half years, the president had created a top level administrative group to prepare such a statement in response to a short deadline from its state coordinating agency.

Impact of Planning

Project staff are doing additional work to assess the consequences of planning processes these institutions had conducted. However, the overwhelming majority of the comments offfered by those interviewed suggested that the performance of most of the processes that had been in operation for several years were rather disappointing. The exceptions were: 1) a prestigious community college in excellent financial condition that had identified, through a planning process, a long list of issue and then had acted on a considerable number of them; 2) a state university, experiencing conflict with state agencies over its mission, that was able, through its planning process, to gain acceptance of its mission and resolve a number of other issues such as improving recruitment of minority faculty (however, the president, reflecting on the turmoil and demands of the process was doubtful whether he would repeat it again during his tenure); and 3) another state university that had a system of departmental planning, based on meeting certain criteria, that was reported to

have identified and resolved some issues before the departments got more sophisticated and began writing plans that showed them meeting all criteria.

Five of the institutions appeared to have performed fairly successfully and had dealt effectively with many of the critical issues they confronted. However, their success did not appear to be related to formal planning processes. In fact two of these institutions had not engaged in formal institution-wide planning for a number of years. Four of these institutions were the graduate/research universities and one was a prestigious private liberal arts institution.

Three campus planning efforts were ended or interrupted by financial considerations. At one campus the planning process revealed the costs of an extensive building program the president was supporting. The president was believed to have ended the planning process at that point to avoid jeopardizing his building program. Reportedly the costs of the building program later resulted in holding down faculty salaries and increasing student/faculty ratios. At the other two institutions the discovery of serious financial problems derailed their planning efforts. At one of these campuses earlier planning apparently had failed either to reveal the growing financial crisis or, perhaps, to get agreement on actions needed to prevent its reaching crisis proportions. At the other campus planning had

just gotten underway when the crisis was discovered by a new chief finance officer.

At two campuses operational planning helped them to make budget decisions but considerable evidence suggested that they were not dealing with significant strategic issues. However, there were numerous complaints at these institutions about the time consuming paperwork involved in their operational planning processes, the inflexibility of the processes and how hard it was to get issues considered in a timely fashion. At two campuses fundamental disputes among faculty and administrators over the missions of the campuses were frustrating planning efforts. At two other institutions, with faculty unions, interviewees reported that union agreements and practices precluded productive faculty involvement in planning. Another unionized campus also reported some problems resulting from unionization.

Use of a representative planning committee, outside of normal campus decision making processes, did not appear to work well. Such committees frequently were accused of taking narrow perspectives, protecting their own "turfs" and failing to address divisive issues. Several presidents spoke of the problem of getting faculty "statesmen" on committees who could transcend their departmental and disciplinary interests.

In contrast to formal institution-wide planning processes,

which generally received a considerable amount of criticism,
those interviewed generally had considerable praise for planning
going on in units such as colleges, divisions and departments.
They were concerned about the possible lack of coherence of such
planning and problems of communication among units but generally
believed it to have been much more effective than campus-wide
planning efforts. As one person put it, "The individual
political processes generally result in decisions that reflect
collective interests. However, I would like to see a more
orderly process." This study did not systematically examine the
planning processes of campus units but the findings suggest it is
a fruitful area for inquiry.

Factors Affecting Campus Planning Processes

The persons interviewed nearly all supported the concept of
planning in principle but, when queried further, revealed a wide
variety of concerns and caveats about institution-wide formal
planning processes. One president who was conducting what
appeared likely to be a successful planning process utilizing
established line officials remarked that he did not believe in
formal planning but would never say so in public. Another person
remarked that their institution did lots of planning but "a big
elephant would trample through every so often and tear things
up." Many persons spoke of the uncertainties imposed by system
and state agencies. Others commented on the general

uncertainties of existence and the weaknesses of predictions.
Still others commented on the political nature of decisions and
problems of consensus. Some preliminary speculations regarding
the reasons planning did not appear as successful as anticipated
are presented below.

