Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Implementing New Roles for the Academic Library

James F Williams Ii

Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Implementing New Roles for the Academic Library

Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Implementing New Roles for the Academic Library

James F. Williams, II
Editor

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Strategic Planning in Higher Education
Implementing New Roles
for the Academic Library

CONTENTS

ABOUT THE EDITOR

James Williams, II, MSLS, is the Dean of Libraries at the University of Colorado at Boulder. He holds a library degree from Atlanta University and is a Visiting Scholar and Senior Fellow at the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Mr. Williams has served on the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, and he is currently a member of the ARL Task Force on Telecommunications, and the Research Libraries Advisory Committee to OCLC. His professional interests include academic library administration, national research and education networking, and leadership for research libraries.

Introduction

American institutions of higher education have been so busy
managing the assaults of McCarthyism and then the upheavals
of Civil Rights, the Vietnam War, and the youth movement,
so busy coping with demographic decline, a savage inflation,
and the multiple demands of multiple constituencies, including
vast changes in internal governance and the need to run the
business parts of themselves like businesses, that they have
not since the end of World War II and the Korean War rede-
fined themselves. . . . American institutions in general and
those for higher education in particular have been coping, but
they have not adapted to changing times, and they are no
longer perceived as leading. They are not perceived as lead-
ing, because, in fact, the institutions themselves while being
competently managed in most cases, are not necessarily them-
selves being led. Management is the capacity to handle multi-
ple problems, neutralize various constituencies, motivate per-
sonnel; in a college or university, it means hitting as well the
actual budget at break-even. Leadership, on the other hand, is
an essentially moral act. It is the assertion of a vision, not
simply the exercise of a style; the moral courage to assert a
vision of the institution in the future and the intellectual energy
to persuade the community or the culture of the wisdom and
validity of the vision. It is to make the vision practicable, and
compelling.[1]

<div align="right">

A. Bartlett Giamatti

</div>

This volume is devoted to the process of vision-setting and the
establishment of academic strategy which has come to be common-
place in higher education after some 22 years of experimentation.
The articles have been authored by college and university presi-
dents, campus planners, and librarians. And, the focus is on the

1

plannning process and its ultimate meaning to the academy and its library.

The literature of management defines strategic planning as any planning activity concerned with the long-term future in broad outline, with summaries of objectives, resources to be used, and methods.[2] While still crude, the processes being applied in higher education today have at least matured to the point where we know what not to do when bringing planning and organizational politics together to formulate and implement academic strategy. According to Keller, it is important to understand that strategic planning is not (i) the construction of a blueprint, (ii) a set of platitudes, (iii) the personal vision of the president or board of trustees, (iv) a collection of departmental plans, compiled and edited, (v) a process done by planners, (vi) a substitution of numbers for important intangibles, (vii) a form of surrender to market conditions and trends, (viii) something done on an annual retreat, (ix) a way of eliminating risks, and (x) an attempt to read tea leaves and outwit the future.[3] To the contrary, academic strategy setting has come to be viewed as a useful management tool in an environment where the educational process is complex, where change is large and constant, and where uncertainty is high. It has come to be used as an effective means to manage change, with a focus on resource allocation and an emphasis on investing in strategies. Its process is analytical and qualitative, and if done well, it results in strategic decisions on timing, priority and context, driven by the vision of the institution. Taken further, it pulls together a diverse educational enterprise, communicates a clear set of strategic objectives and institutional values, and achieves the creative integration of institutional resources.

Libraries in academia today must assume an ever increasing central and integral role in the establishment of institutional policy on information access and use. This can only be accomplished as a collaborative effort between librarians, administrators, and the creators of the scholarly record. A recent award-winning article on the model library states that boundary conditions and transitional steps will alter research libraries radically by the year 2020. Functions, organization, administration, staffing, results, and the library's centrality on campus will be altered, with service clusters formed and disbanded to meet the needs of client groups. Flexibility, collabora-

tion, diversity, and fluidity will characterize research library opera-
tion and service.[4] The authors in this collection share this bold vi-
sion in a series of articles which describe their efforts to devise
plans which define what should exist in order to achieve a library
organization of dimension and quality appropriate to that vision.

The highlight of this volume is its joint message from college and
university presidents, campus planners, and librarians on planning
as a campus activity. Readers will find the following common
themes running through these articles:

1. The intended product of planning is communication, and not a
   formal document;
2. The planning exercise helps the members of the academic
   community understand how institutional decisions are made,
   and how to become more competitive for limited institutional
   resources;
3. With refreshing candor, it is acknowledged that the incentive
   for strategic planning stems from unfavorable circumstances,
   whether rapid economic decline and hardship, declining en-
   rollments, the suggestion that some academic programs were
   no longer appropriate, or the increasing constraints of public
   and private funding that have become serious factors for insti-
   tutions of higher education throughout the nation; and
4. The integration of library planning in the college and univer-
   sity-wide planning process gives the library's goals more
   prominence among campus administrators.

