INFORMATION TO USERS

8202466

LAHR, LELAND ALLEN

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LONG RANGE PLANNING AT SELECTED INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Michigan State University   PH.D.   1981

University
Microfilms
International   300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LONG RANGE PLANNING

AT SELECTED INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

By

Leland Allen Lahr

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1981

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LONG RANGE PLANNING
AT SELECTED INDEPENDENT COLLEGES
IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

By

Leland Allen Lahr

Problem - Smaller colleges are predominant in the private
sector of higher education in Michigan, are resources important to
the state, and are vulnerable to the problems which are expected to
face American higher education for the next decade. Many authori-
ties in higher education administration regard long range planning
as an effective means by which colleges can deal with these prob-
lems. Various planning techniques, models, and systems have been
developed but must be modified in order to effectively serve insti-
tutions which differ in type and scale. Such modifications are to
be based upon the planning currently conducted at these colleges.
However, relatively little has been reported about long range
planning at independent colleges in Michigan.

Purpose - To characterize long range planning at a sub-
stantial proportion of the independent colleges in Michigan by com-
paring long range planning processes, organizations, attitudes, and
issues at these subject institutions.

Background - Studies by Shoemaker and by Palola and Padgett
developed frameworks for differentiating the planning approaches of
colleges and universities. These studies described the planning

conducted at selected American institutions and concluded that institutional planning of a decade ago was typically expedient, unsystematic, and operational rather than substantive, systematic and comprehensive.

Method - A questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions was used to collect data from a randomly chosen sample of 20 of the 47 independent colleges in Michigan. The respondents were the chief planning officers of these colleges. Responses provided descriptions of the long range planning processes, organizations, issues, and attitudes at the subject colleges. Long range planning at six of the colleges was examined more intensively in separate case studies. The study was not concerned with evaluating the effectiveness of institutional planning.

Analysis - Questionnaire responses were interpreted as reflective of informal or formalized approaches to long range planning. The characteristics of the cluster of colleges perceived as informal planners were compared to the characteristics of the cluster of colleges perceived as formal planners.

Conclusions and Recommendations - Descriptors of structure and process provide definitive characterizations of institutional long range planning. Agencies assisting independent colleges might benefit from the use of instruments which analyze the long range planning of a college and compare its structure and process with similar institutions. Attitudes affect the status given long range planning as an administrative function. Studies dealing specifically with the relationships of administrator attitudes and

planning are suggested. Independent colleges are increasingly re-
ceptive to long range planning but appear reluctant to accept stand-
ardized planning systems. Organizations which promote institutional
planning should consider the development of programs which foster
generation of long range planning by individual colleges rather than
the installation of packaged systems at the colleges. Social values
as well as administrative values appear to be derived from long
range planning at colleges. Formalized long range planning was also
viewed as a significant factor in resolution of financial problems
at several colleges. However, these findings should be regarded as
hypotheses to be tested in future study.

To Julie, my steadfast partner in endeavors

good and joyful

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF EXHIBITS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Planning is generally regarded as a primary function of management. As LeBreton and Henning point out, there is no unanimity in the literature as to the best way to describe what managers do, but there is substantial agreement among scholars and practitioners that planning is one of the essential functions of management.[1] It is, therefore, understandable that aspects of planning have been under careful examination.

The time dimension of planning draws considerable attention. As the chief executive at General Electric, Ralph Cordiner raised the status of long range planning a quarter of a century ago when he suggested that planning for the long term was a new horizon, a new frontier for the professional manager. To Cordiner, the quickening pace of change and the growth of uncertainty added urgency to the call for long range planning as an area of managerial activity.

> In a time of radical world wide change, when every day introduces new elements of uncertainty, forward planning may seem to be nearly impossible -- an exercise in futility. Yet there never was a more urgent

---

[1] Preston P. LeBreton and Dale A. Henning, Planning Theory, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961 p. 3.

> need for long-range planning on the part of
> every business, and indeed every other
> important element of our national life.[2]

Where Cordiner urged managers of 20 years ago to conduct long range planning, Ross and Kami asserted in 1973 that long range planning was the first of the Ten Commandments of Management.[3] Examinations of the decline of several large American business firms led Ross and Kami to conclude that the lack of strategic long range planning contributed significantly to decline and failure.

> ... Many companies are so busy with today's
> short-run problems -- tactics -- that adequate
> attention is not given to longer-run strategy.
> This is bad! It is typical of the mediocre
> company.[4]

Business firms are not the only organizations in America facing difficulty and experiencing decline. Institutions of higher education, especially private colleges and universities, are encountering what has been dubbed "the New Depression."[5] The number of Americans of traditional college age is declining. College operating costs are rising more rapidly than college

2 Ralph Cordiner, New Frontiers for Professional Managers, New York, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956, p. 82.

3 Joel E. Ross and Michael J. Kami, Corporate Management in Crisis: Why the Mighty Fall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973, p. 21.

4 Ibid., p. 133.

5 Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

revenues. Between 1965 and 1977, more than 170 private colleges closed their doors.[6]

In the opinion of many authorities on higher education administration, planning is the key to the viability of colleges and universities. Eurich and Tickton argue "that planning is the only method by which colleges and universities can reasonably expect to come to terms with the financial, social, and political crises of our times."[7] Though they recommend planning for higher education, Eurich and Tickton suggest that planning, especially long range planning, is uncommon or unsystematic at the typical American college.

Another advocate, Daniel Pilon, asserts that long range planning is appropriate for institutions of higher education because the alternative is often unacceptable.

> ... For example, planning can make institutional change a gradual and deliberate process... The alternative is for a college to wake up one morning facing the cumulative effects of the situation, see a major crisis, and reach quickly for the less than pleasant tools of abrupt retrenchment....[8]

In addition to what he sees as internal justification for planning, Pilon points out that external elements are pressing for

---

6   Donald L. Pyke, "The Future of Higher Education: Will Private Institutions Disappear in the U.S.?," The Futurist, December 1977, p. 374.

7   Alvin C. Eurich and Signey G. Tickton, Long Range Planning and Budgeting at Colleges and Universities, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1972, p. 14.

8   Daniel H. Pilon, A Planning Approach for Small Colleges, Small College Consortium, Washington, D.C., 1977, p. 2.

more planning on the college campus. Accrediting agencies allude to the importance of planning in their accrediting reviews. External sources of financial support often demand that colleges reveal their planning before the financial requests are considered.

Planning would yield the greatest benefits to the smaller institutions in the view of Bruce Fuller. He claims that the value of planning varies inversely with the amount of resource available to the institution. Since colleges and universities are economic entities, he concludes they would all benefit from planning, but smaller institutions with relatively scant resource stand to gain the most.[9]

Private institutions of higher education appear not only to possess scant resource but also to be extremely vulnerable. Minter and Bowen report that weaknesses other than financial are developing in the independent sector of higher education. Capital, both human and non-human, is being spent without replacement. In time, independent colleges and universities may find that they possess inadequate, obsolete, or inoperative plant and equipment. Minter and Bowen suggest that, even worse, private institutions may lose "the greatest asset of all, capable people," from faculty and staff.[10]

---

[9] Bruce Fuller, "A Framework for Academic Planning," Journal of Higher Education, January 1976, pp. 65-77.

[10] W. John Minter and Howard R. Bowen, Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education, 1978, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., p. 111.

This background material readily yields two conclusions. First, many of those who study institutions of higher education believe that severe and persisting problems exist for America's colleges and universities, especially the independent institutions. Second, many who study higher education administration believe that colleges and universities will be able to cope with these severe and persisting problems only when long range planning is conducted at these institutions.

In this background discussion it is appropriate to include the substantial contributions which have been made to the development of planning tools, techniques, systems, and approaches for specific use by colleges and universities. Among the most noteworthy are the efforts of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. For a decade, this organization has conducted research aimed at improving the planning process at colleges and universities. While much of its original study focused on larger institutions, the Center has adapted management tools and models to the small campus setting and has made research findings available to America's smaller institutions of higher education.

Other organizations and many individuals have directed their attention in recent years to the subject of planning at colleges and universities. In 1968, Vaccaro and Peterson advanced two planning approaches which the authors felt could be afforded

and adopted by colleges, large or small.[11] In 1969 the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia published John Bolin's booklet, <u>Institutional Long-Range Planning</u>.[12] Another booklet, <u>Long-Range Planning and Budgeting</u> by Eurich and Tickton,[13] was offered by the Academy for Educational Development in 1972. The on-going study of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges produced <u>A Systems Approach to College Administration and Planning</u> by Shoemaker[14] and <u>A Planning Approach for Small Colleges</u> by Pilon.[15] The Phelps-Stokes Fund supported the development of a long range planning model by Parekh;[16] and in 1975 the National Association of College and University Business Officers published what that organization referred to as a practical guide to college planning.[17] This overview

---

[11] L. C. Vaccaro and R. Peterson, "Two Approaches to Planning that Small Colleges Can Afford and Large Ones Can Adopt," <u>College and University Business</u>, 45 (November 1968).

[12] John G. Bolin, <u>Institutional Long-Range Planning</u>, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1969.

[13] Alvin C. Eurich and Sidney G. Tickton, <u>Long-Range Planning and Budgeting at Colleges and Universities</u>, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1972.

[14] William A. Shoemaker, <u>A Systems Approach to College Administration and Planning</u>, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1973.

[15] Daniel H. Pilon, <u>A Planning Approach for Small Colleges</u>, Small College Consortium, Washington, D.C., 1977.

[16] Satish B. Parekh, <u>A Long Range Planning Model for Colleges and Universities</u>, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, 1975.

[17] NACUBO, <u>A College Planning Cycle, People, Resources, Process: A Practical Guide</u>, National Association of College and University Business Officers, Washington, D.C., 1975.

of the literature suggests that a variety of aids to systematic long range planning exist and are readily available to institutions of higher education.

Statement of the Problem

The assertion has been made that long range planning has great value for colleges and universities, especially the smaller independent institutions. However, relatively little has been reported regarding the long range planning actually conducted at such institutions. Considerable resource has been expended in the development of planning tools and approaches for situations peculiar to the smaller independent institutions. Yet relatively little is known about the extent to which these planning concepts have been accepted by these institutions and incorporated in the managerial process. Similarly, little is known about how smaller independent institutions look upon the planning aids developed and advanced by such organizations as the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, and the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

In Michigan there are 52 non-public colleges and universities. Of these, only five institutions had headcount enrollments greater than 2,500 students in 1979-1980. Of the 47 institutions with headcount enrollments of less than 2,500 students, 32 institutions had enrollments of less than 1,000 students. By contrast, only 24 public colleges and universities

in Michigan had headcount enrollments below 2,500 students; and only two of these 24 institutions had headcount enrollments of less than 2,000 students. There are 30 public colleges and universities in Michigan with headcount enrollments of over 2,500 students.[18]

The implication is clear: smaller institutions are predominant in the independent sector of higher education in Michigan. If it is assumed that these institutions represent a valuable educational resource to Michigan, then it would appear appropriate to search for means and methods which would help these institutions to enhance their viability. If there is acceptance of the notion that systematic long range planning at these institutions enhances their viability, then it may be regarded as worthwhile to improve the conduct of long range planning at Michigan independent colleges and universities. However, it would seem inappropriate to attempt to make improvements when so little is known about long range planning as it is practiced and perceived by independent colleges and universities in Michigan. At present, relatively little has been reported about who or what initiates long range planning at these institutions or about what tasks in the long range planning process are performed by which members of these college communities.

---

[18] *1979-80 Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, Michigan Department of Education,* Lansing, Michigan.

Focus of the Study

Independent colleges and universities are subject institutions of this study, and it is long range planning at these institutions which is central. Three aspects of long range planning are drawn into focus. First is the structure of the human organization involved in long range planning at each institution studied. The second aspect is that of the long range planning process at each subject institution. The third aspect examined is each institution's attitude toward long range planning. The structure, the process, and the attitude associated with long range planning at each institution are characterized so that long range planning at the several different institutions under study can be compared.

Significance of the Study

A notion advanced by Pilon and other authorities is that the planning process should be tailored to fit specific institutions.[19] A number of agencies and professional organizations are prepared to "tailor" planning at independent colleges and universities in Michigan. However, measurements are needed if a "comfortable fit" is to be achieved. This study seeks to fulfill this need by way of a comparative study of long range planning at such institutions. These comparisons are expected to

---

[19] Charles B. Saunders and Francis D. Tuggle, "Why Planners Don't," Long Range Planning, Vol. 10, June 1977, pp. 19-24.

yield a clearer understanding of long range planning in higher education and also to provide an analytical framework which characterizes institutions in terms which can be used to make long range planning more effective at those institutions.

The following values are sought from the study: (1) it would provide information not currently available relative to long range planning as an important aspects of higher education administration; (2) the study would provide a base of comparative research data which could serve as a foundation for subsequent conclusive research in higher education administration; (3) it would provide information which could be useful to associations and governmental agencies as they assist Michigan independent colleges and universities; and (4) it would provide information which could help research organizations to gain acceptance of new management concepts and systems by smaller independent colleges and universities.

Definition of Terms

At this point it is appropriate to define a few of the terms used throughout the study. Other terms which need definition are not included in the listing which directly follows because it was considered that these other terms would be more appropriately defined when they are introduced and/or by the context in which they are used.

Long Range refers to a time so far into the future that the conditions and characteristics of that time can be portrayed with

confidence in only general terms. By contrast, the "short range" refers to a future time near enough to the present that the conditions and characteristics of that time period are developed with confidence in specific detail. What might be regarded as "long range" at one institution might be called "short range" at another institution, and the perception of what constitutes the "long range" may provide a significant base for institutional comparison. In the literature, the "long range" is designated as a period of time at least five years into the future.

Planning is defined as a process of study and anticipation which generates guidelines for courses of action which are intended to lead to the achievement of organizational objectives. The concept of planning is developed more fully in the review of the literature in Chapter II.

Independent College is to designate an institution of higher education which is owned and controlled by private, non-public parties. By contrast, public institutions are owned and controlled by government. College refers to a degree granting institution of higher education, generally offering only one type of degree, such as a bachelor of arts degree. This institution is distinguished from the university which is to be regarded as a collection of colleges, each awarding its own degree.

Limitations and Delimitations

The major limitation of this study is the dependence upon the perceptions and insights of the respondents for descriptions of

long range planning at the respective institutions. Since the respondents are chief planning officers at their institutions, it may be reasonably assumed that these officers would be among those most familiar with long range planning and long range plans at their institutions. However, it is recognized that other members of a specific college's community might be more fully aware of the long range planning than the chief executive of that specific college.

Other limitations of the study pertain to the study sample and the survey instrument. These limitations are:

1. The sample, though it constitutes 40 percent of the surveyed population, numbers only 20 institutions and may not be regarded as necessarily representative of the universe of independent colleges in Michigan.

2. The survey instrument is not standardized. Therefore, the study is limited to the extent to which the survey instrument elicits and identifies significant aspects of long range planning at the institutions surveyed.

3. The study is also limited by the reliability of the survey instrument and by the methods used in developing comparisons of the institutions.

Several other factors delimit the study. First, the scope of the study was determined through a search of the literature available through the library of Michigan State University, the consortium of Michigan libraries, and ERIC. The boundaries of the study were also established to include only independent colleges in

the State of Michigan. Finally, the study was delimited to the responses of 20 colleges selected from independent colleges in the state.

The Study Design

The objective of this study is to characterize long range planning at several independent colleges in Michigan in such ways as to provide a better understanding of long range planning needs and problems at independent institutions. It is intended that this understanding would provide a basis for future administrative research; and it is hoped that this in turn will help institutions, like Michigan State University, and agencies, like Michigan's Department of Education, develop programs of assistance to independent colleges and universities.

In this dissertation, characterization is accomplished by way of comparing the extents to which the different colleges have formalized long range planning at their respective institutions. This comparison is based on the concept of a continuum extending from long range planning which is described as informal, unsystematic, and unstructured to long range planning which is regarded as formalized, systematic, and highly structured. This concept is suggested in long range planning studies conducted by Saunders and Tuggle,[20] who used the terms "low level planning" and "high level planning" to denote end points on a descriptive

---

[20] Charles B. Saunders and Francis D. Tuggle, "Why Planners Don't," Long Range Planning, Vol. 10, June 1977, pp. 19-24.

continuum. To avoid the suggestion of judgment or evaluation, tnis study uses the term "informal" in the place of "low level planning" and the term "formalized" as a substitute for "high level planning."

The terms, "informal" and "formalized," are contrasting and not absolute designations. The study, through surveys of college administrators, searches for indicators of the tendencies of the institutions to "formalize" long range planning or to take an "informal" approach to long range planning. It may be expected that institutions will present a mix of indicators. Some aspects of a certain college's long range planning may indicate tendencies toward "formalization" while still other aspects may indicate tendencies toward an "informal" approach to long range planning. Following is a list and brief discussion of the principal indicators used in the study.

1. Planning Organization Structure

A tendency toward an informal approach to long range planning (ILRP) is indicated when a college has no designated planning organization or when the planning group has an ad hoc character. Membership on a planning team may change quickly, unexpectedly; and a specific procedure for choosing a planning team may not exist. Also, the roles of the planning team members are unclear; and "experts" or "specialists" who could contribute to planning have only tangential relationships with the planning team.

A tendency toward <u>formalized</u> long range planning (FLRP) is indicated when the structure of the planning organization is known by various segments of the college community, when there is a stated procedure for selection of members of the planning team, and when the relationships of the planning group to other elements of the college are clearly understood. Also FLRP is indicated where specific roles have been established for members of the planning team, and the team may be designated as a planning committee, a planning office, or a planning department.

2. Planning Process and Practice

An ILRP tendency is indicated at a college where no statement has been made as to the planning tasks to be performed, where there is no general understanding as to what steps are to be taken in planning, or where the planning tasks are taken at the direction of one member of the college community, a member who "quarterbacks" the planning process.

In contrast, an FLRP tendency is indicated at a college where a statement has been made as to what planning tasks are to be performed, where

a planning routine exists, and where a "game plan" for planning is generally known to parties in planning.

3. Initiating Event

    ILRP is indicated at institutions where long range planning is conducted irregularly, where such planning is initiated in response to the emergence of a crisis, or in anticipation of a problem situation, or at the insistence of some group, such as an accrediting agency. FLRP is indicated at institutions where long range planning is conducted regularly, where such planning is included as part of the college routine and is initiated by the passage of time.

4. Planning Focus

    ILRP is indicated when the planners focus on the functional units of the college, when the concern is for modification of the operating characteristics of the physical plant and instructional departments. FLRP is indicated when the planners focus on the institution as a systemic whole and when the concern is for modification of the institution to meet the needs of a changing society.

5. Planning Horizon

ILRP is indicated at colleges where the time
projection varies so that planners may generally
use a five year horizon but occasionally use a
shorter horizon. FLRP is indicated at insti-
tutions by the consistent use of a time pro-
jection of five years or more.

6. Planning Data

ILRP is indicated at a college when planners
draw upon different data sources each planning
period, when the data used are drawn solely from
campus sources, when no data are gathered
specifically for the planning team but instead
are "borrowed" from data sources developed to
meet other institutional needs. FLRP is
indicated at a college when planners draw
regularly upon the same data sources, when data
are presented in forms appropriate to the
planning process, and when planners frequently
draw upon off-campus data sources, especially for
institutional comparisons.

7. Planning Objectives

ILRP is indicated at a college when the aim
of long range planning is to improve upon the
operating efficiency of functioning departments,
to provide a means for centralizing control over

the college, or to allocate resources through an extended capital budget. FLRP is indicated at a college when the aim of long range planning is to improve upon operating efficiency of the overall institution, to provide a means for continual redefinition of the role of the institution in society, or to create an arena for discussion which leads to concensus among the many elements of a college community.

8. Planning Framework

ILRP is indicated when the long range plans of a college are framed as directives for specific action, when directives relate to operating components of the institution, and when interaction and interdependence of operating departments are not explicit. FLRP is indicated when the long range plans of a college are framed as guidelines for decision-making, as descriptions of the thrust of the institution, as specification of the interaction and interdependence of component units at the college.

9. Planning Disclosure

ILRP is indicated at a college where long range plans are seldom disclosed to either the campus community or the general public. Knowledge of the content of long range plans is

restricted to higher levels of administration and to the governing board. Written statements of these plans are often limited to memoranda and to minutes of the meetings of the governing board. FLRP is indicated at a college where the content of long range plans is regularly reported to the college community and often disclosed to the general public. These plans are commonly revealed in written announcements made available to interested parties through the office of the chief executive.

10. Planning Impact

ILRP is indicated at a college where the impact is uneven because long range plans are revealed slowly to different units of the institution as the top administration determines when and what these units need to know, where long range plans are statements intended to satisfy off-campus groups, or where long range plans include directives which appear to affect only some of the institution's departments. FLRP is indicated at a college where long range plans are widely know, where these plans are understood as general directives which immediately affect decision-making, especially in terms of budgeting and personnel.

The design of this study uses a two-stage survey of independent colleges and their tendencies toward informal and formalized long range planning. In the first stage, a sample of 20 private colleges in Michigan was surveyed by way of interviews with the chief planning officers of these colleges. A questionnaire was completed in personal interviews with these officers, and the responses on the questionnaire provide indicators of each college's tendencies toward ILRP or FLRP.

The second stage of the investigation involved reviewing six of the 20 institutions - the three colleges with the most indicators of a tendency toward FLRP. The second survey compares these two groups of colleges in detail. The objective is to determine if other characteristics of an institution and its societal environment can be commonly associated with institutions classified by either informal or formalized long range planning.

The second stage was conducted as a case study of each of the six colleges. An overview of the areas of interest probed by the second stage of the study are given below.

- Institutional data: size, programs, governance.

- Institutional history, mission, trends, tendencies.

- Critical concerns, problems, opportunities, prospects.

- The leadership style at the institution.

- The value of long range planning as perceived by various members of the college community.

- Planning practices as viewed by different members of the college community.

- Views on the planning models and systems developed by interested professional groups.

The responses of administrators at 20 independent colleges to the questionnaire and the case descriptions of long range planning at six of these colleges serve as the basis for the comparative study presented in this dissertation.