1. Faulty Assumptions Regarding Campus Governance
Processes. Some interviewed appeared to view planning primarily
as a "rational" means to eliminate or lessen "political"
influences on campus decisions. Their focus was on data
collection and analysis that could illuminate decisions on the
directions in which the campus should proceed and presumably
reduce conflicts over appropriate courses of action. Project
findings suggest that, at most campuses, those interviewed had a
reasonably good grasp of trends and events likely to affect their
campus. Their major problem was gaining consensus, both
internally and externally, on courses of action consistent with
their interpretations of the data and analyses. Power is highly
dispersed on most campuses with faculty having a major role in
decisions on academic matters and administrators having major
influence on budget allocations. In addition, external
constituencies and agencies have an important role in certain
decisions, particularly at public campuses. Consequently,
decisions typically involve reconciling many competing values and
interests. Planning processes too frequently appeared to be
designed to develop technically sophisticated plans without

sufficient attention given to the more difficult problem of
creating a consensus on the practical implications of the data.
Plans affect many vital interests of campus constituencies and
data alone are not likely to overcome significant resistance to
proposed courses of action. Those designing planning processes
must recognize that planning is one ingredient in campus
political processes, not a means to eliminate their effects.

   2. Unrealistic Expectations About Planning Benefits.
Virtually all faculty and department chairs interviewed saw
planning as a means to justify additional resources. However,
since their budgets typically increased incrementally, and only
occasionally did they obtain funding for significantly expanded
or new activities, planning was viewed as largely ineffective and
costly. Administrators, on the other hand, were upset with unit
plans that were "wish lists", unconstrained by realistic views of
available resources. Successful approaches to planning must find
ways to encourage unit creativity while avoiding unrealistic
expectations and disillusionment. Participants did note process
benefits from planning such as improving internal communication
and coordination. However, they frequently believed less
expensive and time consuming means could be found to achieve
these benefits.

   3. Inaccurate Assumptions About Revealing Priorities and
Problems. One result expected from effective planning is a

reconsideration of various campus activities priorities and, when
indicated, reallocating resources. Plans are expected to reveal
problem areas and propose solutions. Project findings suggest
that budgetary process politics make it highly unlikely units
voluntarily will propose plans that reduce their budgets. Even
when reductions appear inevitable bargaining takes place to
obtain _quid_ _pro_ _quos_. Similarly, units are unlikely to document
significant problems.that may become public. They fear, probably
correctly, that the press, politicians and the public will gain
inflated impressions of a problem's significance without
balancing them against their strengths. Competitors, who may not
be so forthcoming, consequently, may utilize such negative
information in resource competitions. This finding suggests that
"bottom up" planning and "open" consideration of problems and
potential areas for reallocation have limitations.

4.   _Unrealistic Reliance on Predictions_. Those interviewed
initially expressed strong support for planning. However, as
they reflected further, they emphasized difficulties in
predicting future conditions. Given these uncertainties, they
placed considerable importance on reacting promptly to emerging
conditions. They valued an ability to implement new ideas
quickly, without delays for amendments to plans or lengthy
justifications for departures from earlier directions. They
appeared to seek a balance between time devoted to formally
examining new directions and maintaining flexibility to react

quickly to new opportunities or problems. Some saw plans as an impediment to the opportunism needed for effective entrepreneurship. These observations suggest that planning processes need to be flexible enough to accommodate issues arising at various times during cycles. They must balance maintaining some consistency in general directions against overly rigid adherence to outdated earlier prescriptions.

Implications for Practice

This paper does not deal directly with the most important questions coming out of the study, namely what approaches should be taken by institutions attempting to deal with questions about their mission, what directions they should be taking and what are the best means to accomplish these objectives. Overall findings from the Project will be published together with recommendations for improving current practices. Other project staff publications reporting on this study are cited in our Center's publication lists.