Whatever the reasons for initiating planning, readers will find the
general approaches to the process remarkably similar as described
here, but with varying degrees of participation by faculty, librari-
ans, and administration. A brief summary and highlights of the pa-
pers in their order of presentation follows.

President James Rosser of California State University, Los
Angeles, and his Vice President for Information Resources Man-
agement, James Penrod, provide a description of the rationale be-
hind an urban university's decision to adopt a formal planning pro-
cess. This article includes a description of the Shirley planning
model and other instruments used in the planning process. The au-

thors go so far as to cite George Keller's dictum that the catalysts for change in higher education come from one of three sources: a major crisis, the exertion of pressure from the outside, or a vigorous, farsighted leader. In paraphrase, these catalysts are then described as crisis, lust, or good fortune, and CSLA acknowledges that all three contributed to its decision to begin strategic planning. Librarians will be interested in the authors' views on libraries as supply-oriented vs. demand-driven organizations; likewise, their thoughts on libraries and the emerging National Research and Education Network.

President Gordon Eaton of Iowa State University and his Associate Provost, Jean Adams, discuss a planning activity with specific emphasis on Iowa State's heritage as the nation's first land-grant institution. The paper is highlighted by President Eaton's charge to the planning committee to think "unthinkable" thoughts and speak "unspeakable" words during its deliberations to create a sharper institutional focus. It is noted that the President specifically sought a planning committee of "statesman-like individuals who would be willing to take part in protracted rational discussions of the possible elimination of their own academic units." Readers should give attention to the well-defined review process that took place at Iowa State, and the authors' advice on institutional self-examination.

Nancy Eaton is the new Dean of Library Services at Iowa State University and her paper describes the process of meshing a campus planning process already underway with a new internal planning process for the libraries; this, in the face of serious internal institutional circumstances and external state-planning circumstances. The highlight of this paper is its tie to the previous paper and the strategy and decisions made by the library administration in this fascinating case study.

Jinnie Davis is the planning officer for the libraries at North Carolina State University and Karen Helm is the University's planning officer. They describe a biennial campus planning process, coordinated with the budgeting process. They also describe the incentives for initiating university planning and the necessity to link it to the decision-making process; this, in an environment where the libraries are considered administrative vs. academic units. The highlight of this paper is the authors' description of the critical outcomes

of the process as related to the libraries, the refinement of the university's planning process in general, and recommendations for successful planning.

Beth Shapiro, Deputy Director at the Michigan State University Libraries, describes the environment at a major research university with a long tradition of strategic planning which did not always include the libraries. This paper is highlighted by a discussion of the effects of sharing fiscal information with staff in terms of establishing a focus on planning and a vision of the libraries.

Barbara Dewey is the Assistant to the University Librarian at the University of Iowa and she describes a planning process for the libraries which existed prior to a university-wide process. This paper chronicles integrating an existing process with a new university planning process and its highlight is a discussion of the future uses of the libraries' strategic plan.

Eileen Mulhare is the previous Director of Grants and Development at the Wayne State University Libraries. Wayne State is a major urban university and the author presents a detailed chronicle of a planning process undertaken in the absence of an overall institutional planning document. The process included the use of an external consultant/facilitator from the Association of Research Libraries. This paper should be read with the understanding that a major objective of the planning process was to produce a document for broad public dissemination.

President Martin Abegg of Bradley University, Provost Kalman Goldberg, and Librarian Ellen Watson take us through a planning process centered on the strategic vision of Bradley (a private institution) and the library's focus on information fluency. Their papers describe a planning and reorganization process which took place with a new library director. One of the more interesting requirements during this process was that "every academic and support unit was asked to evaluate itself," with the potential result that "programs not essential to the mission and of poor quality would be dropped." That did, in fact, occur. And, a central outcome of the Bradley process is that the campus strategic planning committee is now a standing committee of the University Senate. The highlight of these combined papers is the "Strategic Vision: 1997" statement on the library.

Russell Shank is the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Library and Information Services Planning at UCLA, another one of the nation's major urban universities. Russell's paper describes the planning process in a multi-campus system where nine library organizations are considered as one institutional library. The vagaries of local planning are explored here, and highlighted by the wisdom of the author on formal planning as an administrative process.

Marilyn Mitchell, Assistant Director at Denver's Auraria Library, and Rutherford Witthus, Head of Auraria's Archives and Special Collections present an excellent description of urbanism and the urban library in planning mode. The highlight of their article is a thoughtful examination of the organization values audit and environmental scan as two critical components of the planning process currently underway at their institution.