The Study Procedure

The basic instrument in the first stage of the study was a 50-item questionnaire which is examined in detail in Chapter III. Before it was used, the questionnaire was submitted for critical review to three authorities on both higher education and survey research. In light of the reviews, the questionnaire was modified; and a pretest of the instrument was conducted using chief planning officers from two independent institutions.

The colleges surveyed in the study were chosen on a random basis. The names of 20 colleges were chosen from a universe of 50 independent Michigan colleges. Arrangements were made to interview the chief planning officers of these randomly selected institutions. When an interview could not be arranged with the chief planning executive at a selected college, a substitute college was ramdomly drawn until interviews had been conducted at 20 independent Michigan colleges.

The survey questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews with the chief planning officers of these selected institutions. The interview responses were kept confidential; no

individual responses are reported. No names of either officers or institutions are given in the body of the final study report. Only in the acknowledgements are the cooperating colleges cited by name.

Whenever permitted by respondents, tape recordings were made of the interviews so that written versions of the responses could be validated. A three-member panel examined the responses and judged which responses indicated tendencies toward ILRP (informal), which indicated tendencies toward FLRP (formalized), and which responses gave no indication of tendency. The panel members are familiar with institutions of higher education. Two members hold doctorates in Education, the third is a doctoral student in Higher Education. All three members have years of employment on college staffs. In order that they have approximately the same under-standing of the study instrument, the panel members studied the indicators discussed on pages 14-19 of this dissertation and in Appendix B-1.

Independently the panel members evaluated the interview responses. Then the evaluations were compiled so as to develop an ordinal scale which placed toward one end those colleges perceived to have a relatively informal approach to long range planning and toward the other end of the scale those colleges perceived to have a relatively formalized approach to long range planning. The three colleges at each end of the ranking are to be examined further in the second stage of the study. (The ordinal rankings are given in Chapter IV.) Since the objective of the study is to compare aspects of long range planning at institutions within the

sample, the use of inferential statistical analyses was not warranted.

In the second stage, the six colleges were examined in greater depth. The objective of this stage is to characterize in considerable detail the long range planning of each of the six institutions so as to develop contrasts and comparisons. The basic study instrument used has an open-ended structure and is presented in Appendix A-1. This instrument guided the interviews of the second stage. In addition, materials describing the college and its long range planning were gathered. The procedures of the conduct of the second stage are detailed in Chapter III. The findings of the second stage provide the base for the case study characterizations which appear in Chapter IV. The conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the study are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is presented in three sections. The first section reviews literature concerned with planning as a managerial function and with long range planning as an important and developing subject of management study. Differing concepts of the long range planning process and organization are presented. Definitions are developed which are relevant to the study presented in this dissertation.

The second section provides an overview of the literature dealing with the long range planning for institutions of higher education. This section examines a variety of views taken with respect to long range planning for colleges and universities. For some authorities, long range planning represents a response to existing and emerging problems which confront these institutions. Other writers view long range planning only as it relates to certain aspects of the campus rather than to the institution as a whole. The literature also shows contributions made by the disciplines of economics, mathematics, and the management sciences to the development of long range planning as an institutional function.

The third section reviews literature which discusses previous studies of long range planning in social organizations. The

24

principal interest of this review is presentation of methodology rather than research findings. These study projects were conducted in both business and in institutional settings and provide a conceptual base for the comparative study presented in this dissertation.

Literature Review of Planning
as a Management Function

Several approaches have been taken to structuring management thought. One approach is to view management as a system of functions, a set of actions or activities which are appropriate to and characteristic of management. This functionalist approach emphasizes that management functions are so interrelated and interactive that these functions constitute an operating entity. Nevertheless, the functionalists also assert that the understanding of management can be advanced when functions are studied as though they were separable and independent.[1]

The first formulation of a comprehensive set of managerial functions is attributed to Henri Fayol and was first published in 1925. Fayol considered the managerial functions to be planning, organizing, coordinating, commanding, and controlling.[2] In over 50 years since Fayol's publication, other scholars have offered

---

[1] John B. Miner, Management Theory, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1971, pp. 72-73.

[2] Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Limited, London, 1949, Chapter 5.

alternative lists of management functions; and while the lists differ somewhat, nearly all lists include planning.[3]

To Fayol, planning meant "to assess the future and make provision for it."[4] Subsequent definitions of the management function of planning include these two elements of the Fayol definition. The major differences between Fayol's concise definition and longer definitions which followed may be explained as expansions or elaborations of these two elements. Planning is conducted because management wishes certain outcomes to occur in the future. As Koontz and O'Donnel observe,

> Planning bridges the gap from where we are to where we want to go. It makes it possible for things to occur which would not otherwise happen. Although the exact future can seldom be predicted and factors beyond control may interfere with the best-laid plans, without planning events are left to chance.[5]

The justification for planning is found in the assumption that management can do something to effect the future, at least partially, so that the future state would more closely approximate a desired state.

To many management scholars, "assessment of the future" represents an extensive effort. To Brian Scott, for example, the

---

[3] John B. Miner, op. cit., p. 71.

[4] Henri Fayol, op. cit., p. 43.

[5] Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, Principles of Management, Fourth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1968, p. 8.

effort begins with evaluation of current conditions and self-appraisal and continues with the establishment of planning assumptions, the forecasting of future conditions with special attention to possible changes, and the determination of desired objectives in the context of the expected future.[6]

Other contributors to the literature have focused their attention on forecasting as an integral part of planning. Often the concern has been on forecasting techniques rather than the entire process of planning.[7] But Drucker cautions that planning should not be construed as forecasting.

> ... Why forecasting is not strategic planning is that forecasting attempts to find the most probable course of events or, at best, a range of probabilities. But the entrepreneurial problem is the unique event that will change the possibilities.[8]

Thus, Drucker asserts that the "assessment of the future" is more than forecasting what the future state probably will be; managers are also to assess the future in terms of what range of states is possible if organizations make provisions for the future. Differences appear in the literature as to how specific these "provisions" should be.

6   Brian W. Scott, Long-Range Planning in American Industry, American Management Association, New York, 1965. (See Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8.)

7   J. C. Shubin, Managerial and Industrial Economics, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1961. (See Part IV, "Forecasting and Long Range Business Planning.)

8   Peter F. Drucker, Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices, Harper and Row, New York, 1974, p. 124.

Koontz and O'Donnell assert that planning should produce specific strategies and plans.

> Planning is thus an intellectual process, the conscious determination of courses of action, the basing of decision on purpose, facts, and considered estimates.[9]

Similar is the position of LeBreton and Henning, who characterize the role of planning in terms of preparation of plans. To them it is useful to describe the planning function by way of component tasks:

> -- establishing objectives and goals
> -- determining policies and procedures
> -- preparing necessary plans for meeting
> -- stated objectives and goals.
> -- implementing plans[10]

A contrasting view in the literature is expressed by those authors who suggest that the planning process has value for an organization even when no specific courses of action have been generated. Ewing asserts that in many organizations planning is "a technique of so guiding people in the organization that their actions will affect the future in a consistent and desired way."[11] To Ewing, effective planning is incomplete planning; and he suggests that detail or specification may have "a retarding, dragging influence on a program of action rather than a lubricating influence.[12]

---

[9] Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, op. cit., p. 81.

[10] Preston P. LeBreton and Dale A. Henning, Planning Theory, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961, pp. 4-7.

[11] David W. Ewing, The Human Side of Planning, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1969, pp. 195-196.

[12] Ibid., p. 198.

Ewing proposes that the best amount of detail is "roughly proportional to the organization's experience in planning."[13]

In a similar argument, John L. McGruder, a former director of planning for the Atomic Energy Commission, expresses the opinion that the greatest value of planning is derived from the partici-pation of many people in the process.[14] This belief is presented by Ewing in his seventh "law" of planning, which states that "the act of planning itself changes the situation in which the organization operates."

> This law...means that managers can alter conditions that affect the progress of their programs--can actually change the odds of success--by involving people in such routine planning activities as discussing what programs are desirable, pondering who should carry out the programs and when, gathering data for such questions, leading the organization to reach an understanding about goals and programs, and leading people to make personal commitments to projects.[15]

Ewing's statement reflects a thrust in planning literature. The notion is that planning has value in and of itself. This notion was tersely stated by Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Plans are nothing; planning is everything."[16] It is asserted

---

[13] Ibid., p. 200.

[14] Managerial Long Range Planning, George A. Steiner, Editor, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963, p. 75.

[15] David W. Ewing, op. cit.,.p. 206.

[16] Quoted by Phillip Kotler, Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, and Control, Fourth Edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, p. 241.

that planning should not be viewed solely as a generator of plans and that a variety of values derive from planning.

Among the management scholars holding this view is Bernard Taylor, editor of the British publication Long Range Planning. Taylor suggests that planning has several dimensions, each providing a different view of and justification for planning.

The traditional view, according to Bernard Taylor, is of planning as a framework for central control. Such a view may be appropriate for large bureaucratic organizations, Taylor points out; but planning can deteriorate to bureaucratic routine. He asserts that planning viewed as a central control system will seldom be satisfying to the organization and some other complementary view of planning will generally be needed also.[17]

Taylor advances four other complementary views of planning The process of planning can be employed as a "framework for innovation." Human organization existing in a fast changing environment may utilize planning as a stimulus and a mechanism for self renewal, a means of adapting the organization to dynamic situations.

> In certain firms, at certain times top management are able through Corporate Planning to foster innovation in an enterprise, to stimulate creativity in various parts of the organization, and to use these ideas to build the business and in the process open up new opportunities for the individuals or groups concerned and for company employees generally.[18]

---

[17] Bernard Taylor, "New Dimensions in Corporate Planning," Long Range Planning, December, 1976, pp. 81-87.

[18] Ibid., p. 88.

Another view of planning is as a social learning process. This view may be particularly important to organizations which lack clarity of purpose and of lines of command. Public institutions and service organizations which rely upon a concensus approach to management may find this view an appropriate complement to the view of planning as a rational system for organizational control. Taylor points out that planning as a social learning process may be the most rational view of planning for some human organizations, among them institutions of learning. The value of planning to such groups lies with its capacity to provide a framework in which the groups can develop a better understanding of the human systems in which they participate and of the environments in which the human systems operate.[19]

The third complementary view of planning offered by Bernard Taylor characterizes planning as a political process. This view recognizes that both internal and external groups exert forces which impact upon the organization and that the planning process provides a framework for the formation of coalitions of power groups. Taylor suggests that comprehensive, rational, long range planning may be unrealistic for organizations which require the support of a variety of interest groups which possess conflicting values and aspirations. The planning process, for such an organization, is a means of forming a coalition on specific issues and by careful negotiation.[20]

---

[19] Ibid., pp. 89-91.

[20] Ibid., pp. 91-98.

The final view advanced by Bernard Taylor takes the position that planning is an examination of conflict of values, an arena in which the goals and purposes of the organization can be reviewed. This view emphasizes that planning is normative in addition to being descriptive, that planning is primarily the deliberation of changes which should be effected rather than the designation of organizational activities to be performed.

> Planning at the highest level is not just about improving efficiency or choosing strategies, it concerns the development within the individual enterprise and in society of cultures which can claim the allegiance of employees and which are accepted as socially useful by the community at large.
>
> It is also concerned with an attempt to influence the shape of the world in which we will live tomorrow.[21]

As perceived by Bernard Taylor, planning is multi-dimensional. If his perception is accepted as premise, then planning as a managerial function may be performed for a variety of reasons. To assume that the value of planning lies in the quality of plans generated by planning would then not only understate the value of planning, it would misstate the value of planning.

The views on planning of such scholars as Bernard Taylor and David Ewing are given considerable attention in this dissertation for two reasons. First, these views are untraditional in that they are more concerned with behavioral and social aspects of planning than with the functional aspects of planning. Second,

---

[21] Ibid., p. 104.

these views indicate the contributions to an understanding of planning which may be made by other disciplines such as sociology, social psychology, political science, and other social and behavioral sciences. In developing the concept of planning for this study, conventional views provide a starting point but are modified to recognize the broadening influences of untraditional views.

Although variation exists, textbooks for introductory courses in management thought generally agree in their definitions of planning and upon the primacy of planning among managerial functions. Hicks, for example, defines planning simply. "Planning determines where the organization is going and the general aproaches it will use to get there."[22] Hicks emphasizes establishment of organizational objectives and the development of only broad strategies or courses of action.

McFarland expands upon this definition by referring to planning "...as a concept of executive action that embodies the skills of anticipating, influencing, and controlling the nature and direction of change."[23] McFarland's definition attracts attention for two reasons. First, he regards planning as action to be taken by top ranking members of the management organization; and he, thereby, indicates planning is of significant importance. Second, he characterizes planning in terms of change. To repeat programs and

---

22 Herbert G. Hicks, The Management of Organizations: A Systems and Human Resources Approach, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1972, pp. 240-241.

23 Dalton E. McFarland, Management Principles and Practices, Fourth Edition, Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., New York, 1974, pp. 315-316.

strategies or to work deliberately to maintain the status quo would not constitute planning to McFarland. His emphasis is on planning as a change agency, as a producer of new situations for the organization in the future.

The need and desire to create future states are also central to planning as a special type of a future oriented decision-making process. Not all decision-making is planning in the thinking of Ackoff; planning is differentiated by three characteristics.

1. Planning is something we do in advance of taking action; that is, it is anticipatory decision-making. It is a process of deciding what to do and how to do it before action is required....

2. Planning is required when the future state we desire involves a set of inter-dependent decisions; that is, a system of decisions....

3. Planning is a process that is directed toward producing one or more future states which are desired and which are not expected to occur unless something is done.[24]

One of the more comprehensive discussions of planning in basic management literature is developed by Koontz and O'Donnell, who not only define planning but also examine the purposes of planning, the process, some of the problems of planning, and some management principles applicable to planning. To Koontz and

[24] Russell L. Ackoff, A Concept of Corporate Planning, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1970, pp. 2-4.

O'Donnell, planning is an extensive activity which involves study of the organizational situation, a hierarchy of individuals and decisions, and the formulation of strategies and policies.

The Koontz and O'Donnell definition is simple; yet it embraces the notions of decision-making, futurity, and action specification which are generally included in definitions of planning. "Planning is deciding in advance what to do, how to do it, when to do it, and who is to do it."[25]

To Koontz and O'Donnell, planning suggests more than is specified in a definition. Planning, to them, logically precedes the execution of all other managerial functions and permeates the entire organization. Planning also calls for the development of statements of purpose, missions, objectives, strategies, policies, procedures, rules, programs, and budgets. Therefore, planning provides the means for unifying the efforts of an organization. Koontz and O'Donnell assert that planning is important because it facilitates the accomplishment of purpose and objectives.[26]

For purposes of this study, planning is conceptualized as a process of study and anticipation which generates guidelines for courses of action which are intended to lead to the achievement of organizational objectives.

---

[25] Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, Essentials of Management, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1978, p. 56.

[26] Ibid., pp. 57-67.

The use of the word _process_ is to suggest on-going, interactive efforts rather than a well defined event. As McFarland points out, planning is continuing action and not behavior at any given point in time.[27] In this study, _process_ serves as one of the comparative characteristics.

The phrase _of study and anticipation_ is to connote deliberate and extensive intellectual activity associated with the examination of past and present circumstances and with the estimation of future conditions. The tasks central to this study involve mental exercises, such as those related to problem assessment, data analysis, discussion and negotiation.

The conceptualizations of planning vary with respect to the degree of specification required. Fayol was very general and asserted only that planning should make "provision" for the future. By contrast, Koontz and O'Donnell would require that planning stipulate what is to be done, how and when it is to be done, and by whom. This study takes a middle position and calls for the planning process only to _generate guidelines for courses of action._ This notion would accept, as an aspect of planning, the development of agreement on the direction of organizational efforts and the limits of action to be undertaken by the specific members of the organization.

The _organizational objectives_ to be achieved may also vary in terms of specification. LeBreton and Henning consider that it

---

[27]   MacFarland, _op. cit.,_ p. 316.

is necessary that a specific statement of objectives be made. Such a statement gives direction and guidance to all members of the organization. They hold the view that objectives are determined by members of top levels of the organization hierachy and are then passed downward.[28]

Opposing views are emerging in the literature. Haselhoff, for one, observes that organization can no longer rely on an approach from "the top down." He conceives of organizations as systems of "stake-holders" who must be allowed to participate in the development of objectives and strategies. The implications are that the objectives of an organization constitute a set, that the makeup of the set of objectives is determined by social units found throughout the hierachy, and that not all objectives are clearly stated.[29]

Again, this study takes a middle ground and recognizes, first, that objectives provide a unifying influence in planning and, second, that organizational objectives may be expressed with varying degrees of specificity with the degree of specificity yielding another basis for the comparative study of planning.

Time and Planning. Throughout management literature is the notion that time as a variable is significant to planning.

---

28 LeBreton and Henning, op. cit., Chapter 4.

29 Frits Haselhof, "A New Paradigm for the Study of Organizational Goals" in From Planning to Strategic Management, edited by H. I. Ansoff, R. P. DeClerck, and R. L. Hayes, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1976, pp. 15-27.

Although all planning is conducted with the future in mind, the literature indicates that substantive differences in planning derive from the span of time under consideration. The most common time-related designations found in the literature are "short range planning" and "long range planning." Several approaches have been taken to differentiate planning with respect to time.

Organizations frequently use arbitrary time limits to distinguish between long range and short range planning. Neil Chamberlain reports that business firms commonly regard as long range that planning which develops plans which extend into the future five years and beyond while planning which focuses on lesser periods of time is referred to as short range.[30]

As an economist, Chamberlain points out that such arbitrary designations fail to recognize the reason the time dimension is important to planning. To Chamberlain, the distinction relates to resource commitments as limitations on planning. Long range planning is concerned with making commitments of organizational resources as these resources become available. Short range planning is concerned with the use of resources which were previously committed. The time characteristic of planning pertains to the degree of freedom available to planners.[31] Economics recognizes

30 Neil W. Chamberlain, The Firm: Micro-Economic Planning and Action, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1962, pp. 37-48.

31 Neil W. Chamberlain, quoted in Managerial Long-Range Planning, George A. Steiner, Editor, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963, pp. 9-10.

the long range as that time period wherein all resource commitments can be changed by planners. In the short range, planners may be able to consider changes in some resource commitments but not in all commitments. To the economist, time is important to planning because it describes a constraint on planning.

Other authors argue that time is an important characteristic of planning for still different reasons. Brian Scott considers time as a variable related to the futurity of planning decisions and presents four different concepts of time measurement in planning.[32]

1. Plan Preparation Time. This concept measures the time required in collaborative activities, information gathering, and other planning tasks for the development of specific plans. This concept provides planners with a framework for scheduling the work associated with planning but does not provide a distinction between long range and short range planning.

2. Lead Time. This concept measures the lapse of time from planning to implementation and is often the basis for distinguishing between long range and short range planning. Many organizations view as short range those planning efforts which have first stages which can be implemented in a few months or years and as long range those planning efforts which cannot be implemented for several years. Thus, the time variable is perceived as important because it describes the immediacy of implementation.

3. Direct Impact Time. This measure refers to the period of time during which the activity now in planning will continue to operate or to have direct influence over operations.

---

[32] Brian W. Scott, op. cit., pp. 30-39

This concept would define as short range
that period in which adjustments are made in
operations and as long range that period in
which essential and enduring changes are
made in the operation and direction of the
organization. The time variable is
important because it describes the duration
and the degree of change in the organization.

4. Epochal Time. This concept involves the
assessment of historic trends and changes so
as to determine the types of considerations
which are likely to have importance for the
future. Whereas the other three time
measures apply to an inward view of the
organization, the epochal time measure
directs attention to the societal
environment surrounding the organization.
The short range is that period of time in
which societal conditions remain sub-
substantially unchanged. The long range is
that period in which significant changes
appear in societal conditions.

These concepts suggest that the importance of the time variable is

not in the span of time under consideration but rather with the type

of conditions and problems considered in the planning process. For

this reason, other descriptions besides short range and long range

have been linked to planning.

Ansoff introduced the notions of strategic, administrative,

and operational planning as substitutes for long range and short

range planning. Ansoff defines strategic planning as that which is

concerned with external problems of the organization, that is, with

the problems of adjusting the organization to its environment;

administrative planning is that which is concerned with resource

allocations so as to maximize the performance of the organization;

and operational planning is that which is concerned with maximizing

the efficiency of the organization's operations.[33] Thus, Ansoff differentiates planning in terms of the types of problems considered in the planning process.

Ackoff asserts that a clearer understanding of planning is gained when we recognize that not all planning is alike. He advances the terms "strategic" and "tactical" to differentiate planning and suggests that there are three dimensions which distinguish strategic from tactical planning.[34]

1. The longer the effect of a plan and the more difficult it is to reverse, the more strategic it is.... Strategic planning is long range planning. Tactical planning is of shorter range. But "long" and "short" are relative terms and therefore so are "strategic" and "tactical." In general strategic planning is concerned with the longest period worth considering; tactical planning is concerned with the shortest period worth considering....

2. The more functions of an organization's activities are affected by a plan, the more strategic it is. That is, strategic planning is broad in scope. Tactical planning is narrower....

3. Tactical planning is concerned with selecting means by which to pursue specified goals. The goals are normally supplied by a higher level in the organization. Strategic planning is concerned with both formulation of the goals and selection of the means by which they are to be attained....

---

33 H. Igor Ansoff, Corporate Strategy: An Analytical Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965, Chapter 1, pp. 1-12.

34 Russell L. Ackoff, A Concept of Corporate Planning, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1970, pp. 4-5.

A blending of the notions of Chamberlain, Scott, Ansoff, and Ackoff provides an approach to conceptualizing long range planning for purposes of this study. Long range planning is that planning which makes enduring impact upon the organization so that it is difficult to change the manner in which resources are committed and the thrust of the organization. The scope of long range planning is such that all components of the organizaton will be affected either directly or indirectly. Among the considerations of long range planning are the relationships of the organization with its societal environment and the statement of organizational objectives.

This section concludes with an overview of the literature of long range planning. Although the concept of planning as a management function can be traced in the literature back fifty years to Fayol, the subject of long range planning did not receive broad exposure in the literature until the mid 1950's. Most of the early literature was in the form of articles in popular, business publications. Generally these articles argued the need for long range planning in business firms or described the conduct of long range planning in larger American corporations.

Examples of this early literature are found in the first two editions of Long-Range Planning for Management, published in 1958 and 1964.[35] Ewing, the editor of both editions, asserted

---

[35] David Ewing, Editor, Long-Range Planning for Management, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1958 and 1964.

that prior to the 1958 edition there had been no book published which had dealt solely with the subject of long range planning. Since that time, several thrusts of scholarly interest in long range planning have emerged in the literature.

One thrust concerns those scholars who appear interested in applying techniques of their disciplines to long range planning. Examples are found in the fields of the management sciences and accounting. Ansoff[36] and Ackoff[37] are two scholars from the school of management science who advanced the use of operations research techniques, quantitative models, and decision theory in long range planning. In a similar fashion, Anthony offered accounting tools and models as a framework for long range planning and for the management of resources allocated to specific programs.[38]

A second thrust may be identified with those scholars who appear interested in long range planning as it represents a special case of the management function of planning. In 1967, Ernest Dale published Long-Range Planning, in which he described how he

---

[36] H. Igor Ansoff, "A Quasi-Analytical Method for Long-Range Planning" in C. W. Churchman and M. Verhulst (Editors), Management Sciences: Models and Techniques, Vol. 2, Pergamon, New York, 1960, ppo. 229-251.

[37] Russell. L. Ackoff, Scientific Method: Optimizing Applied Research Decisions, Wiley, New York, 1962.

[38] Robert. N. Anthony, Planning and Control Systems -- A Framework for Analysis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966.

perceived it was conducted in larger corporations.[39] His emphasis was on the techniques being employed in long range planning, especially those techniques associated with forecasting. A more comprehensive study is presented by George A. Steiner in his Top Management Planning.[40] The title suggests a concern for only the planning conducted by the higher executive levels of organization, but Steiner's attention is on the broader topic of planning in general and the managerial responsibility for the conduct of strategic planning more specifically. Though Steiner refers most often to business organizations, his presentation of concepts and techniques of long range planning have equal applicability to non-business situations. By integrating contributions from such varied disciplines as operations research and industrial psychology, Steiner develops a way of thinking of planning, a philosophic view of planning as a process and a responsibility.

A third thrust found in the literature has been to examine long range planning in an institutional context. This thrust is concerned with long range planning as it represents an aspect of the management of the institution. The primary attention is paid to the institution and its characteristics, such as its societal role and its power structure. This institution oriented approach to the

---

[39] Ernest Dale, Long-Range Planning, British Institute of Management, London, 1967.

[40] George A. Steiner, Top Management Planning, Macmillan, New York 1969.

study of long range planning has focused on a variety of organizational types, among them the business firm, the military, governmental administrative units, colleges and universities. Most scholars have chosen to devote their attentions to one specific institutional form or another. Melville Branch, by contrast, has examined and analyzed the planning conducted by business corporations, military, and city governments.[41] Branch points out that some planning principles apply universally but that planning practices and organizational structures differ with the institutional situation.

Because of the focus of this study, the following section reviews the literature related to long range planning in the institutional settings of American colleges and universities.

Literature Review of Long Range Planning

for Higher Education

The literature of higher education gave little attention to the subject of long range planning before 1960. Eurich and Tickton allude to the efforts of Beardsley Ruml to promote long range planning to colleges and universities a quarter of a century ago. It was Ruml's contention that institutions of higher

---

[41] Melville C. Branch, _The Corporate Planning Process_, New York, American Management Association, 1962, and _Planning: Aspects and Applications_, New York, Wiley, 1966.

education could benefit, as business corporations had, from the use of long range financial planning.[42]

Extending the views of Ruml was Sidney Tickton, who published in 1961 a monograph which illustrated how colleges could use budgeting as a framework for their long range planning.[43] Though Tickton expresses an interest in comprehensive planning, his emphasis and orientation are financial. All elements, all activities of the institution are to be quantified in financial terms. Such an emphasis on budgeting may create problems in the opinion of Peter Drucker, who suggests that service organizations are often misdirected by budgets. Drucker argues that budget based institutions often become more concerned with the budget than with the performance of societal tasks. Individual persons and units in these institutions may be more interested in obtaining a bigger allotment in the budget than in obtaining results.[44]

A comprehensive, institution-wide view of long range planning was uncommon in the literature until the late 1960's. Rather, much of the literature of the decade appeared to reflect a

[42] Alvin C. Eurich and Sidney G. Tickton, Long Range Planning and Budgeting, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D. C., 1972, pp. 1-3.

[43] Sidney G. Tickton, Needed: A Ten Year College Budget, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D. C., 1961.

[44] Peter F. Drucker, Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1974, pp. 141-142.

problem orientation for long range planning. Thus, Dexter Keezer reflected a concern of that day -- the financing of higher education in the face of continuing increases in the student body and the accompanying demands for more buildings, more faculty, more programs, and more services.[45] The long range planning focus was on the financial problems rather than on the institution as an integrated operating system.

Only a small proportion of the literature of the 1960's dealt with long range planning as an institutional process. Instead, the literature would treat as individual and independent the many and varied issues which might justify the development of long range planning at America's colleges and universities. Thus, the early planning literature was seldom comprehensive but rather was fragmentary; it dealt with long range planning for a single department or a separate activity. By way of example, Dober examined in great detail the process of campus planning.[46] Though detailed, Dober's concept of campus planning deals entirely with the physical plant. Other elements of institutional planning are mentioned only as they impact upon the planning of the physical plant. The planning process described by Dober has limited applicability to the institution as a whole or to other operational

---

[45] Dexter M. Keezer, Editor, Financing Higher Education, 1960-1970, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1959.

[46] Richard P. Dober, Campus Planning, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, 1963.

aspects of the institution. Dober's master plan of a college or university would be in terms of physical plant. Because the physical plant was planned to accommodate students, faculty, programs, and services -- all other aspects of the institution are assumed to be included implicitly in the planning of the physical plant. Such approaches to comprehensive planning reflect the individual's linkage to an academic field rather than a balanced view of the institution as an operating system.

The need for comprehensive, coordinated planning emerges in the literature in the mid-1960's. The Sixth Annual Institute on College Self Study for College and University Administrators may be regarded as a landmark event for comprehensive planning. These meetings were concerned with planning and change in American higher education, with the problems confronting institutions, and with the resources and systematic approaches needed in planning.[47] Whether in response to this event or not, the literature following that event reflects a marked increase in the interest in long range planning for higher education.

In 1966, Fincher asserted that centralized, comprehensive planning is required of higher education if it is to meet its obligations to society. To improve the quality of institutional planning, Fincher advances several suggestions:

- Personnel with specialized, professional background in planning should be employed.

---

[47] Owen Knorr, Editor, Long Range Planning in Higher Education, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, 1965.

- Institutions need to recognize the differences between planning and administration.

- Institutions need to make careful use of projections.

- Colleges and universities not only should provide adequate planning staffs but should also describe carefully the roles which are played by the staffs at the institutions.

- Planning for statewide systems must be distinguished from planning for individual institutions in the systems.

- Planning must be recognized as a form of leadership at institutions.[48]

Since the middle '60's, the interest in planning for higher education has grown at such a rate as to suggest the existence of a "planning movement." In this period, the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP) was formed and was to become an important vehicle for the dissemination of views, methods, and techniques of planning for higher education.

In this same time period, state government interest in planning was manifested in position statements advanced by public agencies responsible for state-wide systems of higher education. Though the list of concerns varied from state to state, officials in public higher education (1) recognized the dramatic growth in state supported institutions for post-secondary education; (2) attempted to define the role of public institutions as instructional, research, and service units; (3) asserted the power of central

---

[48] Cameron Fincher, Planning in Higher Education, Institute of Higher Education, Georgia University, Athens, Georgia, 1966.

agencies over individual units in state-wide systems; (4) delineated the relationships of individual institutions to central agencies; and (5) affirmed the need for system-wide long range planning to cope with such problems as financing, the building and maintaining of physical plants, and the development of educational programs to meet changing student bodies.[49]

As the decade of the '60's closed, NCHEMS (the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems) emerged as an important agent of research and development of planning systems for colleges and universities. NCHEMS Projects have yielded planning models which have applications to institutions of varying scale, smaller independent colleges as well as state-wide public system.

The efforts of NCHEMS and others conducting study of higher education planning reflect a deliberate drive toward the formulation of an integrated, comprehensive systems model. At the turn of the decade, a number of disciplines were contributing to this thrust;

---

[49] Among the statements of state-wide planning in this period were:

Long Range Planning, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 1968.

A Philosophy for Minnesota Higher Education, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1968.

Planning for Higher Education in North Carolina, North Carolina State Board of Higher Education, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1968.

An Indiana Pattern for Higher Education: Report of the State Policy Commission on Post High School Education, Indiana State Policy Commission on Post High School Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1968.

and these contributions demonstrated more global views of planning than earlier studies had shown. Still the distinct stamps of the various disciplines could be seen.

For example, Arthur structures his long range planning model with the elements of financial policy-making, what he refers to as the considerations and practices of making strategic expenditures. Central to his model, though, is a process of translating the educational objectives of the institution into financial plans. Thus the content of the model is educational programming though the structure of the model is financial.[50]

Smilarly, the systems models for educational planning examined by Fox are built upon quantitative techniques of economic analysis. Yet, these optimization models start with the expressions of educational performance in mathematical terms.[51]

In the time period of the late 1960's and early 1970's, the computer scientist joined in the study of long range institutional planning. The earliest uses of computers in planning were in simulating future situations for colleges and universities. The computer facilitated the collection, processing, and analysis of data, thereby increasing the efficiency of planning. But perhaps of

---

[50] William James Arthur, *The Development of a System of Administering and Measuring Strategic Expenditures in Private Colleges: A Research Report*, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1969.

[51] Karl A. Fox, Editor, *Economic Analysis for Educational Planning: Resource Allocation in Nonmarket Systems*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1972.

even greater value was the utilization of the computer to project alternative sets of future conditions for institutional planners to ponder. Computer scientists developed mathematical models which incorporated an institution's operating characteristics and its estimates of factors which would have important influences on the institution in the future. With the models the computer would approximate future conditions, thus allowing planners to deliberate the range of probable outcomes which would derive in the years ahead from policies made today.

Since their introduction to higher education planning in the late 1960's, computer systems have been refined and simplified. However, the acceptance of simulation models as tools of the planning process appears to depend upon the ease of their application to institutional stiuations. Sutterfield contended that the HELP model (standing for Higher Education Long-range Planning) is readily applicable to the information systems existing at many colleges and universities.[52] Hopkins questions the usefulness of computer-based models, especially the large-scale simulation models, because they require substantial data bases for operation. He suggests that computer models such as CADMS, the Costing and Data Management Systems model developed by NCHEMS may have value for only larger institutions.[53]

---

[52] William D. Sutterfield, "Managing Information: College Planning Could Use HELP," College and University Business, March, 1971.

[53] David Hopkins, "On the Use of Largescale Simulation Models for University Planning," Review of Educational Research, Number 41, 1971.

Computer scientists may also be accused of sub-optimizing because they have developed computer-based programs and models which have attempted to find the "best" solutions for functional areas of the institution rather than for the institution as a comprehensive system. Often what is optimal for a unit of the system is less than optimal for the institution as a whole. For example, early applications of computer-based models dealt with problems of budgeting or physical plant utilization. A case in point is the Long-range Financial Forecasts model (LRFF), which was developed at Stanford University. As Hopkins and Massey point out, the usefulness of the model to institutions depends upon the inclusion of other complementary tools and techniques of management.[54]

Wartgow concluded that computer simulation models were not being utilized at colleges and universities to degrees which justified their expense. However, Wartgow also noted that the value of computerization was directly related to the existence on the campus of a climate favorable to change and to the ability of the institution's leadership to recognize how the computer could be utilized. Perhaps most important to this thesis is Wartgow's conclusion that computer-based models induce institutional leaders to focus on long range planning.[55] As the use of computers

[54] David S. P. Hopkins and William F. Massey, "Long Range Budget Planning in Private Colleges and Universities," New Directions for Institutional Research, 13, Spring 1977.

[55] Jerome F. Wartgow, "Computerized Institutional Planning Models: An Objective Analysis," North Central Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1973.

becomes more common to institutions of higher education and as institutional leaders become more adept at utilizing computers, it may be expected that institutional administrators will be encouraged to conduct more systematic long range planning.

Parallel to the literature of scholars who perceived institutional planning in the dimensions of their respective disciplines is a stream of literature which urged a comprehensive view of planning for higher education. Several characteristics distinguish this comprehensive view.

1. Planning is comprehensive when it considers all units and aspects of the institution. Bolin contends, "Any long range plan, to be worth the effort put into it, must be well organized and developed with a comprehensive framework."[56]

2. Planning is comprehensive when it recognizes the interactive or systems nature of the organization. "Characterizing the university. as a system means simply that it consists of a set of interacting parts and exhibits some kind of integrity as a whole," according to Moran. "Systems, whether biological, social or mechanical, are ordinarily engaged in

---

[56] John G. Bolin, Institutional Long Range Planning, University of Georgia, 1969, p. 5.

generating a product or achieving an objective. It is characteristic of a system that when one part is altered, the whole is altered in a greater or lesser degree through rearrangement of the parts."[57]

The systems concept recognizes the interactions and interdependencies of all elements of the institution: faculty, student bodies, administrators, programs, facilities, departments, budgets, objectives, values, etc. .

3.   Planning is comprehensive when it is an on-going process rather than occasional, ad hoc, or sporadic activity. Miller points out, "It should be restated that planning is a continuing process, not an event. Planning is continuous; a plan is not."[58]

4.   Planning is comprehensive when it relies upon a variety of sources of data and information. These sources would include

---

57   William E. Moran, "A Systems View of University Organization," in Paul W. Hamelman (Editor), Managing the University: A Systems Approach, Praeger Publishers, New YUork, 1972, p. 3.

58   John Edgar Miller, "Planning in Small Colleges," Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall, 1980, p. 29.

materials regularly generated by institutional offices, data from the institution's research, and relevant information from off-campus organizations. Shoemaker emphasizes the importance of such materials.

> ... Decisions that are made at each step of the planning process must be based on as hard a body of data as methodology and time permit. Unit costs, environmental trends, goal and climate indices, "market" analyses, and outcome measures must become a regular part of individual, departmental, and institutional life....[59]

5. Planning is comprehensive when members from various constituencies of the college campus are involved in the process. Not only should top-level administrators and trustees be involved, but the literature suggest that the inclusion of faculty, alumni, and perhaps student leaders should be considered. Bolin asserts:

> To be effective, planning at the institutional level must be a cooperative endeavor.... Also, planning for the future direction of the institution requires broad participation directly or indirectly within the institution, for nearly everyone in the institution should be involved to some extent.[60]

---

[59] William A. Shoemaker, Data and Its Use: A Process System for Planning, The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1975, p. 12.

[60] John G. Bolin, op. cit., p. 3.

6. Planning is comprehensive when organizational focus is on the process rather than on the plan as the product of and principal justification for planning. Vaccaro argues that the conceptualization of planning "relies on a continual spirit of dialogue and philosophizing about the nature, aims, and objectives of the institution."[61]

The literature reveals continual efforts have been directed at the development of comprehensive planning for institutions of higher education. General agreement on the concerns and the constituent elements of the process has emerged.

Though he offers no definitive process for comprehensive planning, Bolin is thorough in his discussion of the range of concerns to be considered by the institutional planners.[62] Smith, in his study at Colgate University, developed a detailed 22 step process for institutional planning.[63] The Smith model provides extensive elaborations of the tasks to be performed, the rationale, working examples, and commentary on each step in the planning process.

---

[61] Louis C. Vaccaro, "Planning in Higher Education: Approaches and Problems," College and University, 51, Winter 1976, p. 159.

[62] John G. Bolin, op. cit , p. 16.

[63] Robert G. Smith, College and University Planning Report on a Joint Study by Colgate University and the American Foundation for Management Research, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, 1969, pp. 27-49.

Published in 1969, the Smith conceptualization stands as an effort to present in full detail the planning process, but its fullness reduces its usefulness as a model for other institutions. A later model, offered by the United States Office of Education, may be viewed as a compression or distillation of the Smith model. Those colleges and universities involved in the Title III program (for developing institutions) were provided a model which described planning as a relatively simple five-step linear process.[64]

Step 1.   The Institutional mission or purpose is defined.

Step 2.   Institutional goals are developed in keeping with the statement of institutional missions.

Step 3.   Programs with measurable objectives are formulated.

Step 4.   Actions to be taken by operating units of the institution are specified.

Step 5.   Criteria for evaluation of the performance of the institution are stated.

Other planning models authored in this time period generally agree with the process described in the model of the Office of Education. Noteworthy differences appear in the assumptions implicit in the models and in the emphasis placed on various aspects of planning. The Office of Education model emphasizes the linear nature of the process and assumes each individual institution will develop

---

[64]   Louis C. Vaccaro and John E. Miller, Planning in Small Colleges, Peterson, Rounding & Schoumman, Inc., Detroit, Michigan, 1979, p. 2.

its own means of progressing through the process. It leaves it to each institution to choose techniques for gathering and processing relevant data, to structure the team which is to conduct the planning, and to create mechanisms for resolving organizational conflicts encountered in the planning process.

Published in this period were two models which gave special recognition to the "human side" of institutional planning. The first, written by Shoemaker, emphasized the interactions and interdependencies of operating units of the institution in the planning process.[65] Shoemaker also emphasized the crucial role of data in planning. The second model was developed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).[66] This model, like that of Shoemaker, gives attention to the organization as human participants in the planning process. But the emphasis of the NACUBO model is on the allocation of resources as ultimately described in the institutional budget. Neither the Shoemaker nor the NACUBO model discusses approaches to resolving human conflicts, to obtaining concensus, or to gaining organization-wide acceptance of planning. It appears that both

---

[65] William A. Shoemaker, A Systems Approach to College Administration and Planning, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D. C., 1973.

[66] NACUBO, A College Planning Cycle, People - Resources - Process: A Practical Guide. National Association of College and University Business Officers, Washington, D. C., 1975.

models may assume that throwing the spotlight on the human aspects of planning is enough to induce appropriate and effective response by institutions.

A review of two more models argues strongly for the contention that systematic, comprehensive planning models currently exist for use by institutions of higher education. These models also reflect clearly that concerns for the problems of human interactions in an organization have been secondary.

The NCHEMS contribution is reflected not so much in a single comprehensive planning model as in the systems and techniques derived from more than a decade of study of planning in management in higher education. NCHEMS has provided sets of interfacing systems which link together to assist institutions in setting goals, in specifying measurable objectives, in defining programs, in assessing resource availability and requirements, and in stating quantifiable outcomes.[67] The NCHEMS planning format emphasizes the extensive use of quantifiable data, as though to imply that data and techniques would provide adequate force to pull institution planners through the process. Little attention

---

[67] The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, has published an extensive set of books dealing with various aspects of institutional planning. Following are several of especial relevance to institution-wide planning:

Higher Education Planning and Management Systems: A Brief Explanation
Why Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems for Higher Education
Outcome-oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or an Impossibility?

has been given by NCHEMS researchers to the problems of securing organizational cooperation, concensus, and acceptance -- aspects of what Ewing calls the "human side of planning."[68]

The comprehensive model developed by Parekh[69] is similar to the set of planning tools designed by NCHEMS; and conceptualizations from NCHEMS have been utilized by Parekh. Like the NCHEMS planning proposals, the Parekh model emphasizes the importance of institutional data and provides a matrix framework for collection and utilization of these data. The NCHEMS planning systems are more precise in the statement of how data are to be processed; the Parekh model describes more specifically the institutional units which are responsible for data collection. Parekh articulates these responsibilities and discusses how institution-wide planning cascades upon the planning of the operating components of the institution.

Both NCHEMS and Parekh place heavy emphasis on data as though to assume that it is the collection and the use of data which propel the institution through the planning process. Nearly all studies of planning regard data as critical to the process. Miller asserts, "The most important components of any planning process are people and data."[70] Though the "people" component of institutional planning is recognized in the models discussed above, the people related problems

---

68   David W. Ewing, op. cit., p. 200.

69   Satish B. Parekh, A Long Range Planning Model for Colleges and Universities, The Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, 1975.

70   John Edgar Miller, op. cit.

have received far less research attention than have the data related problems of institutional planning.

In 1976, Bergquist and Shoemaker presented a synopsis of the various contributions which had been made to institutional planning and development.[71] This publication stands as a review of planning systems but may also be seen as a suggestion of research opportunities. Bergquist and Shoemaker discuss extensively the use of available data oriented systems but also survey techniques and approaches which have been employed to deal with people related aspects of planning. Bergquist and Shoemaker report on the uncommon but growing use of delphi techniques, scenarios, human relations training, team building, confrontation sessions, and other techniques employed to promote human acceptance, cooperation, and support of institutional planning.

It should be noted that no comprehensive models have been advanced to deal with the "people" component of planning comparable to the comprehensive models advanced to deal with the "data" component of planning. The importance of this research opportunity is highlighted by Ewing, who suggests that "future breakthroughs" in planning will be on the human side.

> ..., on the human side we have tended to
> follow the primitive way, satisfying ourselves
> with such pat generalities as "a plan that's
> good for the company is good for all

---

[71] William H. Bergquist and William A. Shoemaker, "Facilitating Comprehensive Institutional Development," New Directions for Higher Education: A Comprehensive Approach to Institutional Development, William H. Bergquist and William A. Shoemaker, Editors, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, California, 1976, pp. 1-45.

employees," or "our people will be under
pressure but they'll produce if we explain
the problem." Such bland generalizations
shield the planning leader from the human
facts just as "I guess we can get enough
money" would shield him from vital financial
facts....[72]

Literature Review of Research Methodology

Applicable to the

Long Range Planning Study

The search of the literature was guided by the framework of the study to be conducted. Four characteristics were sought in literature revealing the methodologies used in the study of long range planning. First, the study was to be of the entire organization's planning rather than of the planning of a sub-unit or component of the organization. This characteristic was sought because the study reported in this dissertation relates to institution-wide planning of long range character.