Linda Cain is the Dean and University Librarian at the University of Cincinnati and William F. Louden is the Assistant University Librarian for Planning and Budget. They discuss planning in a collective bargaining environment, where both faculty and staff are organized as established bargaining units; an environment where planning was conducted in the midst of a consultant's report which recommended the elimination of 300 positions across the University, over 10% of which were in the Libraries. Here is an example where the Libraries' strategic planning committee used an outside facilitator (again from the Association of Research Libraries) and a pre-planning retreat to kick-off the planning process in an atmosphere charged with apathy and skepticism. The authors present an excellent case study where wide-participation in the planning process was as important, or more, as the resulting document. The highlight of this article is the authors reflections on the process.

Leslie Manning is the Dean of Libraries at the University of Colorado at Colorado Spring. Her paper provides an excellent history of strategic planning and a review of the literature as related to higher education. It also describes a university system planning process in detail. The most interesting aspect here, however, is that the author (a librarian) was responsible for the entire planning process on her campus; one of four campuses in a university system.

The capstone paper is by Nancy Cline, Dean of Libraries at the Pennsylvania State University, and Salvatore Meringolo, Assistant

Dean and Head of Collections and Reference Services. They describe a planning initiative that started in the mid-80's with a new president in an environment of skepticism; likewise, an environment where most deans and administrators were unaccustomed to having their initiatives and programs subjected to committee review. This paper details an evolutionary process for planning at Penn State which the authors describe as a campus today with a "planning mentality." Readers will be interested in the administrative and organizational changes that have occurred as a result of Penn State's excellent planning process; one where resource allocations are tied directly to strategic goals. And one where the planning process has moved the libraries away from being seen as a competitive threat, to their being viewed as a partner in academic funding requests. The highlights of this article are the section on drawbacks and benefits to strategic planning, and the thoughtful suggestions in the conclusion.

This volume speaks broadly of a process that has afforded higher education, the academy, and its libraries a solid means of developing excellence in new academic areas while maintaining and improving the best of traditional disciplines and services. For those institutions represented in this publication, their initial and current planning activities have also poised them to enter a new plateau in strategic planning. Readers will note that the planning initiatives of these institutions were not limited to academic disciplines, as the complexities and challenges of higher education in this and the coming decade far transcend the traditional pathways of the academy. The most appropriate summary of the focus of this collection is again, a quote from A. Bartlett Giamatti:

> The most pressing need in higher education in the next ten years is not for management strategies. It is for debate on each campus, led by its leaders, as to what the purposes and goals of each campus are—for only in the open arrival at some shared consensus of what the contour, the shape, the tendency, of the campus or of higher education will be can the drift of higher education be halted; can the further internal fragmentation of campuses be forestalled; can the rush of special interest be reversed; can the public's faith that these places

know what they are about, know why they exist and where they are going, be restored.[5]

E. Gordon Gee
James F. Williams, II

REFERENCES

1. Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1988. pp. 35-36.

2. Finch, Frank. *The Facts on File Encyclopedia of Management Techniques*. New York: Facts on File Publications, 1985. p. 244.

3. Keller, George. *Academic Strategy; The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983. pp. 140-142.

4. Anne Woodsworth et al. "The Model Research Library: Planning for the Future." The Journal of Academic Librarianship, July 1989, pp. 132-138.

5. Giamatti, A. Bartlett. Ibid. pp. 37-38.

Strategic Planning and Management:
A Methodology for Responsible Change

James M. Rosser
James I. Penrod

SUMMARY. This article presents the rationale of a large, urban, culturally diverse, comprehensive university for adopting a formal strategic planning and management methodology. The external forces and the internal initiatives that contributed to the decision to do formal planning are listed. The planning model is described and the current status of the planning and management process is portrayed. The way in which the library fits into the campuswide process is depicted and planning and management challenges that await a new Librarian are presented. The paper concludes with observations regarding the need for a regional assessment of the potential for an electronic library consortium and the need for a National Research and Education Network.

INTRODUCTION

The California State University

The California State University (CSU) system comprises twenty campuses and over 360,000 students served by more than 38,000 faculty and staff. Together these institutions constitute the largest university in the world. The extended CSU campus stretches 1,000 miles, from Humbolt in the north to San Diego in the south. The CSU is part of the tripartite approach to public higher education in the State of California, along with the California Community Col-

---

James M. Rosser is President of California State University at Los Angeles. James I. Penrod is Vice President for Information Resources Management at California State University at Los Angeles.

9

lege System and the University of California System. The twenty CSU campuses enroll undergraduates from the top one-third of those completing a college bound curriculum in high school and student transfers who have successfully completed studies at a California Community College, as well as graduate students in a wide variety of disciplines.