The second rule of search regards the review of planning studies which attempt to compare planning in different organizations . Again, this is relevant because this dissertation study attempts to compare planning conducted at selected private institutions.

A third characteristic sought in the literature was the type of research approach taken. Because the study conducted for this thesis employs both survey and case study techniques, those

---

[72] David W. Ewing, op. cit., pp. 208-209.

studies which utilized survey and case study methodologies were of special interest.

A fourth limiting characteristic of the literature search was concerned with the exposition of the methodology rather than the results of the research. The primary interest was in the presentation of the research approach; the results of the study were of secondary interest. Many papers reviewed are excluded from this section because they lacked description of the research approach taken. However, in an attempt to compensate for the limitations imposed by the search rules, the literature review included not only studies related to planning in higher education but also in business organizations.

Survey Research in Planning Studies

The survey method represents an organized, systematic examination of subject matter; the intent of survey research is to gather facts about a specific subject.[73] The range of subjects under investigation can be very wide as Moser and Kalton suggest in their discussion of social surveys.

> ... When it comes to subject matter, all one can say is that surveys are concerned with the demographic characteristics, the social environment, the activities, or the opinions and attitudes of some group of people.[74]

---

[73] C. A. Moser and G. Kalton, Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Second Edition, Basic Books, Incorporated, Publishers, New York, 1972, p. 1.

[74] Ibid.

Not only does survey research address a broad range of subjects, the study design may also vary considerably. Survey research need not use formal, standardized methods and cover large representative samples, according to Moser and Kalton.

> ... A researcher wishing to investigate certain aspects of family life may choose to confine himself to a handful of families, studying them intensively, rather than to make a more superficial examination of a large-scale sample.[75]

As might be expected, survey research in planning varies greatly in its range of subject matter and in its design. Surveys have been made to describe in broad terms the planning in social organizations. Surveys have been conducted to determine what conditions hinder or facilitate organization-wide planning. Some survey designs have been highly structured and have involved hundreds of respondents. Still other survey designs have possessed relatively little structure and/or attempt to conduct intensive study of a relatively small number of persons concerned with planning.

Scott in his 1962 study[76] surveyed executives in 12 business firms which had considerable experience with systematized planning. In personal interviews with senior executives, Scott obtained historical accounts of the development of planning at these firms. From these interviews are drawn a composite view of

---

[75] Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[76] Brian W. Scott, op. cit.

the process and organization of comprehensive, systematized long range planning in the corporate circumstance. Scott's sample is small; his approach to gathering facts has relatively little structure. Yet his book, which describes planning in large and medium size corporations, has been regarded as a reasonably accurate portrayal of corporate planning situations of that time.

A contrasting survey is one conducted by Steiner and Schollhammer.[77] Their study sought to determine what large multi-national firms regarded as pitfalls to be avoided in initiating, understanding, and conducting long range planning. A structured questionnaire was employed; and 460 complete question-naires from companies in six different nations were used as the basis for their report. This survey research constituted an ambitious endeavor, and it may be inferred that Steiner's world-wide reputation aided considerably in obtaining respondent cooperation.

A different experience was encountered by a lesser known Japanese professor, Toyohiro Kono. His mail survey[78] yielded a response rate of 17% from the American firms contacted and 14% from the Japanese firms contacted. The Kono study is of interest because it sought to compare long range planning of American firms with that of Japanese firms. Kono used a structured questionnaire to ascertain

---

[77] George A. Steiner and Hans Schollhammer, "Pitfalls in Multi-National Long Range Planning," Long Range Planning, April, 1975, pp. 2-12.

[78] Toyohiro Kona, "Long Range Planning -- USA -- Japan -- A Comparative Study," Long Range Planning, October 1976, pp. 61-71.

the extents to which long range planning was conducted in American and Japanese firms, the reasons firms gave for their conduct of long range planning, variations in the organization of the planning process, the degrees of decentralization of planning, the time horizons of long range planning, characteristics and elements found in long range plans, and various approaches taken to evaluate and reshape long range plans. The Kono comparative survey study required over two years to complete and was based on responses from 59 American firms and 57 Japanese firms.

Later research of Kudla[79] contains study objectives which are similar to those of the Kona survey. The research designs of the two studies, however, are contrasts. The data of the Kudla survey were elicited through the use of structured in-depth interviews with key planning executives of 14 large corporations in one American metropolitan area. It is interesting to note that Kona and Kudla have applied divergent survey designs to significantly different samples in attempts to find answers to similar research questions.

Frequently cited among early surveys of comprehensive planning in higher education is the Smith study,[80] sponsored by Colgate University and the American Foundation for Management Research in the late 1960's. Smith stated that the objective of his project was to develop a new approach to institution-wide planning.

The first phase of the project called for intensive surveys of several colleges and universities in order to determine what practices

---

[79] Ronald J. Kudla, "Elements of Effective Corporate Planning," Long Range Planning, August 1976, pp. 82-93.

[80] Robert G. Smith, op. cit.

of institution-wide planning were then being followed. (The exact number of institutions surveyed is not stated in the report.) Smith conducted an unstructured investigation. Of interest to this dissertation is the important role which exploratory descriptive survey research played as the initial step in the development of the detailed process for comprehensive planning in higher education revealed in the study report.

The Smith survey may be viewed as evidence supporting the argument of Moser and Kalton that useful findings may be generated by surveys which have no hypothetical bases.

> ...To insist that a sociologist must not collect facts until he has a hypothesis would merely encourage the use of arbitrary hypotheses, which can be as bad as indiscriminate fact-collecting. The sociologist should look upon surveys as one way, and a supremely useful one, of exploring the field, of collecting data around as well as directly on the subject of study, so that the problem is brought into focus and the points worth pursuing are suggested.[81]

Like the initial stage of the Smith project, the study of this dissertation is exploratory or descriptive. No hypotheses are to be tested; rather it is description in comparative terms which is sought.

Of great relevance to this dissertation study is the methodology of exploratory research conducted by Palola and Padgett.[82]

---

[81] C. A. Moser and G. Kalton, op. cit., p. 4.

[82] Ernest G. Palola and William Padgett, Planning for Self-Renewal: A New Approach to Planned Organization Change, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkley, California, 1971.

Their survey stands as one of the broadest examinations of planning in higher education. Some seven hundred interviews were conducted at 80 institutions of various sizes and types, both private and public, in the states of California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. Using structured surveys, Palola and Padgett developed general character- izations of institutional planning and variables which irfluenced this planning. Their research tested no hypotheses but rather clas- sified institutional planning as substantive, expedient, or mixed.

In addition to general descriptions of the 80 subject institutions and their planning, Palola and Padgett also developed more detailed characterizations of six of the 80 institutions. This research framework parallels the design of this dissertation study and for this reason was of special interest.

While this work of Palola and Padgett is regarded as an example of survey research, it also has attributes of case study research. During the last decade, the case study has become in- creasingly common as a method for the examination of institution- wide planning in higher education. The case method also provides a basis for comparative study. For these reasons, case study research methods were reviewed briefly for this dissertation.

Case Research in Institutional Planning

The distinction between intensive survey research and case study research lies primarily in the scope of the study. Surveys, even intensive surveys, are to provide a breadth of study whereas the case study approach is concerned with the depth of the examination.

Another characteristic of case study is the existence of a central problem or set of related problems.[83] Several academic disciplines -- among them law, medicine, and business -- have utilized the case study design, not only in research but also in the curricular programs of their fields.

The case method of research calls for the development of the history of the subject under study, for the collection of data relevant to the central problems, for a detailed statement of the current situation, and for the systematic examination of the elements of the subject of the study. Facts of the case may be gathered from a variety of sources -- from interviews, from records and documents, from external sources as well as internal sources.

An early case study in educational planning involved Sangamon State University in 1969.[84] This study describes the conditions and prospects facing that university and exposes the critical questions and problem issues which had to be addressed by the institutional leadership. The Sangamon State University, as a case study, lacked the completeness of detail achieved in other later case studies.

---

[83] C. William Emory, Business Research Methods, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, 1976, p. 80.

Harper W. Boyd, Jr., and Ralph Westfall, Marketing Research: Text and Cases, Revised Edition, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, 1968, p. 58, pp. 60-62.

[84] Sangamon State University, "The Long Range Academic Planning Picture for Sangamon State University, Sangamon State University, Springfield, Illinois, 1969.

A somewhat more extensive study is found in the case of Bethany Nazarene College.[85] The institutional history is presented as are self-study documents, committee reports, interview findings, and commentaries from consultants. This study reflects detailed reporting; however, systematic examination of the institution was not conducted.

Among the most complete and systematic case studies of institutional planning have been those conducted by NCHEMS.[86] The format of the study report allows the reader to follow the development of the planning process on the subject campus. Institutional history relevant to the planning needs is provided. The progressive development of the planning process and organization is presented in chronological fashion. Documents, organizational charts, planning calendars, worksheets, questionnaires, and data sources are customarily included in the studies. The range of institutions examined by NCHEMS researchers makes it possible for colleges and universities of nearly any size or character to find a case study for comparative purposes.

---

85 Stanley M. Frame, Institutional Self-Analysis and Long Range Planning in a Small Liberal Arts College, Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany, Oklahoma, 1970.

86 Raymond N. Kieft, Academic Planning: Four Institutional Case Studies, National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, 1978.

Frank Armijo, Richard S. Hall, Oscar Lenning, Stephen Jonas, Ellen H. Cherin, Charles Harrington, Comprehensive Institutional Planning: Studies in Implementation, National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, 1980.

Summary

A review of the literature of planning readily yields several observations. First, some 20 years of study have resulted in a substantial systematized body of knowledge about long range planning. There appears to be concensus among interested scholars as to what elements make up the long range planning process and what organizational conditions provide a favorable setting for long range planning. Little attention has been given to the study of how conditions favorable to long range planning can be created and how the unfavorable can be identified in organizations.

It can also be observed in the literature that a systems view of long range planning has emerged in higher education. The literature of a decade or two ago reflected an incremental approach to long range planning, as though to suggest that adjustment or improvement in one area of planning constituted enhancement of the institution's overall long range planning. The more current literature emphasizes the interrelatedness of all parts of the institution and that comprehensive, institution-wide planning will necessarily involve long range considerations.

Another observation relates to the contributions which exploratory survey research has made to the body of knowledge of long range planning. When case and field studies are defined as surveys, then survey research is recognized as the approach most commonly taken in the investigation of institutional long range planning. This observation gives support to the use of a survey design in the following study of selected independent colleges in Michigan.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study is to develop comparisons of long range planning at selected independent colleges in the state of Michigan. It was recognized that long range planning might be expected to vary dramatically if the sample included institutions which were characteristically different. The intent was to seek out the dissimilarities which exist at colleges performing roughly equivalent roles. Three types of institutions were excluded from the subject population: universities, junior colleges, and proprietary schools. The sample was selected from Michigan colleges with the following common characteristics: (1) all offered a single type of degree, such as a bachelor of arts degree; (2) all were non-profit educational corporations; and (3) all were non-public institutions.

The sample was made up of 20 of 47 qualifying institutions; a sample equal to 42.6% of the population. The specific colleges selected as study subjects were drawn at random from a list prepared by the State of Michigan Department of Education.[1] A table of random numbers was employed to generate the list of institutions to be surveyed.

---

[1] *Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, 1979-80,* Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, p. 29.

The survey was conducted in two stages. The first stage called for the use of structured questionnaires in personal interviews with the chief planning officers at these 20 institutions. The second stage involved closer examination of long range planning at six of the 20 surveyed institutions. The six colleges examined in the second stage were selected from the sample on the basis of evaluations of the responses obtained in the interviews of the first stage of the study.

Conceptual Foundations

The questionnaire employed in the surveys of the first stage was developed from concepts found in the work of Shoemaker, Palola and Padget. Shoemaker has suggested that college planning progresses through 15 stages of development of practices and attitudes.[2] At one end of the series is the "status-quo" stage, where the planning is intended to maintain the existing situation and where the attitude of the planners is one of satisfaction with conditions as they are. At the opposite end of the developmental chain is the systematic and informed collegial model of broad participation in an on-going planning process.

Shoemaker depicts institutions at the lowest levels of planning development as having a current campus orientation, narrow

---

[2] William A. Shoemaker, "CASC Management and Planning Projects," an unpublished paper prepared for presentation at the Exxon Invitational Seminar on Improving Academic Admistration and Management of Colleges and Universities in New York City, October 5 and 6, 1978, p. 7.

participation in planning, ad hoc data collection from internal sources, and a sensitivity to the need to plan an occasional "tune-up" of operations. At the highest level of development are those institutions which have a societal orientation and broad participation in planning, which continually draw data from a broad variety of sources, and which are sensitive to the need to plan "model changes" to meet shifting demands of society.

At the highest level of development is planning which Shoemaker regards as systematic. The inference is that planning at the lowest level is unsystematic.

In their study of 80 colleges and universities, Palola and Padgett used the concept of dimensions to describe institutional planning.[3] They identified eight dimensions of planning: scope, integration, priority, style, research, participants, participation, and structure.

> Scope of planning refers to planning orien-
> tation. Ends-oriented planning considers
> educational objectives and purposes. Means-
> oriented planning aims to determine staff,
> budgetary, and facility needs.
>
> Integration refers to the degree to which
> planning recognizes the interrelatedness of

---

[3] Ernest G. Palola and William Padgett, Planning for Self-Renewal: A New Approach to Planned Organization Change, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkley, California, 1971, pp. 23-24.

decisions regarding academic, facility, and budget issues.

Priority refers to the recognition of the need in planning to rank goals in an order of importance.

Style refers to planning as either a continuous adaptation to new conditions and commitments or as periodic reactions to situations and demands.

Research refers to the variety of data used in planning.

Participants refers to the existence of joint or separate groups of faculty and administrators in planning.

Participation refers to the degree or extent of faculty involvement in planning.

Structure refers to the use of special or existing organizational mechanisms for planning.

These eight dimensions provided the measures for classifying institutional planning as _substantive, expedient,_ or _mixed._ _Substantive_ planning was that which was ends-oriented, which was integrated, which had established priorities, which was continuous,

which used a varied data base, which had broad faculty participation, and which used special or joint structure. Expedient planning was defined as that which was means-oriented, which was piecemeal rather than integrated, which lacked priorities, which used separate or existing structure, and which had little faculty participation. Institutional planning was classified as mixed if it possessed attributes of both substantive and expedient planning.

Like the systematic-unsystematic continuum of the Shoemaker paper, the substantive-expedient continuum yields descriptors which provide the basis for comparative study of planning conducted at different colleges. By borrowing descriptors from both conceptualizations, this thesis study develops a continuum of formal to informal for use in classifying and comparing the long range planning of different colleges.

The terms formal and informal are appropriate to this study; there is no intent to evaluate, only to compare long range planning at different institutions. Such terms as systematic, unsystematic, expedient, and substantive may connote valuation. By contrast, the terms formal and informal are not likely to be interpreted as disparaging. In addition, the management literature shows the common use of formal and informal as qualifiers of the concepts of process and organization which are two aspects of long range planning to be examined in this study.

This study's concept of formal long range planning approximates the concepts of systematic and substantive planning.

Similarly, the concept of informal long range planning has many characteristics of unsystematic and expedient planning.

The Research Instrument

The principal tool for investigation was a structured questionnaire to be used in personal interviews with the chief planning officers of the 20 subject colleges. The questionnaire contained probing questions and can be considered intensive as well as extensive because of its length.

The questionnaire was constructed and submitted for review and suggestions to three authorities on the conduct of survey research. A revised version of the questionnaire was pretested with planning officers at two colleges before use in the survey of the 20 colleges selected for the sample. The two colleges involved in the pretest were selected because they were terminating or phasing out their educational programs in the near future. It was considered that they would be appropriate subjects only for the pretest of the surveys.

Several benefits were derived from the pretest of the questionnaire. First, the pretest made it obvious that strict adherence to the promises of confidentiality and anonymity was required if the interviews were to obtain full disclosure of institutional long range planning. Second, the pretest provided an estimate of time required for conduct of the survey interviews. Intensive surveys conducted with college officers who have considerable responsibility and authority require substantial blocks of

time and occasionally more than one interview. Determining this in the pretest was beneficial in the later scheduling of interviews with planning officers of the sampled colleges.

The pretest also revealed the importance of face-to-face contact to the administration of the questionnaire. Such personal contact allowed for clarification of questions and enhanced the rapport required for probing.

A fourth benefit of the pretesting came from the use of a portable tape recorder. As an adjunct to the collection of questionnaire responses, the recorder shortened the interview time, appeared to enhance rapport between the respondent and the interviewer, and served as a means of corroborating and expanding the responses noted by the interviewer. No respondent appeared ill at ease in the presence of a tape recorder when it was made clear that (1) there would be no evaluation of the long range planning conducted at the institution and (2) there would be strict observance to the principles of confidentiality and anonymity.

The questionnaire was prepared with the intent that each item would elicit a response which would describe a tendency toward either a formal or an informal approach to long range planning. The first four questions were to determine the role of the college administration, the historical background of this role, the tasks or steps of the process being performed by the administration. The personal background of planning administrators also was sought.

The next set of questions was to determine the extent of the involvement of the institution's governing board in long range

planning. Questions were asked about the history of the board's involvement, the background of the board membership, the planning role performed by the board, the existence of a planning committee, the history and membership of such a committee, and the method of choosing committee members.

Two similar sets of questions were asked to determine (1) if the college had established a separate department or office for long range planning and (2) if the college had a campus committee which participated in the institution's long range planning.

The purpose of the first 20 questions was to characterize the structure of the planning organization, the breadth of participation of the various college constituencies, and the degree of specification of the planning process.

The next section, 17 questions, sought to determine if the long range process was sporadic or on-going, means or ends oriented, based upon a narrow or a broad information base, impromptu or routinized, framed in departmental or institutional terms. This section of the questionnaire also attempted to determine the extent to which long range planning was integrated with the near term operations.

A series of six questions was aimed at characterizing the openness of the process. Questions were asked about the knowledge which the college constituencies had with respect to who was involved in long range planning, what issues were being addressed, and how the long range plans were disclosed.

The questionnaire concluded with questions asking for the personal views of the planning officer on the evolution of planning at his college, on changes in planning which he expected to occur on his campus, and on the status of long range planning at other independent Michigan colleges. (A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A-1.)

Conduct of First Stage

The colleges contacted were those on the randomly drawn list. In telephone conversations, the study was described to the chief planning officers who were college presidents in most cases. In each conversation, it was emphasized that the study had neither the intention nor the design capability to evaluate the institution. The study was presented solely as a survey of institutional long range planning. It was also emphasized that the confidentiality and anonymity of both the planning officer and the institution would be maintained. Planning officers at three colleges stated they were unable or unwilling to participate in the survey. These three colleges were replaced in the sample by three other institutions randomly drawn from the remaining population.

Appointments were scheduled for interviews. Typically the interviews required somewhat more than one hour to complete. The amount of time the officer was willing to spend in discussion and administrative interruptions were the major determinants of length of the interview. Despite the substantial time required for the interview, all respondents were open, courteous, and hospitable to

the inteviewer. Some respondents stated they had no concern for the maintenance of confidentiality and anonymity.

Shortly after the completion of the interview, the responses were transcribed to a second questionnaire sheet. The purpose of this transcription was to remove names and other clues to the identify of the subject institution. This transcription was derived from the interviewer's notes and the tape recording of the interview. Malfunctions of the recorder produced unusable recordings of two interviews and destroyed two other recordings during transcription. Because the recordings were a supplement to written responses, no data were lost.

The unidentified transcriptions were then read independently by three persons interested in and knowledgeable of administration in higher education One reader had previously served as a college planning officer and is currently a planning consultant for several colleges in the Midwest. Another reader has been an administrator at both public and private institutions. The third reader is a doctoral student in higher education at Wayne State University. These readers were selected because of their expressed interest in college planning and their willingness to participate in the project.

The study was explained to the readers; the descriptions of formal-informal planning were discussed; and a sheet of guidelines was provided each reader for reference as he read the unidentified transcriptions of the interviews. (See Appendix B-1) The reader was then to interpret whether the response to each question

suggested a formal or informal approach to long range planning and to indicate his interpretation. (See Appendix B-2) When in doubt, the reader was to check the "not sure" column.

After readers had tallied their interpretations, the interpretation sheets were scored. A response interpreted as indicative of formal long range planning (FLRP) was scored as a plus one; a response interpreted as indicative of informal long range planning (ILRP) was scored as a minus one; a "not sure" interpretation was given a zero value. Each tally sheet yielded a net score, and there were three net scores for each college surveyed, one from each reader. (See Appendix B-3)

The net scores for the 20 colleges were arrayed with the largest positive net score at one end of the array and the largest net negative score at the opposite end. The three colleges at each of the extremes of the array were selected for closer examination in the second stage of the study.

The first stage of the survey study had three purposes to accomplish. One, the survey was to provide a useful data base for the comparative study of all 20 subject institutions. Second, the first stage was to provide an objective means for selecting six institutions for closer examination in stage two of the study. Third, the first stage was to perform analyses intended to guide the conduct of the second stage of the study.

Three separate analyses were performed at the conclusion of stage one. The first, an item analysis of the questionnaire sought to identify in the responses the characteristics of all 20

institutions. The responses to each question of the questionnaire were examined for institutional variables which may or may not characterize planning. A response which describes the composition of a governing board, for example, does not characterize planning but does reveal non-planning characteristics of a college. The resulting tabulations comprised an overview of the entire sample stated in terms of both planning and non-planning characteristics.

In a similar fashion, the five colleges at each end of the net scoring array were identified with non-planning characteristics drawn from their responses. This second analysis attempted to develop "composite pictures" of the five perceived as most often tending toward a formal approach to long range planning and the five perceived as most often tending toward an informal approach. The composites drew attention to dissimilarities between the two subgroups and between each of the subgroups and the total sample, again in terms of both planning and non-planning characteristics.

A third analysis involved a cross examination of the response interpretations made by the readers of the questionnaires and the non-planning characteristics which appeared in these responses. Unlike the first two analyses, this procedure sought to relate non-planning features mentioned in specific responses to reader interpretations of these responses as indicators of formal or informal planning. The intent was to develop a list of those non-planning characteristics which may have influenced the interpretations of the responses.

The results of these analyses are in the form of suggested directions for the second stage of the survey.

Conduct of Second Stage

Stage one was to classify institutions in two groups according to dissimilarities observed in planning characteristics. The objective of the second stage of the study was the discovery of observable non-planning characteristics which appear to have an established association with specific planning characteristics, such as those described as formal or informal. Stage two sought similarities in non-planning characteristics associated with institutions which have similar planning characteristics. In this stage, efforts were made to establish that colleges which have dissimilar features of planning also possess dissimilar nonplanning features.

No attempt was made to develop associations which suggest a causal relationship. Rather, the attempt was to use the associations to draw more clearly the comparisons between colleges which practice formal and informal long range planning.

The research design of stage two and the case method have many of the same attributes. Both utilize analogies, similarities, and dissimilarities and seek to establish relationships. Both are intensive, relatively unstructured, and reliant to some degree upon serendipity.

Unlike the case method which centers on a problem, the intensive survey design of this stage had as its focus long range planning. No problem need be present for long range planning to

exist. The case method seeks information related to the problem to be solved. The task of this research was to determine the non-planning factors at an institution which may have relevance to long range planning.

The procedure followed for this research stage involved intensive examination of (1) the historical background of each of the six subject colleges, (2) the current status of each institution, and (3) the constituencies which influence long range planning at each college.

Libraries, college catalogs, public relations releases, interviews with campus veterans were among the sources to be used in the examination of an institution's historical background.

Annual reports, news releases and interviews with informed campus personnel were some of the means used to develop an estimate of an institution's vitality and viability.

Three groups -- the board, the administration, and the faculty -- appeared of primary importance to institutional planning. Alumni and student bodies are viewed as having lesser influence. A set of questions was developed as one means of guiding the second stage of the study. However, this question set should not be regarded as a research instrument but rather as a list from which questions were drawn for use in interviews of the second stage of the study. Not all questions were applicable to every interview but the list of questions provided starting points for discussions with respondents. (See Appendix A-2)

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the study of long range planning at 20 selected independent colleges in Michigan. Three levels of investigation are reported. First, the results of the survey of long range planning characteristics at all 20 colleges are reported. In the second level of study, the five colleges classified as tending to have the most formal approach to long range planning (FLRP) were compared with the five colleges classified as tending to have the most informal approach to long range planning. These comparisons are reported in this chapter. The third level of investigation involved intensive examination of six colleges, the three regarded as most formal in their long range planning and the three regarded as most informal. The descriptions of these six colleges focus on the comparative aspects of long range planning and on the comparative institutional characteristics which may have influenced long range planning.

The findings of this study are presented in four sections. The first section provides an overview of the survey of all 20 colleges and ends with the arraying of the colleges according to perceptions of formal and informal long range planning.

The second section of this chapter presents comparisons between the five colleges perceived as most formal with the five

87

colleges perceived as the most informal in their approaches to institutional long range planning.

In the third section are the results of the analysis of institutional characteristics which were not perceived as directly related to planning but which provided some additional comparisons of the subject colleges. Among these institutional characteristics were such observable characteristics as student size and degree programs. Other institutional characteristics were derived from interview responses. The findings of stage one also provided bases for comparisons and guidelines for the conduct of the second stage of the study.

The fourth and final section of this chapter presents descriptive studies of the three colleges regarded as the most "formal" and the three colleges regarded as most "informal" in long range planning. These six descriptions constitute the findings of the second stage of the research.

Overview of College Survey

Four aspects of planning were used to guide the search for differences in long range planning at the 20 colleges surveyed. These four aspects were the structure for planning, the process of planning, the issues central to planning, and attitudes toward planning.

The concept of structure in this study refers to instituional organization for long range planning. Structure directed the study to the consideration of the persons and the groups

involved in planning, the extent to which persons and groups are involved, and their relationships to other persons and groups also involved in long range planning.

In this study, the concept of process is meant to relate to the activities of long range planning. The examination of process led to the specification of each institution's long range planning tasks and practices, of the procedures and schedules which it followed, of the data collected and analyzed, and of the sources of data and information which it contacted.

The concept of issues directed the survey in the search for problems, crises, events, concerns, and considerations which have given impetus to long range planning at the 20 colleges examined.

The fourth aspect of planning which guided the questioning of the survey was that of the attitude toward planning. The concept of attitude refers in this study to the feelings, disposition, or position of an institution toward long range planning. It is recognized that description of long range planning in terms of attitudes lacks the precision associated with the previous three aspects of planning. However, it is also recognized that attitudes have the potential to shape long range planning significantly. Therefore, this survey sought to elicit and record statements which might reflect the beliefs, orientations, and positions held with respect to long range planning at the 20 colleges under study.

In the interest of conserving space in the tables and listings of this report, several sets of letters, initials, have been employed. They are the following:

LR stands for long range

LRP stands for long range planning

FLRP stands for formal long range planning

ILRP stands for informal long range planning

SR stands for short range

SRP stands for short range planning.

Structure. The first findings of the survey of the 20 colleges deal with their various structures of organization for the conduct of long range planning. Four elements or units of structure were found at these colleges: administrators, committees of trustees, planning departments or offices, and college committees for planning.

Eight of the 20 colleges regarded their chief executive officers as the members of administration reponsible for long range planning. Six colleges indicated the president and his cabinet were responsible. At two colleges, administrative responsibility for long range planning was charged to chief operating officers who were not the presidents. At one college, the administration's participation was through a planning office; and at one college the administration was represented on a planning council charged with the responsibility.

Six of the 20 colleges indicated the participation of special planning committees from the boards of trustees. All six committees contained trustees with executive experience in business. College administrators, clergy, and physicians appeared on three committees. Attorneys and off campus educators were members of two committees.

Six of the 20 colleges utilized planning officers or departments. These arrangements, however, were not long standing. Two

had existed for less than two years, two for three years, one for four years, and one for five years. Staffing of these offices was by presidential assignment. Two persons were assigned the planning office because of their expressed interest in planning; one assignment was made because of the planning officer's campus-wide respect; and three assignments were made to persons with previous experience in institutional planning.

College-wide planning committees were found at 11 of the 20 colleges; two of these were special and nine were standing committees. This planning group was a fairly new campus experience. Three had existed for less than one year; one was less than two years old; five were three years old; one was four years old; and the oldest had existed for just over five years. All 11 committees included both faculty and administration. In addition, eight committees had student representatives; four contained trustees; three had alumni members; and two had representatives from non-managerial employees.

Membership in these committees was by invitation at all 11 colleges. At five colleges, the president issued the invitations, choosing his own administration representatives and following the recommendations of the faculty, the student government, and the trustees for their representatives. At three colleges, the president invited the members from administrative staffs, while the faculty invited the faculty representatives, the student government selected its representatives, and the chairman invited from the

trustees. At three colleges, the faculty member chairing the committee also issued invitations to its membership.

Another descriptor of the organization is the communication network. The breadth of college participation in long range planning may be reflected in the college community's awareness or its knowledge of the long range planning. All 20 colleges indicated that top administrators and board members had access to long range plans. Three colleges stated that it was then up to the board to decide who else could see the long range plans. Such plans were available to faculty at nine colleges, to the student bodies at eight colleges, and to all employees at seven colleges. Five colleges indicated that long range planning documents were available for anyone to read, and four colleges reported that anyone could find out about long range plans in personal interviews with administrators.

General disclosure of long range plans varies. Three colleges indicated that long range plans are revealed only by the board of trustees. Five colleges made no formal disclosure, but left it to administrators to inform staff personnel. Five other colleges held regularly scheduled meetings for the presentation of long range plans, and two of the 20 colleges disclosed long range plans at college-wide assemblies. Two institutions distributed long range planning documents to faculty and staff personnel each year, and three colleges stated that disclosure of long range plans varied with the occasion.

The colleges described how the general campus population learned of long range planning through channels other than the

formal disclosure. Typically colleges mentioned several communication networks operating on their campuses. The most commonly mentioned way cited by 12 colleges for the general campus population to learn of long range plans was in conversations with top administrators. Gatherings of students, faculty, and the administration were mentioned by 11 college planning officers. At seven colleges it was felt that faculty and employees learned of long range plans in group meetings and in superior-subordinate conversations at five colleges. The general campus population learned of long range plans from members of the planning committee according to four planning officers and at planning committee meetings on three other campuses. Long range planning documents were available to the general campus population at three colleges.

Despite the formal disclosures and informal communication networks, 10 colleges saw no indications that the college community was familiar with long range plans. Seven planning officers felt that statements in faculty meetings indicated some faculty members were familiar with long range plans. Alumni correspondence was interpreted by three colleges as an indicator of alumni knowledge, and at two colleges the coverage of long range plans in the student newspapers was taken as a suggestion of student body awareness. Similarly, two colleges regarded broad participation by college constituencies on their planning committees as indicators of awareness of long range plans.

EXHIBIT I

Summary of LRP Structure at 20 Independent Michigan Colleges

Administrative responsibility for LRP falls...

...to the president/chief executive officer at 8 colleges,

...to the president and top administrators at 6 colleges,

...to chief operating officers (who are not presidents) at 2 colleges,

...to a committee of trustees and the president at 2 colleges,

...to a planning officer (who is not the president) at 1 college,

...to a college planning council at 1 college.

A committee of trustees is involved in LRP at 6 colleges.

A planning officer/department coordinates LRP at 6 colleges.

A special college committee participates in LRP at 11 colleges with committee members...

...from faculty and administration at 11 of 11 colleges,

...from faculty, administration, students at 8 of 11 colleges,

...from administration, faculty, students, trustees, alumni at 3 of the 8 colleges,

...from administration, faculty, students, trustees, alumni, non-managerial personnel at 2 of the 3 colleges.

The planning officers generally believed that the campus population knew little about long range plans or the people involved in long range planning. All 20 colleges reported that the trustees knew who conducted long range planning. Nine colleges thought their

academic faculties would know the planning organizations, and eight planning officers indicated that the administrative staffs would know. The alumni of five institutions, it was assumed would know who conducted long range planning at their colleges. One president asserted that only 20% of the faculty and staff knew about long range plans and the planners. Another president suggested that the campus community wasn't especially interested in long range planning; "Nobody seems concerned about anything beyond the next two or three years."

Process. The survey findings which describe the process of long range planning were associated with four sets of activities. These were: (1) the performance of tasks by the different units of the planning organization, (2) the scheduled procedure followed by the college, (3) the gathering of data and information specifically for long range planning, and (4) the preparation of planning documents. It should be remembered that these statements of planning activities were made by the chief planning officers; and, therefore, these findings are based upon the perceptions of these officers of the planning process at their institutions.

Chief planning officers at 11 of the 20 colleges indicated that long range planning followed a procedure. In this study, a procedure is defined as a predetermined series of actions taken to accomplish a project. There are variations in the tasks specified by the procedures, but a commonality of procedure emerges. It should be noted that the nine colleges which indicated no procedures were followed often perform the same planning tasks which are performed on campuses which indicated procedures were followed. The difference

lies in the presence or absence of a routine, an established step-wise progression of planning activities. At colleges without planning procedures, the tasks are typically assigned by the president and tend to vary with the situation and from period to period.

The most extensive set of tasks is performed by the administrative groups responsible for long range planning, though specific duties vary with college administrations. The range of tasks performed by the five trustee committees is rather narrow and reflects the supervisory character of the governing board. It is noteworthy that these committees can be so deeply involved as to propose programs, as one trustee committee does, and to assign long range planning tasks, as three committees do. At all 20 colleges, the boards of trustees approve long range plans; at four colleges, these long range plans must first be reviewed and approved by the trustee planning committees.

Colleges which have established separate planning departments or offices appear to regard these units as suppliers of technical services. The tasks tend to be limited to the collection of data, ideas, and views and to the preparation of unified plans which have been developed by other participants in college planning. These offices apparently are established to facilitate rather than to formulate.

Campus committees are involved in long range planning at 11 of the 20 colleges. The range of committee tasks is nearly as extensive as that of administrative units participating in long range planning. At some colleges, such committees serve as strictly

advisory groups, while at other colleges these committees are the principal planning elements. Often the campus planning committee performs tasks with another organizational unit or in parallel with other organizations. Most colleges appear to use the campus committee as a forum and as a means of obtaining and disseminating information. These committees represent the strongest linkage of the various college constituencies to the planning structure and process.

The following summary details how the structural elements of college long range planning are involved in the activities of the planning process. The 11 colleges which indicated they followed a long range planning procedure also appear to have more different groups involved in the planning process than the nine colleges which indicated that no set procedure was followed.

The "average" college regarded a five year projection as the long range and had been using this time reference for the last two or three years. Typically, the scheduling of long range planning is tied to meetings of the trustees and to the academic year. Three of the colleges stated that the schedule varied from year to year and depended upon the president.

All 20 officers indicated they relied primarily upon the data collected from administrative departments. Generally these data had been generated for some other institutional use and not specifically for long range planning. Most often mentioned as sources of data were the offices of registrar, financial affairs, and admissions.

EXHIBIT II

Summary of LRP Activities Surveyed At

20 Independent Colleges in Michigan

The numbers of colleges which use specific organizational units to perform difficult LRP activities are given below. Nine colleges indicated that LRP followed no set pattern, routine, or procedure. Eleven colleges indicated they used an established procedure for LRP.

The numbers without parentheses refer to colleges without a LRP procedure. The numbers in parentheses refer to colleges with LRP procedures.

Involved in These LRP Activities Are...

LRP Activity	Admin. Group	Trustee Committee	LRP Depart.	College Committee	Trustee Board
Assigns LRP Task	7 (8)	2 (1)	0 (1)	1 (3)	0 (0)
States Mission	4 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)	3 (6)	9 (8)
Analyzes Situation	8 (9)	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (6)	1 (1)
Evaluates Per- formance	8 (8)	0 (2)	0 (0)	2 (5)	4 (4)
Prepares Forecasts	9 (9)	0 (0)	2 (4)	1 (1)	0 (0)
Collects & Ana- lyzes Data	8 (8)	0 (0)	2 (4)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Gathers Views & Suggestions	6 (7)	0 (0)	2 (3)	4 (7)	0 (0)
Prepares College Projections	9 (9)	0 (0)	2 (3)	1 (2)	0 (1)
Defines Objectives	9 (8)	0 (2)	0 (0)	2 (7)	2 (5)
Proposes Programs	9 (9)	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (7)	1 (0)
Prepares LR Plan	7 (1)	1 (0)	2 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Approves LR Plan	1 (3)	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (3)	9(11)

Nine of the 20 colleges obtained specific institutional research for long range planning though only three colleges indicated the existence of established, institutional research units. The research most often requested for planning pertained to economic and demographic factors, to admissions practices and student body composition, and to student academic performance.

Data and information from campus sources were regarded as the most valuable to the planning process, especially the analyses of trends in student enrollment and financial conditions. Off-campus sources of information were tapped by all planning officers. The Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Michigan (AICUM) was the external source most often cited. Professional organizations and government agencies also were frequently mentioned as sources of information and data which have value in long range planning. Demographic analyses and comparative institutional data were described as the most useful planning material obtained from off-campus sources.

Three of the 20 colleges indicated they prepare no long range planning document in any form. Only two colleges prepared published forms of their long range plans for distribution each year. The other 15 colleges prepared various forms of their long range plans, generally for internal use. Parts of these plans are used in annual reports and in public announcements of top officers.

The most common element, a statement of long range goals, was included in the long range plans of 12 colleges. A review of the institutional mission was mentioned by 10 colleges as part of

their long range plans; and 11 officers included performance reviews in their planning statements. Only two colleges indicated that projections and forecasts were in their plans. Statements of financial conditions, resource needs, and specific strategies were included in five long range plans; the next year's budget was incorporated in three plans.

The three colleges which prepared no long range plans regarded their budgets as their short run plans. Eight others also prepared their short run plans in budget formats but cast their long range plans as more general pictures of the future. The nine other colleges stated that long range and short run plans were prepared in the same framework; the differences were in the degree of specification.

Several approaches were cited for translating long range plans into operating plans. Four colleges indicated that their small, close groups of administrators were able to develop short run plans without losing sight of the institution's long term objectives. Four other colleges observed that their long range was still relatively short run so that operationalizing was automatic. Six planning officers cited the use of multi-step long range plans; the farthest year out is general, but each of the closer years is more specific.

Issues. The survey sought to elicit responses which indicated problems, changes, concerns, or events having influence on college long range planning. As descriptors of institutional planning, "issues" lacks the objectivity which may be attributed to

"structure" and "process" descriptors. The responses were generalized in the attempt to protect institutional anonymity.

Financial problems, unexpected changes in enrollments, and changes in the character of the college gave impetus to long range planning at 10 colleges. Forces external to the colleges were cited by 12 respondents as influences on long range planning activities. Six stated that trustees had expected or requested more long range planning at the college. Two colleges reported that accrediting agencies had urged them to develop more extensive long range planning. Four colleges stated that long range planning was demanded of them as recipients of government grants. On five campuses, the presidents were viewed as supporters of increased long range planning; the faculty was seen to play a similar role at two other colleges. Planning officers observed that generally several influences joined to foster increased planning at a college. Two officers stated that committees were formed to prepare accreditation reports and then were continued as planning committees. Six colleges indicated that planning committees were supported by the presidents who wanted broader campus involvement, a forum for discussion, or "a vehicle for bringing the college closer together."

The major concerns discussed by long range planning groups were finances, academic programs, and physical facilities. Sixteen officers regarded institutional financing a persisting issue. Ten colleges cited academic programs as a regular issue; eight showed a regular concern for buildings and physical plant. By contrast, only

two colleges cited fund raising or personnel policies in their range of concerns. Accreditation was mentioned by only one college.

For 11 colleges, long range planning is initiated as a matter of procedure during the year. At the other nine colleges surveyed, long range planning was more likely to be initiated by the appearance of an issue or concern. Most frequently cited were: requirements of accrediting agencies, financial situations, and demands of the boards of trustees for long range planning.

Attitudes. The survey attempted to identify beliefs, orientations, philosophies, and predispositions which might sug-attitudes toward long range planning. The chief planning officers appeared to hold four different expectations of long range planning. First, it is expected to be an administrative device. ("It gives us control...," "...helps us to allocate resources.") This view was the expectation most often cited. A second expectation was that long range planning would unify the college community. ("It helps us to pull together...," "It builds esprit de corp...") The third view expresses the expectation that long range planning defines the college's role in society. ("...relates the college to the world...," "...gives us institutional direction....") A fourth expectation is that long range planning will be a means of obtaining external support. ("...justifies going after additional funds...." "...helps meet demands of accreditation....")

Most planning officers expressed the feeling that long range planning permeates institutional management. ("...subtly it affects our daily thinking....") The aspects of college operations

most obviously affected were staffing and personnel, according to nine planners. Budgets, financing, and the curricular programs were mentioned as affected by two colleges. Five planning officers claimed to be so new to long range planning that they could not comment.

To nearly all respondents, the practice of long range planning had advanced at their colleges over the last 5 to 10 years. ("It was hit-or-miss, now better organized." "It was entrepreneurial, now more of the college community is involved.") Five officers asserted they were still refining and improving long range planning at their colleges. Two respondents felt that little or no change had taken place in the long range planning of their colleges.

Most planning officers predicted that more systematic approaches to long range planning would appear in the next decade. Among the predictions were: "...the greater use of the computer...," "...more and better data for projections and evaluations, ...more areas of the college will be involved, ...the trustees will be more involved, ...the planning will extend farther into the future, to 10 years and beyond typically...." Seven of the 20 planning officers predicted no significant changes; only modification to increase effectiveness would occur.

The 20 planning officers were asked to comment on the adequacy of long range planning at independent colleges in Michigan. Five made no comment. Abstracted quotations from the other 15 respondents illustrate their attitudes.

"Few colleges have concrete plans, just dreams."

"Generally planning isn't integrated and comprehensive so the mission is changed unintentionally."

"Long range planning has a low priority at independent colleges."

"Few colleges do thorough planning--inadequate data, poor forecasting and projections."

"Most colleges aren't management oriented, they really have no long range planning."

"It is too short ranged, deals with budgets and staffing but not strategic issues."

"Planning varies with leadership styles."

"Planning varies with the resources of the institution; stronger colleges conduct better planning."

"All colleges are doing it differently."

"The test of planning is in the vitality and viability of the college."

The questionnaire also asked for comments on the organizations involved in long range planning at other independent colleges in Michigan. Ten declined to make statements. Abbreviated commentary is given below.

"Many college presidents pay lip service to long range planning. They don't really accept it; and without real presidential support, planning is ineffective."

"Participation in planning is too narrow; too often only top administration is involved. The faculty is frequently over-looked."

"Often long range planning has too many persons with finance orientation who think only in terms of assets and solvency--not in terms of mission or role."

"Few educators have long range planning experience; the right people for planning lack the right experience for planning."

The 20 planning officers (mostly college presidents) were asked to comment on the necessity of long range planning at independent colleges. All responded that long range planning was very important, essential to survival. More specific comments follow.

"...essential because private colleges lack the luxury of long lead times to deal with crises..."

"...without a sense of long term direction, a college can self-destruct in the short term..."

"...private colleges lack the resources to go through crisis after crisis. Long range planning may help us to survive, even with little resource..."

The last question of the questionnaire solicited general comments on long range planning. Following are excerpts from some of these commentaries:

"Without long range planning, events are random; I don't think we can leave the futures of private colleges to chance."

"We should plead with persons who have had long range planning experience in business, government, or wherever to offer this experience to private colleges because private colleges are 10 to 20 years behind business in their understanding of long range planning."

"Change is occurring at an increasing rate. An institution must use long range planning and every other device available for looking at the future. Otherwise, that college will find itself organized for a future that may never come to be."

Responses were read independently by three reviewers who then interpreted each response as a suggestion of "formality" or "informality" of approach to long range planning. These interpretations were scored, and the 20 colleges are arrayed in the following summary with the "formal" colleges at the top of the array.

EXHIBIT III

Array of Colleges from "Formal" to "Informal"

College By Code	Number of Responses Rated "Formal" Indicators	Number of Responses Rated "Informal" Indicators	Net Score Formal(Informal)
17	112	16	96
12	103	16	87
11	103	19	84
06	100	17	83
02	94	17	77
04	100	29	71
18	83	26	57
03	86	30	56
08	74	37	37
10	71	40	31
07	72	46	26
15	59	42	17
20	61	54	7
14	58	63	(5)
16	41	59	(18)
09	37	61	(24)
01	36	60	(24)
13	39	73	(34)
19	27	64	(37)
05	34	82	(48)

Ten Colleges Compared

In this section, the five colleges which were ranked as most formal are compared with the five colleges ranked as most informal. By definition, the "formal" institutions would have well defined planning structures; specified tasks, procedures, and schedules; and broader bases of information. Also, "formal" colleges were to be identified by their broader involvement of college groups and their disclosure of planning issues or concerns.

These colleges are differentiated according to certain characteristics; and it is the purpose of this section to discuss

the extent of the differences between the two sets of colleges. The four aspects of planning--structure, process, issues, and attitudes--were again employed.

Structure. The ILRP (Informal Long Range Planning) colleges may be characterized as "centralized" in their planning organizations. In all five colleges, the president is the key participant in planning; top administrators were cited as important to planning at three the five institutions (but not at all five). One ILRP college also had a planning officer, and another ILRP college had an ad hoc planning committee composed of faculty and administrative personnel.

By contrast, the FLRP (formal Long Range Planning) colleges might be characterized as "participative." At all five campuses, planning involved the presidents, top administrators, and standing college committees. In addition, planning involved special trustee committees at two FLRP colleges and separate planning officers at three colleges. Faculty and administrators appeared on all five college planning committees; and the college president was a member of three such committees. Students and non-managerial employees were on two planning committees; alumni and trustees were included on one such college planning group.

No dramatic differences appear in the examinations of disclosures to the organizations. However, the awareness and knowledge of planning by the campus community may be more extensive at FLRP colleges by virtue of the fact of the broader participation of various college constituencies.

EXHIBIT IV

Summary of Planning Structures at 10 Colleges

FLRP refers to the five colleges which were most often regarded as taking formalized approaches to long range planning.

ILPP refers to the five colleges which were most often regarded as taking informal approaches to long range planning.

	FLRP	ILRP
Those Involved in LRP:		
President	5	5
Top Administrators	5	3
Trustee Committee	2	
Planning Office/Department	3	1
College Planning Committee	5	1
Committee Includes:		
Faculty and Administration	5	1
Students and Staff	2	
Alumni and Trustees	1	

Process. The most dramatic difference between FLRP and ILRP colleges relates to planning procedures or the absence of procedure. All five FLRP colleges described specific procedures to be followed in the long range planning process. All five ILRP colleges stated that no set procedure existed.

Both "formal" and "informal" colleges perform many of the same tasks, though the FLRP colleges have more extensive lists of tasks. Also tasks are more often shared at FLRP colleges.

The time projection is the same period for both FLRP and ILRP colleges, five years. However, the schedules followed by the two sets of colleges are clearly different. The "formal" colleges conduct long range planning according to a yearly schedule. Two "informal" colleges indicated that long range planning followed no schedule; the other three stated that planning generally was keyed to trustee meetings or to preparation of the annual report or the next year's budget.

EXHIBIT V

Summary of LRP Activities Surveyed At

10 Independent Colleges in Michigan

The numbers indicate how many colleges perform a specific LRP task on their campuses. The numbers in parentheses refer to ILRP colleges, the five colleges which were most often regarded as taking informal approaches to long range planning. The numbers without parenthese refer to FLRP colleges, the five colleges which were most often regarded at taking formalized approaches to long range planning.

LRP Tasks Performed By...

LRP Activities	Admin.	Trustee Committee	Planning Dept.	Campus Committe	Trustee Board
Assigns LRP Tasks	3(5)	1	1	2	
States Mission	1(3)			5	4(5)
Analyzes Situation	4(4)			4(1)	1
Evaluates Performance	4(4)			4(1)	2(3)
Prepares Forecasts	4(5)		3	1	
Data Collection & Analysis	3(4)		3	1	
Gathers Views & Suggestions	3(3)		3	5(1)	
College Projections	4(5)		2	2	
Defines Objectives	3(5)			5	3(2)
Proposes Programs	4(5)			5	
Prepares LR Plan	3(5)		2	1	
Approves LR Plan	2	1		2	5(5)

Both sets of colleges rely on essentially the same sources for data and information and regard as valuable the same inputs to planning. The "formal" colleges appear to extract more data from government agencies, while the "informal" colleges seems to use more often their personal contacts at other colleges.

All FLRP colleges prepared planning documents while only two ILRP colleges prepared long range plans. At FLRP colleges, long range plans are articulated with short range plans by way of documents. At the ILRP colleges, translation of long range plans into short range plans is made strictly through the personal interactions of members of the administration. The two sets of colleges differ not so much in what they do in long range planning as in how they do their long range planning.

Issues and Attitudes. Both "formal" and "informal" colleges apparently face the same issues and concerns -- finances, physical plant, academic programming, accreditation. The perspective, however, tends to differ with the two groups of colleges. The "informal" colleges appear to view the issues or concerns as reasons to initiate planning. By contrast, the "formal" colleges seem to regard issues or concerns as items which have been revealed by and examined in the planning process. At the "formal" colleges, the process of long range planning was initiated as a matter of course, as part of the campus calendar. At one "formal" college, the respondent declared, "Long range planning must be regular and on-going; it can't start with a crisis. Then it is too late." The planning officer at another "formal" college asserted, "Good

administration is anticipatory, not reactive administration. We conduct long range planning so we can anticipate problems and, therefore, don't need to react to them."

While the "informal" colleges cited a list of concerns or issues which were deserving of attention in long range planning, the "formal" colleges indicated that there would be methodical reviews of their institutions and the problems facing them. There is suggested in the questionnaire responses that methodical examinations of issues and concerns tend to follow formalization of the organization and process of long range planning.

Planning officers from both sets of colleges express a high regard for long range planning. "It will become increasingly important as costs continue to escalate and resources available to colleges become more and more scarce," states an "informal" planning officer. "Only private colleges which know their own situations and what they do for society will survive. Therefore, long range planning will be even more important in the future," asserted a "formal" planning officer.

It is significant to note that none of the "formalized" planning systems existed at the sample of 20 independent Michigan colleges a decade ago. Some "informal" colleges hint of an interest in formalizing their planning approaches. At the same time, the "formal" colleges indicate an interest in refining and adjusting their planning approaches.

Differences in attitudes seem to reflect differences in the depth and breadth of understanding of long range planning at various

campuses. Currently, it appears to be appropriate and vogue to give official support to long range planning.

Examination of Non-Planning Characteristics

The subject institutions were first compared in terms of readily observable characteristics. All 20 colleges had coeducational student bodies. Eight of the colleges had religious affiliations while 12 colleges were non-sectarian. Nine of the colleges offered degree programs which were described as general studies; 11 colleges offered degree programs which were career related. The 20 colleges were also classified by size of student bodies, stated in terms of "head count." Four colleges had student bodies of less than 500. Five colleges had student bodies of 500 to 1,000. Four had student bodies of 1,000 to 1,500. Three colleges had student enrollments of 1,500 to 2,000. Four colleges had student bodies of 2,000 and over.

These various classifications of the 20 colleges were then examined in terms of average net scores. The average net score of the 20 colleges, considered as a group, was 25.350 and the median score was 28.50. Both the group average and group median indicated that the readers perceived that the "average" college tended to be more formal than informal in its approach to long range planning.

When compared acording to student body size, dissimilarities among the colleges appeared. The four colleges with student bodies of under 500 had an average net score of minus 8.0, indicating that the readers perceived the "average" college of this group as informal in long range planning.

The five colleges with student enrollments of 500 to 1,000 had an average net score of 42.80, indicating that long range planning was seen as tending strongly toward formalization.

The four colleges with student enrollments between 1,000 and 1,500 had an average net score of 24.667, just slightly below the average for the entire 20 colleges.

The three colleges with student bodies in the range of 1,500 to 2,000 had an average net score of 32.333, again indicating that the "average" college in this grouping was viewed as having a formal approach to long range planning.

The four colleges with the largest enrollments, 2,000 students or more, had an average net score of 23.5, somewhat below the average net score for all 20 colleges.

These figures should be viewed with caution. First, it should be remembered that no absolute measures were applied to the responses; the net scores reflect subjective perceptions and not objective measurement. Second, it is appropriate to recognize that high positive and high negative net scores appeared in each group of colleges except that group of colleges with student bodies of less than 500.

Another dissimilarity was found through the examination of the scores of the colleges grouped according to the program offerings. The nine colleges offering general programs of study had an average net score of 37.333, indicating that the "average" college of this group was seen as tending toward a formal approach to planning. By comparison, the 11 colleges offering career related

programs had an average net score of 15.545, suggesting that the "average" college of this group was perceived as tending toward a formalized planning approach but markedly less formal than colleges offering general programs.

The colleges offering general programs were almost identical to the colleges grouped according to religious affiliation, while the colleges offering career related programs were all non-sectarian. Specifically, the eight colleges with religious affiliations had an average net score of 42.625. The 12 colleges which were non-sectarian had an average net score of 13.833.

Again, the scores are not conclusive. Relatively high positive and high negative scores appeared in each grouping of colleges. Rather than presenting conclusions, these findings suggested that other institutional characteristics should be sought.

The responses of the planning officers were reviewed with the objective of developing a list of institutional characteristics which did not relate directly to long range planning. This did not constitute a search for planning correlates but rather for non-planning descriptors of the institutions under study.

The result was a list of institutional descriptors generated to provide guidance to the second stage of the survey. The bodies of general interest as suggested by the previous analysis were the trustees, the administrators, the faculty, and the student bodies. A more complete list of these descriptors of non-planning features of each of the six colleges follows:

- The educational backgrounds of the trustees

- The career backgrounds of the trustees

- The traditional role of the board of trustees

- The history of the institution

- The traditional role and style of the president

- The educational background of the president

- The career background of the president

- The composition of administrative teams.

- The educational backgrounds of the top administrators

- The career backgrounds of the top administrators

- The traditional role and character of the faculty

- The educational background of the faculty

- The career background of the faculty

- The traditional and current educational programs

- The socio-economic character of the student body

- The academic performance of the student body

- The trends in composition of the student body

Several avenues of investigation were taken in search of these characteristics. Documents of a general nature as well as those applying to planning were sought. Face-to-face and telephone interviews also were employed. The intent of the descriptive studies is to develop characteristics to the degree that comparisons may be validly drawn. At the same time, the descriptions must be general enough that identities of the colleges are not revealed.

Six College Comparative Study

The final set of results takes the form of the descriptions of six colleges, the three most often perceived as formal and the three perceived most often as informal in their planning. Attention has been given to the background, current status, and the constituencies of each college. Though comparisons of the institutional characteristics are drawn, no comparisons of administrative effectiveness were made or should be inferred.

Formal College I. Over 100 years old, this liberal arts college is strongly church related. The mission of the college stresses the integration of religious teachings in its educational programs. While the curricular offerings reflect a core of traditional liberal arts, modifications in programs demonstrate an interest in preparing graduates for careers and professional schools. Review and adjustments in programs appear to be regular, on-going activities at the colleges rather than sporadic.

The student body is well over 2,500 full-time equivalent students making the college one of the larger private institutions in Michigan. Most of the students reside on campus and participate fully in a broad range of curricular and extra-curricular activities. The student body is regarded as above average in academic skills, from upper middle-class families, and with a strong personal identification with the college. Loyalty to the college appears strong among the graduates and is manifested in significant financial support by the alumni. Student enrollments have remained

steady the last several years, and the administration suggests that enrollments are at an optimal level.

The clergy constitute a majority on the board of trustees though physicians, lawyers, and other professionals are also members. The trustees appear to have a well defined perception of their role in long range planning. They maintain an overseer position for the college. They seem to accept as their responsibility the task of redefining and stating the college mission but appear most receptive to the views and comments expressed by the administrative team and the faculty. The trustees have representation on the campus planning committee which evaluates college performance, establishes planning priorities, and makes long range planning suggestions to the administration.

The campus planning committee appears to be the central unit in the college organization for long range planning. Recommendations for institutional changes are made by this committee which includes representatives from the faculty, the administrative team, the board, and the student body. The administrative team is then responsible for the development of specific programs intended to effect the changes recommended by the committee. The administration presents its programs to the committee for review and approval. The committee and the administration must agree on specific programs before the president presents them to the board for final approval.

The planning process is couched in the framework of a five-year "rolling plan" so that the various parties to planning

have bench marks for performance evaluation and a common view of the institution's thrust. The efforts of the planning organization appear to be to give specification to the "rolling plan" more than to alter the direction of the college. Planning recommendations take the form of adjustments rather than drastic departures from previous planning.

The college appears to face no crises or grave dangers in the near future. The physical plant and the finances of the college appear to be in good condition. The relationship of faculty and administration seems harmonious. The faculty has a tradition of strong influence on the campus and personal commitment to the college. About 60% of the faculty hold terminal degrees in their fields. About the same percentage hold tenure. The faculty seems to feel it participates actively in the long range planning of the college. Though the faculty generally has had little experience in planning prior to college involvement, faculty representatives on the campus planning committee feel they make a contribution to the process and are "learning to do a better job of planning" as the process is repeated each year.

The president is the chief planning officer for the college. Though educated in the humanities, the president had considerable previous experience in institutional planning before joining the college administration. The president is familiar with various planning models in the literature but feels that the present approach is best suited to the college because it has been derived from extensive campus discussion and deliberation.

Tradition calls for the president to be the strong central figure on campus, though the role is clearly defined as subordinate to the board. While the current president fills this role completely, the leadership style of the president appears to be participative and consultative. The president appears receptive to all views, to delegate responsibility and authority, and to perform only those tasks which only the president can perform.

The relationships of the president and faculty and top administrators seem cordial and collegial. The president appears demanding and supportive of the administrative team. Administrators at the college have appropriate academic backgrounds and considerable experience in their current positions. The administrative team has both experience and staff support personnel.

The administrative team and staffs are important to the planning process. They collect and analyze the materials required by the president and the planning committee. Members of the administrative team are involved in the development of specific plans and programs which are presented to the committee and the board.

Once approved by the board, the updated "rolling plan" is published, distributed to faculty and staff members, and discussed at campus meetings. The college also makes the plan available to interested off-campus parties.

Long range planning appears to be regarded by the various campus constituencies involved as an appropriate, valued activity which has become so integrated into the pattern of college governance that it is not readily perceived as a distinctive set of tasks.

Informal College I. Though similar in size to Formal Col-
lege I, this college differs on many institutional characteristics.
A product of this century, Informal College I regards its principal
strength as its science programs. Programs have been changed rather
significantly over the years to reflect changes in career situations
in Michigan. The educational mission of the college has a career
orientation.

The student body is well in excess of 2,500 full-time
equivalent students. Enrollments have climbed slowly but steadily
to levels which the administration describes as most desirable. The
college is located in an urban area and can be described as a com-
muter institution. The admission standards are liberal, but rigors
imposed by the programs and the faculty seem to suggest that only
above average students graduate. Extra curricular activites involve
a minority of the students. The typical students appear to be
serious about academic pursuits. Students and alumni tend not to
identify personally with the college; graduates seem to have weak
emotional ties to the college.

The trustees appear to perform roles as reviewers and ap-
provers of institutional programs. The board involvement in long
range planning has been to counsel and approve the administration
plans for fiscal, physical plant, and academic programs. Trustees
have typically been successful businessmen and industrialists though
educators and other professional persons have also been members.
Individual trustees have been deeply involved in institutional

planning at the board's direction or the administration's invitation. Board members typically have extensive experience in long range planning by virtue of their executive positions in business.

Long range planning appears to be centralized in the college president. There is no formalized organization. Faculty and staff administrators are invited by the president to contribute views, information, and recommendations. The faculty, through its administration, informs the president of perceived needs for academic changes.

The college president has risen through ranks, starting with the college as an instructor. His experience with long range planning has been acquired at the institution. He expresses the view that planning should be conducted at the top administrative levels to ensure effective coordination. All college constituencies are considered as planning advisors but not as formulators of institutional plans. The college has not examined alternative planning models and considers no changes in its planning approach. The president regards centralized planning as a major reason for the current condition of the college. Both the finances and physical plant appear to be sound.

The tradition, here also, has called for a strong president. The president continues to represent centralized administrative power. Administrative personnel are expected to take all exceptional situations to the president for disposition. The leadership style of the president is open and informal, all faculty and staff personnel are known by their first names. The president

maintains an "open door" policy to all campus constituents though decisions appear seldom to be made in haste.

The campus climate seems friendly and personal. Administrative personnel, below the top level, tend to view their roles as functionaries, as though they recognize they have little impact upon planning or policy formulation. The faculty also appears to feel divorced from institutional governance. Faculty members seem committed to their curricular fields, the students, and their academic departments. Like students and alumni, the faculty show weak emotional ties to the college.

Knowledge of long range plans appears restricted to the trustees and top level administrators. Other members of the campus community seem to accept the notion that the long range plan will be revealed in parts to the general campus from time to time. One side effect of partial disclosure appears to be acceptance without full support. As one faculty member declared, "I'm not getting on the bus until I know all about where we're going." This study could not discern the extent of this feeling; and it should be recognized that over 50% of the faculty were tenured, indicating substantial career commitment to the institution.

Formal College II is located in an urban area, and might also be described as a "commuter" institution. Its educational mission appears to have a strong career orientation. Curricular programs are continuously reviewed with the objective of enlarging upon the job opportunities of the college graduates. In line with

this objective, the college provides extensive counseling and placement service.

The student body numbers over 1,000 with most of the students employed part-time. The college prides itself on being an institution for the working classes. Students appear to be well motivated in their academic pursuits though they generally possess academic skills somewhat below the average student entering college. Extra-curricular activities are minimal, and most students are on campus only to attend classes.

The board of trustees is a mix of corporate executives, attorneys, educators, and owners of smaller enterprises. The board is actively involved in the college planning process. Trustees approve the long range plans conducted by the college-wide planning organization but also have come to view the plan as an evaluation tool as well. While the trustees have been supportive of the college planning organization, trustees have not given automatic approval to the college planners. Both trustees and the planning organization have been receptive to differing views and have been able to arrive at agreement.

The college uses a planning office as a coordinator and service unit. The planning office establishes the schedules and agenda, collects data, assists individual departments in developing budgets and plans, is secretary to the campus committee, and responds to the directives of both the planning committee and the administration.

The planning committee is composed of faculty, students, middle-level administrators, and some top administrators. The committee represents a forum for the college. The committee develops assumptions regarding the future, prepares a set of assumptions and a list of priorities for the college, reviews plans prepared by administrative units, then makes recommendations to the administration. Because members of the administrative are also members of the planning committee, interaction and communication between the committee and the administration are positive and extensive.

The planning office has developed a manual of procedures. All parties to planning, both committee members and administrators, are provided manuals and "coached" in the conduct of institutional planning. The "education of the college" with respect to long range planning is regarded as a primary task of the planning office.

Since the introduction of long range planning four years ago, the college has continued to extend its planning horizon. Now, the college prepares five year projections and "rolling plans." Last year, the planning office began using a computerized simulation in its development of long range projections.

The president has supported the formalization of the planning of the college. As the principal tie between the college and the community, the president regards the planning process as an asset in the solicitation of financial support. However the president has delegated the role of chief planning officer to another top college administrator who had had extensive education and experience

in institutional planning before coming to the college. This administrator's style of leadership is methodical and participative. Regarded as a competent, hard working, helpful technician, this former college professor appears to understand the different characteristics of the various college groups involved in planning.

The formalized approach appears to bring different groups into planning and facilitate their participation. The planning committee contributes evaluations, commentary, suggestions, and advice. The administrative group is expected to develop programs and plans to be reviewed by the committee and ultimately to be approved by the trustees. The planning department is responsible for the performance of routine tasks; it handles the details of planning.

Generally, campus groups favor the college planning system. There appears to be some concern about the amount of scarce resources needed by the system but definite support of the participatory character of the system. In defense of the planning approach was the comment, "When resources are scarce, we must plan or the college would break up fighting over what little there was."

The physical plant and financial resources appear to be adequate to the mission of the college. The morale of the faculty and staff seems to be high. Relationships appear friendly and cooperative. A high degree of dedication by faculty and staff can also be observed. Individual students appear to receive an unusual amount of attention and counsel.

The faculty tends to express a feeling of involvement in the institution. Disclosure of long range planning occurs

frequently in small group sessions. Membership in the planning com-
mittee involves nearly all academic departments so that the entire
faculty has the opportunity to keep abreast of the concerns being
addressed by the planning organization.

Informal College II operates in an urban setting and has an
enrollment of several hundred full-time equivalent students. Again
the student body may be characterized as "commuters." The educa-
tional mission has a career orientation, and careful attention is
given to modifying curricular programs in light of changing pro-
fessional demands. The college maintains, as an objective, a close
working relationship between faculty and students and a relatively
low student-teacher ratio.

The student body is distinguished by strong professional
interests. Highly motivated to achieve in academic programs, the
students seem to minimize their extra-curricular campus involve-
ment. It is a "work serious" student body. Strong bonds often
develop between students and individual faculty members; to a much
lesser extent, between the students and the college. The alumni
appears loyal and interested if not deeply involved.

The board of trustees is composed of individuals either in
the professions served by the college or with strong interests in
these professions. While the board of trustees has expressed a
strong interest in the development of long range planning at the
college, the trustees themselves have educational and career back-
grounds which typically include very little planning. The trustees

have expressed a desire for long range planning but have given no specific directions for the development of an appropriate system.

Similarly, the faculty members have had very little experience in planning. However, they manifest an interest in the development of the institution and a willingness to participate in efforts which promote the college. Generally, individual faculty members and departments view development in terms of advancement of their own discipline areas.

To date, it has been up to the president to "knit together" the views, suggestions, and requests of the different academic departments. The president views current long range planning as a concensus of faculty and the administation.

Unlike the trustees and faculty members, the president has a familarity with planning derived from both education and career experience. The president is aware of various planning models and interested in adapting or developing a long range planning approach suitable to the institution. As yet no comprehensive model has been adopted; however, the president expressed the belief that the use of departmental long range planning served as foundation for the establishment of college-wide planning in the future.

The leadership style of the president is seen as consultative, bargaining, and democratic. The president is regarded as a coordinator and a mediator rather than as an authoritarian innovator. Relationships between the president and all groups in the college community appear to be open and congenial.

The administrative staff is small but seems competent. The other members of the administrative team appear involved in the current approach to long range planning, generally by way of data collection and analysis for the president and the academic departments. The president solicits from each academic department perormance evaluations and five year plans, reviews these departmental reports and relevant institutional data, and amalgamates academic and administrative materials in a planning statement. In conference, the president elicits a concensus plan which is presented by the president to the board.

Though the president is the central figure in planning, there is considerable participation by faculty and administrators. Disclosure to the campus of the approved plan is provided by placing copies of the planning documents in the college library.

Formal College III. Another liberal arts institution, this college has innovated within its mission framework. It has readily introduced new programs but has related them to a core of traditional liberal arts studies. New programs have had their orientations in career opportunities and to specialized post graduate professional studies. To be approved by the administration and the trustees, a new program must be perceived as in harmony with the college educational mission and as an answer to a substantial educational need in the community.

Situated in a large urban area, the college has a mix of both residential and commuter students. The enrollment substantially exceeds 2,000. The student body is composed mostly of

"traditional" students, but a growing number of "untraditional" students are enrolling for adult education and professional course-work. Therefore, it is difficult to characterize the typical student. Both the "traditional" and "untraditional" students appear to be serious about their academic programs and to have above average study skills.

About one-third of the trustees are members of the clergy. The balance of the board membership is from business and the profesions. While there is no trustee long range planning committee, there are trustee committees which parallel the functioning areas of the college. Each of these committees has expressed interest in the long range planning of the functional areas. In addition, the trustees have formed a special committee to restate the general college mission for the next 10 years.

Because of financial difficulties experienced a decade ago, the trustees became deeply involved in the operations and planning of the college. The board continues to be an active, interested overseer of the college but is no longer as involved in operations. The financial problems have been resolved, and the college is in a sound fiscal condition. The physical facilities also are in good condition.

The central figure in the college planning is the president. Long range planning has emerged in the last six years as an important, ongoing administrative activity on the campus, largely as a result of presidential action. In the middle '70's, the president invited top administrators and senior faculty members to join him on

a long range planning committee. Using the format of the college budget, this committee evaluates institutional performance, develops specific plans for the coming year, and proposes a "rolling" five year plan.

The views and commentary of the faculty and staff are solicited though the planning committee remains essentially an arm of the office of the president. The influence of the planning group is reflected in the president's comment: "Even though I chose the group to help me, I wouldn't decide to do something unless there was group concensus."

The presidential style is perceived as that of a strong administrator who chooses to share his authority. The president appears to delegate both responsibility and authority but maintains centralized control. In addition to campus teaching experience, the president had served at other institutions as an administrator of both academic and fiscal affairs before coming to the presidency of this Michigan college.

The relationship of the president and other administrators is friendly and professional. The president is recognized as the strongest figure on campus and respected by long time faculty and staff members for the role played in the resolution of the college's financial difficulties.

The faculty appears to regard the president as a strong, demanding, and just individual. Faculty members appear not to resent the centralization of institutional governance in the presidential office. Faculty views are expressed in planning meetings by

the vice president for academic affairs and by the senior faculty members invited by the president. The relationship of the administration and the faculty has apparently been enhanced by the president's efforts to make full disclosure of the college's condition and planning at regularly scheduled meetings of the faculty, the administrative staff, and student leaders.

The role of the president in the formalization of long range planning at the college warrants emphasis. The president chose to develop a planning procedure and organization. The president selected the members of the planning team. The planning schedule and agenda were developed by the president. The planning group evaluates institutional performance and raises issues and concerns for group deliberation. When the planning group requests data and analyses, the president assigns those tasks to the appropriate staff departments. The planning group formulates budgets and long range plans which the president presents to the board of trustees for approval. It is the president and the members of the planning team who disclose long range planning to the faculty and college at large.

This central role in planning is explained in the president's statement: "Long range planning must be anchored to the president. It will not be meaningful to the college unless the president is deeply involved."

Informal College III. This institution has many of the same characteristics associated with the college previously described. Both are church related liberal arts colleges. Both have

traditions of strong presidents and the faculty as advisors in college governance. Admission standards are similar at the two colleges. Both consider as their primary admission targets the offspring of middle class homes. The faculties and the administrative staffs have similar credentials and professional experience.

The boards of trustees are different in composition. The trustees of Informal College III are drawn largely from business and the law profession. Clergy, educators, and other professionals constitute a small minority of the board membership. Though a majority of the board members have long range planning experience in business, the trustees have not shown a strong concern for long range planning at the college. To the contrary, the trustees have evidenced an interest in the near-term prospects and plans of the college. There are no crises facing tne college. The college is fiscally sound. The physical facilities are more than adequate to the college mission. The college has experienced significant changes in the composition of its student, but enrollments have not varied drastically. Shifts also have occurred in the popularity of various programs with career related majors being increasingly favored by students at the expense of traditional arts programs. While not to be regarded as crises, these changes in student demographics and interests have apparently drawn the attention of the trustees.

The student body is of the "traditional" age. The typical student has above average study skills, makes a serious commitment

to the college life style, and acquires a considerable amount of "school spirit." A rather broad range of curricular and extracurricular activities are provided by the college. Students tend to graduate into loyal alumni and become regular financial supporters of the college. Both students and alumni appear unconcerned about the institution's long range plans.

Again, the president appears to be the potent factor in long range planning. The graduate education and previous administrative experience have provided the president of Informal College III with extensive knowledge of long range planning. Fairly new to the position, the president expressed the belief that elaborate planning systems were inappropriate to smaller private colleges, that smaller institutions could not justify specialized planning personnel, and that suitable planning systems had to evolve at the smaller colleges. The president reflected that his experience with an elaborate planning system at a public institution was that the system generated its own bureaucracy and placed demands on the institution that were not justified by the planning assistance it provided.

The president regarded long range planning as important, essential, and an implicit responsibility of the college presidency. In staff and faculty meetings he solicits views on the direction to be taken by the college. While some faculty members show interest and concern for the future, faculty members show little understanding of the range of activities of a planning process.

They appear not to be familiar or comfortable with concepts of situational analysis, assumptions of future conditions, and strategy formulation. At the same time, faculty members who have participated in self-studies for accreditation are familiar with such planning concepts as mission statements, institutional objectives and programs.

The faculty seems generally apathetic about long range college-wide planning. But, morale seems high, and the relationship between faculty and administration is one of mutual trust and respect. The faculty appears to have great confidence in the president and to be willing to leave long run planning to the office of the president. It is felt that faculty views and wishes can be given the president informally and will receive a proper hearing.

The style of the president might be described as gentle leadership. A warm and open person, the president appears to recognize the office as the vortex of the college. All campus affairs of importance flow to the president's office. Decision-making power is centered in the president, though campus constituencies generally express the feeling that they have been allowed proper voice in the decision-making process. In informal contacts, the president continually coaxes administrators and faculty leaders to ponder the future implications of current decisions and actions. The president appears interested in starting an evolution in long range planning on the campus. Such a strategy is consistent with the president's style and would appear reasonable given the rather low level of interest in long range planning shared by trustees and faculty.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a brief summary of the study and the conclusions, implications, and recommendations supported by the study's findings.

Summary of the Study

Background

The consideration of several factors led to the conduct of this study. First, it is the estimate of many authorities in higher education that the next decade will present many difficulties to the colleges and universities of America. It has also been suggested that independent institutions may be especially vulnerable. A second assertion made by individual scholars and by professional organizations is that long range planning has the potential for assisting institutions as they prepare for futures which include prospects of difficulty.

A third consideration is of the previous work done to develop long range planning systems and approaches specifically for use by the management of colleges and universities. Though over a decade of study and testing has yielded a high level of knowledge about planning, very little is known of the impact which such

knowledge has had on the long range planning practices of independent institutions.

Purpose

The purpose of the study is the characterization of long range planning at a substantial proportion of the independent colleges in the State of Michigan. Such a characterization was expected to produce four contributions of value to the field of higher education administration.

(1) The study would provide information not currently available relative to long range planning as an important aspect of higher education administration.

(2) The study would provide a base of research data which could serve as a foundation for subsequent conclusive research in higher education administration.

(3) The study would provide information which could be of use to associations and government agencies dedicated to the assistance of independent institutions of higher education in the State of Michigan.

(4) The study would provide information which could help research organizations to gain acceptance of new management concepts and systems by smaller independent colleges and universities.

Procedure

The research was conducted as a survey of 20 of the independent colleges in Michigan. Though the sample was randomly drawn, no

statistical references are drawn to apply to the population of independent colleges in Michigan. The random sampling was intended to raise the probability that various institutional types would be included in the study. The objective was to identify the characteristics of long range planning at a variety of independent institutions. However, the identification of features of planning at a certain type of institution was not taken as an assertion that these features would necessarily be found at other similar colleges in the state.

In addition, the survey made no attempt to develop long range planning characteristics as correlates of effective college management. The study sought to identify four sets of characteristics of institutional long range planning: the structure or human organization involved in long range planning, the process or activities associated with long range planning, the issues or events related to long range planning at the institutions, and the attitudes which planning personnel held toward long range planning.

The survey was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, interviews were conducted with the chief planning officers at the 20 colleges. The responses elicited in these interviews were reviewed by three independent readers who interpreted the responses as indicative of either a formal or an informal approach to long range planning.

The 20 colleges were arrayed on a continuum from formal to informal in their approaches to planning, and comparisons of the characteristics of these institutions were made. These comparisons

were examined again in the second stage of the study when the three most "formal" colleges and the three most "informal" colleges were investigated further.

Descriptions were prepared of each of the institutions studied in the second stage of the research. Similarities and contrasting features of the colleges were noted. In order to maintain anonymity, the institutional data were presented in generalized terms.

Findings Summarized

It should be remembered that no attempt is made to develop statements about long range planning at all independent colleges in Michigan from what was learned about long range planning from a sample of 20 independent colleges in Michigan. The study strove to describe in detail and, where possible, in comparative terms the long range planning of the colleges in the sample.

The chief planning officers at all 20 colleges stated that long range planning was an important, appropriate, and worthwhile function of the administration of educational institutions, especially the smaller private colleges. However, long range planning, perhaps like liberty, appears to be acclaimed by all but to mean something different to each person. At one extreme, long range planning was equated with the long range plans of someone "important" at the college. At the other extreme, long range planning viewed as an on-going process which involved a broad range of campus groups deliberating the future and ways to achieve the mission and objectives

of the college. The benefits expected from long range planning varied. Colleges with informal approaches tended to expect plans, budgets, and performance guidelines. Colleges with more formal approaches generally expected more; long range planning was expected to increase understanding of college problems and prospects, was to provide a means for examining differences and for managing conflict, and to foster a sense of community in addition to generating plans, budgets, and performance measures.

Knowledge of long range planning was found to be shallow and narrow at most of the colleges studied. Most campus personnel knew little of the concepts of long range planning, were unfamiliar with the literature, and were unaware of the planning models and systems developed specifically for private institutions. Even at those colleges with several years of planning experience and relatively high degrees of formalization, knowledge of long range planning tended to be concentrated in those persons directly participating in long range planning.

Interest and involvement in long range planning has increased markedly in the last five years at the colleges studied. Only one college had records indicating the regular conduct of long range planning before 1975. Eighteen of the 20 planning officers noted that their colleges had become more receptive to planning ideas in recent years. Also, it was recognized that colleges were tending to formalize their planning. The study indicated that 65% of the colleges were viewed as definitly leaning toward formal

rather than informal aproaches to long range planning, and most planning officers expected this trend to continue.

Twelve specific tasks or activites were identified as commonly performed in long range planning at the 20 colleges studied. While all colleges appeared to perform all tasks occasionally, few colleges performed all activities regularly. Also, it appeared that some colleges performed planning tasks more thoroughly and more objectively than other colleges.

From interviews with the 20 planning officers it was inferred that five different types of college groups or units appeared in long range planning organizations. In recent years, the planning structure had become more formalized. Most planning officers expected this trend to continue and for more campus constituencies to be included in the planning organization in the future.

No consistent definitive relationships were found linking the long range planning approaches to commonly reported institutional characteristics, such as degree programs, religious affiliation, student body size or composition. Other institutional characteristics, some difficult to obtain, appeared to influence significantly the long range planning at independent colleges. The second stage of the study suggests that formalization of institutional planning was related to the presence on campus of strong personalities, of an articulate dissenting group, of a volatility in significant conditions, or of a persistent problem or concern.

The second stage of the study also suggested that the character of institutional planning could often be traced directly

to a strong central figure on the campus. It was also inferred in the second stage that the morale at colleges with formalized planning was better than that found at colleges perceived as being informal in their planning. However, it should be noted that generalizations derived from the study's second stage are to be held most tentatively. Only six colleges were examined in stage two, and the examination was broad and general. The suggestions of stage two of the study represent hypotheses which might warrant testing in future research.

It should be remembered that no findings reflect upon the effectiveness of the administration of any of the 20 colleges.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Though the study makes no attempt to draw inferences about all independent Michigan institutions from the findings of the study, the conclusions are viewed as having applicability to the general population of private colleges and universities. Each conclusion is followed by related implication(s) and recommendation(s).

Conclusion 1. Structure and process descriptors provide definitive characterizations of the extent of formalization of long range planning at colleges and universities.

Implication 1. Institutional leaders who desire a clearer view of the status of their long range planning might benefit from the use of structure and process descriptors as assessment tools. Colleges which had formalized their long range planning were able to

discuss in detail the tasks performed in their planning and the members of the college who performed each task. Colleges with informal approaches generally had difficulty describing long range planning on their campus. At times, it seemed the very exercise of trying to describe planning to a stranger pointed out to college officers the need for definitive structure and process for planning.

Recommendation 1. Agencies which assist independent colleges in the resolution of administrative problems should consider the development of an instrument which helps a college to take an "inventory" of its own long range planning and to compare its structure and process with other similar institutions.

Conclusion 2. Attitudes are inconclusive descriptors of the tendency toward formal or informal long range planning.

Implication 2. All respondents proclaimed the value and importance of long range planning. Yet variations in planning practice and participation suggest that many colleges actually assigned a low priority to planning. Other, more precise measures of attitudes toward long range planning appear to be needed to discern the impact of attitudes.

Recommendation 2. Additional study might be considered, focusing on the associations of leadership styles and attitudes toward planning, of career and educational backgrounds and attitudes toward planning, and of the presence of crises and attitudes toward planning.

Conclusion 3. The degree of formalization of long range planning is not associated with the type of institution. The sample

included liberal arts colleges, professional and specialized institutions, sectarian and non-denominational schools. The size of student body varied from a few hundred to several thousand. Examples of all types were found in both the formal and the informal clusters of colleges.

Implication 3. All classes of institutions are capable of adopting systematic, comprehensive long range planning. It appears that a motive force needs to exist on a campus for progressive formalization of planning to occur. At several colleges, the president appeared to propel formalization. The study revealed that cohesive, dedicated faculty can also provide the impetus, as can trustees. In all instances of formalization there appeared to be some party which changed the climate for college-wide planning.

Recommendation 3. Research should be considered to ascertain what conditions need to be present on a campus to foster the formalization of long range planning.

Conclusion 4. Formalized long range planning may have emerged at independent Michigan colleges during the last decade. Though four colleges alluded to "master plans" formulated earlier, only one college could trace its comprehensive formal planning back to 1971. The other colleges which possessed established procedures and other characteristics of formalized long range planning stated their systems had been in operation two to five years.

Implication 4. The formalization of long range planning may be a phenomenon at independent colleges in this decade. Respondents frequently observed that college long range planning has

lagged significantly behind that of business and governmental units. Private colleges also are aware of the formalized planning conducted extensively at public institutions of higher education. Some independent colleges are recognized as models of planning and have stimulated interest at peer institutions. Interest in planning appears to be spreading, especially among trustees and top administrators.

Recommendation 4. Agencies and organizations interested in the promoting of institutional planning systems should consider the development of programs which help independent colleges to refine or up-grade their efforts. These agencies should emphasize the flexibility and adaptability of their planning systems.

Conclusion 5. The existence of a planning committee on the board of trustees is associated with a relatively high degree of formalization of long range planning.

Implication 5. The existence of a planning committee on the board announces to the college administration the board's interest in the performance of that management function and develops within the board membership a fuller understanding of the planning process.

Recommendation 5. The American Governing Board or a similar organization should consider research to determine the extent to which these committees are used, the characteristics of the membership of such committees, and the range of roles performed by these committees.

Conclusion 6. The planning experience of the college president is a principal determinant in formalization of the institution's long range planning. The educational backgrounds of the presidents appear to have less of an influence on formalization of planning than their career experiences before becoming chief executives.

Implication 6. The more planning experience a college president has, the more systematized and comprehensive the planning at his institution is likely to be. While presidents become different in office, their perceptions and feelings about planning may be somewhat fixed by the time they enter office. At all five colleges perceived as most "formal," comprehensive planning has been introduced in the last six years and with the support of relatively new presidents. In two instances, the presidents were told by their boards that among their first duties in office would be the initiation of formalized long range planning.

Recommendation 6. Boards of Trustees should examine the careers of candidates for presidential office for previous experience in institutional planning. Trustees also should expect presidential office holders to take in-service training in planning. Colleges of education in Michigan should consider the offering of seminars and short courses on long range planning to presidents of independent institutions.

Conclusion 7. Involvement in long range planning has had the effect of raising campus morale and of creating an esprit de corp.

Implication 7. Meaningful participation in long range planning yields a significant benefit in the form of conflict management and institutional unification. Several respondents observed that planning committees provided a forum for discussion. Members of the college community expressed views, aired grievances, and often discovered valid though opposing positions. Dissent was felt to decrease on the campus when the planning system provided for active participation of potential dissenting groups.

Recommendation 7. Longitudinal research of organizational unrest and morale should be considered at colleges undergoing a progression toward more formalized, comprehensive planning. In addition, study might be warranted of campuses where faculties and/or staff personnel have recently been organized as union groups. Such a study might aim to determine if participation or non-participation in planning was a factor in unionization.

Conclusion 8. Formalized long range planning has been a significant factor in the resolution of financial problems at several independent colleges. Five of the 10 colleges perceived as tending most toward formal long range planning had experienced financial problems in the past and regarded long range planning as an important contributor to the resolution and avoidance of these problems.

Implication 8. Long range planning is directly related to effective financial management at independent colleges. Two subject colleges, admittedly in financial difficulty, asserted that long range planning was the key to their continued existence. Such

planning reportedly helped the institutions to husband financial resources effectively and to secure additional support from external sources.

Recommendation 8. Research should be conducted to establish whether or not a direct relationship exists between financial management and long range planning. Studies have strongly suggested that such a relationship exists in business firms. If the same assertion could be made for collegiate situations, colleges would probably be more receptive to new planning concepts and systems.

Conclusion 9. Knowledge of planning is uncommon to the independent college campuses. Only six planning officers expressed an awareness of the planning models developed by such organizations as NCHEMS, NACUBO, and CASC. Faculty members at most of the colleges surveyed had neither educational nor career backgrounds which included planning. Boards of trustees were often without members who had been involved in planning activities. For many colleges, planning is learned "under fire."

Implication 9. The effectiveness of participants in long range planning would be enhanced by raising the participants' level of understanding of planning. Typically, faculty members have had little occasion to study or participate in long range organizational planning. Managerial concepts are foreign to most faculty members and to many middle level staff personnel. Even top level administrators -- registrars, admissions officers, for example -- are often unaware of the tasks involved in long range planning. This has been explained by the observation that top administrators often acquire

their positions by virtue of special expertise. Their views and those of faculty are frequently parochial. The effectiveness of institutional, comprehensive planning may be a function of the planning education provided by the system.

Recommendation 9. Colleges of education in the state should consider providing training sessions in planning to those participating in long range planning at independent colleges. These training programs should be prepared with the level of participant understanding and the character of the institution's planning in mind.

Closing Commentary

It was intentional that the research design included no measures for evaluation. It was regarded as inappropriate for this descriptive study to judge what constituted effective long range planning or what college was best at long range planning. Such research objectives would probably have reduced significantly the number of planning officers willing to participate in the study.

Nevertheless, questions naturally arose in the minds of those involved in the study. Which is better, "informal" or "formal" long range planning? Which better serves the independent colleges, an "informal" or a "formal" approach to long range planning? What are important strengths and weaknesses of each approach to long range planning? Though the study failed to provide a basis for thorough discussion of these questions, partial answers were implied. It should be remembered, however, that these partial answers

constitute commentary and should not be regarded as validated conclusions.

Almost all private colleges appear to rely upon the president for institutional leadership and operational direction. An informal planning approach tends to concentrate institutional responsibility and authority in the presidency even further. (It need not, but the tendency has been for that concentration to occur.) The health, happiness, and viability of the institution is directly related to the health, happiness, and vitality of the president.

One measure of how well long range planning serves a college may be in how and what planning contributes to the perpetuation of that college. Formal approaches to long range planning may better foster institutional continuity by involving more persons and groups concerned with the future of the college. This generalization applies especially well when the trustees and senior faculty members participate in deliberations of the long term college situation. The tenure in office of the "typical" college president is a declining span of time. If this trend continues, it will be increasingly important to involve in institutional planning the trustees and the senior faculty since their time frames of reference are longer term. For this reason, formal planning may contribute significantly to institutional continuity and may moderate the effects of executive change.

Excessive formalization is a potential danger in long range planning. Formalization is excessive when planning no longer is an

instrument to be used in the achievement of a purpose but rather becomes an end itself, when groups meet to perpetuate the planning organization, and when data are gathered to be fed into the planning process.

One answer offered to this potential difficulty is in the form of performance measures. The colleges which reported being satisfied with their planning approaches were able to articulate what specific benefits were expected of planning. The colleges which expected the most of their long range planning tended to be the colleges most satisfied with their long range planning but also were perceived as having highly formalized planning. The secret to avoiding excessive formalization may lie in the establishment of performance measures for long range planning.

Another measure of the effectiveness of planning suggested by the study is the degree to which planning has been internalized at the institution. Perhaps long range planning is truly effective when every person concerned about and responsible for a college automatically relates all current experiences to the long term future of that college.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND QUESTION LIST
FOR
INTERVIEWS

LONG RANGE PLANNING SURVEY

Preamble to the Survey Interview:

This interview is part of a study to find out more about the long range planning conducted by private colleges in the State of Michigan.

For this study, "long range" is defined as a time projection far enough into the future that the plans for that time period are developed only in general terms, as sketches without sharp details. By contrast, "short term" refers to a future time period near enough to the present that plans can be developed in specific details. The "long range" plan is akin to an architect's rendering which suggests what a building might look like after construction while a "short term" plan is similar to an architect's blueprint which guides the construction of the building.

This interview is confidential. Your responses will not be reported and will not be associated with your college. Only in the acknowledgements will your college be cited by name; no colleges will be named in the report of the study.

RESPONDENT:

NAME_____

TITLE/POSITION_____

INSTITUTION_____

ADDRESS_____

_____

SURVEY IDENTIFICATION CODING_____

SURVEY IDENTIFICATION CODING_____

1. Who of your campus administration is responsible for the conduct of long range planning for your college? (Titles, positions, no names.)

2. How did this responsibility come to fall to this person, this group? (PROBE: history, rationale, selection process, etc.)

3. Describe the long range planning tasks performed by this person, this group? (PROBE: defines mission, reviews plans prepared by others, approves of plans, gathers data, etc.)

4. What is the background of this person, this group? (PROBE: campus experience, education, administrative roles, etc.)

5. Is there also a long range planning group or committee on the governing board of your college? (PROBE: official, designated, informal, etc.)

   No_____(Skip to 9)   Yes_____

6. Briefly describe the origin and the role of the group.

7. What long range planning tasks are performed by this group? (PROBE: defines mission, states goals, gathers data, reviews plans prepared by others, etc.)

8. What are the backgrounds of the members of this governing board group/committee? (Titles, positions, no names.)

9. How is the long range planning group of the governing board chosen? (PROBE: by invitation, whose invitation, prescribed procedure, etc.)

10. In addition, has your college established a separate planning office or department or made some existing office or department responsible for long range planning?

    No____(Skip to 14)   Yes____

11. How long has this arrangement existed at your college?

12. How was this department/office selected for this long range planning responsibility? (PROBE: history, rationale, selection authority, etc.)

13. Describe the long range planning tasks performed by this office or department. (PROBE: gathers data, situation analysis, forecasting, defines goals, prepares plans for review, etc.)

14. Does your college also use a campus committee for long range planning?

    No____(Skip to 21)   Yes____

15. How long has this committee existed?

16. Is this a standing or a special committee?

17. How did this committee come to be formed? (PROBE: history, rationale, etc.)

SURVEY IDENTIFICATION CODING_____

18. Who is represented on this committee? (PROBE: faculty, alumni, administration, community, etc.)

19. Who are members selected for this committee? (PROBE: by invitation, prescribed procedure, selection authority, etc.)

20. What long range planning tasks are performed by this committee? (PROBE: defines mission, gathers data, states goals, reviews plans, etc.)

21. Generally, how far does your college long range planning project into the future? (PROBE: five years, regularly, with special circumstances, etc.)

22. How long has your college been projecting its planning this far ahead?

23. What initiates long range planning on your campus? (PROBE: crisis, accreditation, annual event, etc.)

24. What is the scope or range of concerns which typically would be considered in your college long range planning? (PROBE: social change, financing, personnel, etc.)

25. Is there a certain, specified procedure which your college follows in its long range planning?

    No_____   Yes_____

26. How does your college go about its long range planning? (PROBE: step-by-step progression, specific assignments, etc.)

SURVEY IDENTIFICATION CODING_____

27. What kind of a schedule does long range planning follow at your college? (PROBE: annual, deadlines, extemporaneous, etc.)

28. What offices or departments at your college would be called upon to provide materials (i.e., data, information, analyses) for use in your long range planning? (PROBE: specially prepared, drawn from existing reports, from computer data bank, etc.)

29. Does your college conduct institutional research especially for use in long range planning?

   No_____   Yes_____

30. What types of institutional research have been used in your long range planning? (PROBE: cause for research, who conducted research, regularly conducted, etc.)

31. What sources outside of your college provide materials (data, information, analyses, etc.) for your long range planning? (PROBE: consultants, professional organizations, other colleges, etc.)

32. What inputs or kinds of inputs to long range planning have been the most important, the most valuable?

33. What is long range planning expected to do for your college? (PROBE: provide central control, institutional renewal, consensus, etc.)

34. What typically would be included in the final version of your college's long range plan? (PROBE: mission statement, situation analyses, statement of objectives and strategy, etc.)

35. How is your long range plan stated in ways similar to your short term operational plan, ways different from short term plan? (PROBE: same format, same type of detail, degree of detail, etc.)

36. How is your long range plan translated into your operational plans?

37. How widely does your college long range planning affect your current operations? (PROBE: budgeting, personnel policies, hiring, etc.)

38. How does your college typically disclose its long range plans?

39. What members of your college community would have access to your long range plans? (PROBE: faculty, students, alumni, etc.)

40. What indications do you have about the familarity of these groups with your college long range plans? (PROBE: alumni studies, student newspaper articles, etc.)

41. What members of your college community (i.e., faculty, students, alumni) would know the persons who conduct long range planning?

42. How would the general campus population (i.e., workers, faculty, students) go about finding out about the college long range plans? (PROBE: memos, open discussions, counseling, etc.).

SURVEY IDENTIFICATION CODING_____

43. What is the policy of your college with regard to disclosure of long range plans to the general campus population (i.e., workers, faculty, students) go about finding out about the college long range plans? (PROBE: memos, open discussions, counseling, etc.)

44. How would long range planning at your colege today compare with long range planning at your college five to ten years ago?

45. How do you think long range planning will change at your college in the future?

46. What impressions do you have regarding the adequacy of long range planning activities at independent colleges in Michigan?

47. What impressions do you have regarding the appropriateness of the people involved in long range planning at independent colleges in Michigan.

48. What impressions do you have regarding the necessity for long range planning at independent Michigan colleges?

49. Any concluding comments on long range planning?

50. Would you want a copy of the final report of the study?

APPENDIX A-2

QUESTION LIST FOR STAGE II INTERVIEWS

The following list of questions was used in the second stage
of the research. Questions from this list were asked of various mem-
bers of different constituencies on selected college campuses. Not
all questions were appropriate to ask of all constituencies. Thus,
this list was intended to help the interviewer to stimulate discus-
sion and should not be mistaken for a questionnaire.

APPENDIX A-2

Describe this college in your own way, as you view it today. What are its most significant aspects? What are its best features? What characteristics trouble you?

How has the college changed in the time you've known it? What changes please you? What changes trouble you?

In your opinion, what changes are most likely to occur at your college in the next several years? What affect will these changes have on you? On the college?

What is the origin of this college, as you understand it? What led to the establishment of this college?

What is the mission of the college, the role of the college in society -- as you see it? How has this mission changed in the time you've known the college? How may this mission/role change in the next several years? What would you like the mission of the college to be?

Describe the programs offered by the college. Are these the most important? Are they good programs, the right programs, in your opinion? Are there other programs? What programs do you think should be added/amended/deleted?

CASE CODING_____

How large is the student body, in your estimate? Is this "head count," "full-time equivalents," what? How is the student body changing? Describe the "typical" student? What type of student would you prefer to have enrolled in the college several years from now? How does your expectation compare with the Admissions Office expectation?

What would you like this college to be in 5 to 10 years? What programs? What kind of campus life? What kind of leadership?

As you see them, what are the prospects, the opportunities for the college in the next several years? How will opportunity change during the next decade? How significant are these opportunities to the college?

In your opinion, what problems face your college today? How do these problems differ from the problems of the past? What problems do you expect to emerge in the college's future? How significant are these problems to the college?

What do you estimate the strengths of the college to be today? How do these strengths compare with those of the past? What do you expect the strengths of the college to be in the future? How significant are these strengths to the college?

What do you perceive to be the threats to the college? How are today's threats different from those of the past? What future, potential threats do you forecast for the college? How significant are these threats to the college?

CASE CODING_____

If you had the power to change your college to suit yourself, how would the college you'd create differ from the college as you know it today?

Who, in your opinion, are involved in shaping the future of your college? What positions, groups, roles are involved? Who are officially involved? Who unofficially? Are the right persons involved in shaping the future of the college?

What is the "official" picture of what the college will become? How is the official statement of the college long range plan developed? By whom? How often? How widely known is this "official" statement?

In your opinion, does discussing the future of your college give you a clearer view of how you interact with others on campus? How widely understood is the college organization? Who on campus knows which office does what? How well is the power structure understood on campus?

Most colleges include several groups which have varied feelings about what the college ought to become, where the college ought to be headed. How does long range planning at your college handle differences of opinion, situations of conflict?

How receptive is your college to new ideas, new programs, new procedures, new approaches? How well does long range planning stimulate innovation on your campus? How commonly are new ideas integrated into your college's planning? Are certain types of innovation readily received while other innovations are taboo?

Describe how the college is governed and who is running the college?

CASE CODING_____

What is the Board of Trustees like in your opinion? What is the quality of the Board membership? What is the background of the Board membership? How is the Board involved in long range planning?

What is the role of the faculty in running the college? What is the real power of the faculty? How would you describe the faculty? How large? Full-time? Part-time? How involved is the faculty in the long range planning of the college?

What is the president's role in planning the college's future? What, in your opinion, does the president want the college to become? How does the president conduct long range planning for the college? Describe the president. Is he open to new, different ideas? Is he a dominating personality?

What role does the administrative staff play in planning the future of the college? Characterize the administration of the college. How would you describe the quality of the administrative staff? What do you think the administrative staff would like the college to become?

What benefits/values come from long range planning at your college, in your opinion? What do you expect long range planning to do for your college? If you had your way, what long range planning would you want for your college?

How does your long range planning identify and evaluate factors and changes in society which would affect your college?

Does long range planning provide centralized guidance and evaluation of your college's performance? How?

CASE CODING_____

Is planning at your college often retrospective -- that is, planning done to correct past decisions and actions?

Is your college planning predominantly prospective -- that is, planning directed at creating a desired future?

How comprehensive is long range planning at your college?

Does your college have a written long range plan for the next three years or longer?

Does the written long range plan include specific goals and objectives?

Does the written long range plan include strategies, specific courses of action?

Does the written plan include estimates of future resource requirements?

How does your college long range planning anticipate or detect variations from the specific plan?

How do you feel about long range planning at your college?

CASE CODING_____

What do you regard as the advantages and disadvantages of long range planning at colleges?

What are your opinions on long range planning models and systems developed for colleges?

How do you feel about instituting a formalized, comprehensive long range planning system at your college?

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES AND TALLEY SHEETS
FOR
RESPONSE INTERPRETATIONS

GUIDELINES FOR INTERPRETING RESPONSES

Check ILRP Column When . . . .

- no planning group is designated

- planning group is ad hoc

- membership in planning group changes quickly or when no selection procedure exists

- the roles and tasks of members of planning group are unclear

- no routine or procedure is specified for the planning group

- there is no known calendar or schedule

- LRP is conducted irregularly or initiated in response to a problem or event

- the focus is on operating departments, on physical plant and programs

- LRP is less than five years

- LRP draws almost entirely from inside data sources, borrows from data generated for other reasons

- LRP aims at improving operating efficiency, at allocating of resources, at providing centralized control

- LRP generates directives for operating departments without describing interactions among departments

- LRP is known to only key personnel and not widely discussed

- LRP is revealed by top administration "as needed" by operating units

Check FLRP Column When . . . .

- a planning group is designated

- planning group is ongoing

- there is a specific procedure for choosing planning group members and the membership is stable

- planning members have specific roles or tasks

- a routine or procedure is specified for the planning group

- a calendar or schedule is known to the planning group

- LRP is conducted regularly as part of the normal college routine

- LRP focus is on overall institution, comprehensive changes

- LRP is five years or more

- LRP draws on same data sources and augments inside data with outside data and research done for LRP

- LRP aims at adjusting to societal changes, at developing broader understanding within the college, at developing consensus as well as improving operations

- LRP generates guidelines for decision-making, describes the direction of the college, specifies interactions

- when LRP is disclosed to the entire college community and discussed

- LRP is widely known, impact upon decision-making, especially budgeting and staffing, is understood

APPENDIX B-2

TALLEY SHEET FOR RESPONSE INTERPRETATIONS

Read a question and its response. Judge whether that response
suggests a formal (FLRP) or informal (ILRP) approach to LRP. Check
the appropriate column before going to the next question and
response. Refer to the guideline sheet for assistance.

Q.	ILRP	FLRP	NOT SURE	Q.	ILRP	FLRP	NOT SURE
1.				26.			
2.				27.			
3.				28.			
4.				29.			
5.				30.			
6.				31.			
7.				32.			
8.				33.			
9.				34.			
10.				35.			
11.				36.			
12.				37.			
13.				38.			
14.				39.			
15.				40.			
16.				41.			
17.				42.			
18.				43.			
19.				44.			
20.				45.			
21.				46.			
22.				47.			
23.				48.			
24.				49.			
25.				50.			

Respondent Identification Code_____

Date of judging_____ _____

Initials of judge_____

166

APPENDIX B-3

TALLEY SHEET FOR RESPONSE INTERPRETATIONS

Read a question and its response. Judge whether that response suggests a formal (FLRP) or informal (ILRP) approach to LRP. Check the appropriate column before going to the next question and response. Refer to the guideline sheet for assistance.

Q.	ILRP	FLRP	NOT SURE	Q.	ILRP	FLRP	NOT SURE
1.				26.			
2.				27.			
3.				28.			
4.				29.			
5.				30.			
6.				31.			
7.				32.			
8.				33.			
9.				34.			
10.				35.			
11.				36.			
12.				37.			
13.				38.			
14.				39.			
15.				40.			
16.				41.			
17.				42.			
18.				43.			
19.				44.			
20.				45.			
21.				46.			
22.				47.			
23.				48.			
24.				49.			
25.				50.			

Respondent Identification Code_____   FLRP_____ X(+1) = _____

Date of judging_____   ILRP_____ X(-1) = _____

Initials of judge_____   NET   _____

                                       NS _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ackoff, Russell L. Scientific Method: Optimizing Applied Research Decisions, Wiley, New York, 1962.

Ackoff, Russell L. A Concept of Corporate Planning, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1970.

Ansoff, H. Igor. "A Quasi-Analytical Method for Long-Range Planning" in C. W. Churchman and M. Verhulst (Editors), Management Sciences: Models and Techniques, Vol. 2, Pergamon, New York, 1960.

Ansoff, H. Igor. Corporate Strategy: An Analytical Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965.

Anthony, Robert N. Planning and Control Systems--A Framework for Analysis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusettes, 1966.

Armijo, Frank, Hall, Richard S., Lenning, Oscar, Jonas, Stephen, Cherin, Ellen H., Harrington, Charles. Comprehensive Institutional Planning: Studies in Implementation, National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, 1980.

Arthur, William James. The Development of a System of Administering and Measuring Strategic Expenditures in Private Colleges: A Research Report, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Bergquist, William H., and Shoemaker, William A. "Facilitating Comprehensive Institutional Development," New Directions for Higher Education: A Comprehensive Approach to Institutional Development, William H. Bergquist and William A. Shoemaker, Editors, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, California, 1976.

Bolin, John G. Institutional Long Range Planning, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1969.

Boyd, Jr., Harper W., and Westfall, Ralph. Marketing Research: Text and Cases, Revised Edition, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois.

Branch, Melville C. The Corporate Planning Process, New York: American Management Association, 1962.

Branch, Melville C. Planning: Aspects and Applications, New York, Wiley, 1966.

Chamberlain, Neil W. The Firm: Micro-Economic Planning and Action, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1962.

Chamberlain, Neil W. Managerial Long-Range Planning, George A. Steiner, Editor, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963.

Cheit, Earl F., The New Depression in Higher Education, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, New York, 1971.

Cordiner, Ralph. New Frontiers for Professional Managers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, New York, 1956.

Dale, Ernest. Long-Range Planning, British Institute of Management, London, 1967.

Dober, Richard P. Campus Planning, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, 1963.

Drucker, Peter F. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices, Harper and Row, New YUork, 1974.

Emory, C. William. Business Research Methods, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, 1976.

Eurich, Alvin C., and Tickton, Sidney G. Long-Range Planning and Budgeting, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Ewing, David W. Editor, Long-Range Planning for Management, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1958 and 1964.

Ewing, David W. The Human Side of Planning, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1969.

Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Limited, London, 1949.

Fincher, Cameron. Planning in Higher Education, Institute of Higher Education, Georgia University, Athens, Georgia, 1966.

Fox, Karl A. Editor, Economic Analysis for Educational Planning: Resource Allocation in Nonmarket Systems, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1972.

Haselhof, Frits. "A New Paradigm for the Study of Organizational Goals" in From Planning to Strategic Management, edited by H. I. Ansoff, R. P. DeClerck, and R. L. Hayes, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1976.

Hicks, Herbert G. The Management of Organizations: A System and Human Resources Approach, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1972.

Hopkins, David, and Massey, William F. "Long Range Budget Planning in Private Colleges and Universities," New Directions for Institutional Research, 13, Spring 1977.

Keezer, Dexter M. Editor, Financing Higher Education, 1960-1970, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1959.

Kieft, Raymond N. Academic Planning: Four Institutional Case Studies, National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado, 1978.

Knorr, Owen. Editor, Long Range Planning in Higher Education, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, 1965.

Koontz, Harold, and O'Donnell, Cyril. Principles of Management, Fourth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1968.

Koontz, Harold, and O'Donnell, Cyril. Essentials of Management, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1978.

Kotler, Phillip. Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, and Control, Fourth Edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

LeBreton, Preston. P., and Henning, Dale. A. Planning Theory, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961.

McFarland, Dalton E. Management Principles and Practices, Fourth Edition, MacMillan Publishing Company, Inc., New York, 1974.

Miner, John B. Management Theory, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1971.

Minter, W. John, and Bowen, Howard R. Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education, 1978, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.

Moran, William E. "A Systems View of University Organization," in Paul W. Hamelman, Editor, Managing the University: A Systems Approach, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1972.

Moser, C. A., and Kalton, G. Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Second Edition, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1972.

National Association of Colleges and University Business Officers, A College Planning Cycle, People - Resources - Process: A Practical Guide, Washington, D. C., 1975.

Palola, Ernest G., and Padgett, William. Planning for Self-Renewal: A New Approach to Planned Organization Change, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkley, California, 1971.

Parekh, Satish B. A Long Range Planning Model for Colleges and Universities, The Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, 1975.

Ross, Joel E., and Kami, Michael J. Corporate Management in Crisis: Why the Mighty Fall, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973.

Scott, Brian. W., Long-Range Planning in American Industry, American Management Association, New York, 1965.

Shubin, J. E. Managerial and Industrial Economics, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1961.

Smith, Robert G. College and University Planning Report on a Joint Study by Colgate University and the American Foundation for Management Research, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, 1969.

Steiner, George A. Editor, Managerial Long Range Planning, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963.

Steiner, George A. Top Management Planning, Macmillan, New York, 1969.

Tickton, Sidney G. Needed: A Ten Year College Budget, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D. C., 1961.

Vaccaro, Louis C., and Miller, John E. Planning in Small Colleges, Peterson, Rounding & Schouman, Inc., Detroit, Michigan, 1979.

Periodicals

Fuller, Bruce. "A Framework for Academic Planning," Journal of Higher Education, January 1976.

Hopkins, David. "On the Use of Largescale Simulation Models for University Planning," Review of Educational Research, Number 41, 1971.

Kona, Toyohiro. "Long-Range Planning -- USA -- Japan -- A Comrative Study," Long Range Planning, October 2976.

Kudla, Ronald J. "Elements of Effective Corporate Planning," Long Range Planning, August 1976.

Miller, John Edgar. "Planning in Small Colleges," Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall 1980.

Saunders, Charles B., and Tuggle, Francis D. "Why Planners Don't," Long Range Planning, Vol. 10, June 1977.

Taylor, Bernard. "New Dimensions in Corporate Planning," Long Range Planning, December 1976.

Vaccaro, Louis C. "Planning in Higher Education: Approaches and Problems," College and University, 51, Winter 1976.

Vaccaro, Louis C., and Peterson, R. "Two Approaches to Planning that Small Colleges Can Afford and Large Ones Can Adopt," College and University Business, 45, November 1968.

Wartgow, Jerome F. "Computerized Institutional Planning Models: An Objective Analysis," North Central Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1973.

Government Documents

Indiana State Policy Commission on Post High School Education, An Indiana Pattern for Higher Education: Report of the State Policy Commission on Post High School Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1968.

Michigan Department of Education, 1979-80 Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, 1980, Lansing, Michigan.

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, A Philosophy for Minnesota Higher Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1968.

North Carolina State Board of Higher Education, Planning for Higher Education in North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1968.

Sangamon State University, "The Long Range Academic Planning Picture for Sangamon State University," Sangamon State University, Springfield, Illinois, 1969.

University of Missouri, Long Range Planning, Columbis, Missouri, 1968.

Unpublished Sources

Shoemaker, William A. A Systems Approach to College Administration and Planning, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D. C., 1973.

Shoemaker, William A. Data and Its Use: A Process System for Planning, The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1975.

Shoemaker, William A. "CASC Management and Planning Projects," an unpublished paper prepared for presentation at the Exon Invitational seminar on Improving Academic Administration and Management of Colleges and Universities in New York City, October 5 and 6, 1978.