California State University, Los Angeles

The California State University, Los Angeles (CSLA) campus, founded in 1947 by action of the California State Legislature, has become a comprehensive university offering programs in more than fifty academic and professional fields. The six schools of the University serve approximately 21,000 students distributed as follows: Business and Economics (25 percent), Natural and Social Sciences (17 percent), Health and Human Services (14 percent), Engineering and Technology (11 percent), Arts and Letters (10 percent), Education (5 percent), and other programs (18 percent). About one-third of the University's students are engaged in postbaccalaureate study.

Located in northeast Los Angeles, the primary service area for CSLA is ethnically diverse and economically mixed. It encompasses many of the Los Angeles basin's business, industry, and government districts. Cal State L.A. is, therefore, an urban, multicultural institution that is somewhat unique within the 20-campus CSU. It is perhaps the most ethnically diverse university in the nation — 31 percent Caucasian, 29 percent Asian Pacific, 28 percent Hispanic, 11 percent African American, one percent American Indian and other. Almost 28 percent of the student body are not U.S. citizens, and 64 percent do not speak English as their primary language. Some 58 percent of students are women, 68 percent work, and the average age is 27 years.

CSLA is a quarter system, year round operation campus. There are approximately 1,300 full- and part-time faculty members and 933 full-time staff. The annual operating budget (FY'90) is $127,000,000.

FACTORS LEADING TO A FORMALIZED STRATEGIC PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PROCESS

It has been said that the catalysts for change in higher education are reasonably clear; they come from one of three sources. The first source is a major crisis, the second is the exertion of pressure from the outside, and the last is a vigorous farsighted (perhaps, newly arrived) leader. To paraphrase, the forces of change are crisis, lust, or good fortune.[1] All of the above, in varying degrees, contributed to the decision at CSLA to institutionalize a formal methodology for strategic planning and management.

At Cal State L.A. strategic planning and management is: (1) setting goals that match institutional activities, competencies, and resources with the external environment's present and future opportunities, demands and risks; (2) formulating alternative courses of short-term and long-term action for achieving goals; (3) selecting and implementing a best course of action, and directing and coordinating resources and activities to help assure successful performances; and (4) evaluating results to insure that goals are met and monitoring the appropriateness of the course of action and the necessity for modifications.[2]

External Elements

In 1980, Cal State L. A. began the new decade with a newly installed president and a periodic visit from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the regional accreditation association. Although the institution's academic accreditation was extended for a full ten year cycle, several statements in the final *WASC Report* pointed to the need for enhanced planning and for a different approach to managing the resources of the campus: (1) It was specifically noted that the academic planning process was weak. (2) The faculty needed revitalization. (3) The campus lacked hardware, software and support in the critical area of information technology to meet the needs of instruction, research and administration. (4) There were concerns regarding enrollment management. (5) There was a need to take greater advantage of the strategic loca-

tion of the institution. And, (6) there was a need to pursue a vigorous community relations program.[3]

The changing demographics of Southern California and the CSLA primary service area indicated that the trend toward a highly diverse multicultural student body which began in the 1970's would continue. The rate of college-going Hispanic and African American students showed that enrollment management would be a needed endeavor. As the decade progressed and participation rates dropped, this became even more significant.

The introduction of microcomputers, the divestiture of AT&T, and the growing use of information technology in disciplines other than the hard sciences pointed to rapidly expanding needs in this area. Additionally, many deficiencies in administrative support services could be traced to the lack of adequate administrative computing systems.

The era of "less is better" and conservative national and state government fiscal policies suggested that funding sources for new initiatives or for revamping problem areas would have to come primarily from reallocation of campus resources or from non-state entities.

Given the need to address a growing list of existing difficulties, environmental challenges, technological advances, and financial constraints the following strategies were derived and put into action at Cal State L.A.

Institutional Initiatives

Efforts were aimed at capitalizing on the campus location, near downtown Los Angeles and in the midst of the dynamic, multicultural environment of Southern California. Links were established with business, government, and civic leaders. From these new contacts, a reinvigorated President's Advisory Board was formed consisting of men and women representative of the ethnic diversity of the campus. Similarly, other advisory or support groups for professional schools, development activities, etc., were formed.

The University was reorganized. The schools were redefined to encompass more logical and focused academic units. Faculty development efforts and an aggressive program to recruit, retain, and

promote minority and women faculty were begun. A formal, joint agreement defining functions and responsibilities was developed and endorsed by the administration and the academic senate. The administrative structure of the campus was grouped into units reporting to the President and the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Information Resources Management, Operations, and Student Affairs. A University reserve consisting of about one percent of the operating budget is set aside to address unanticipated fiscal difficulties and to provide seed funding to meet unbudgeted needs and to respond to new initiatives and opportunities.

Careful recruitment was initiated for a senior administrative team oriented to strategic planning and management and dedicated to working cooperatively to accomplish institutional goals. Over a period of five years, experienced leaders were brought together. During this period, several new deans also were hired.

A vision for the future was formulated and articulated. Succinctly stated, the CSLA mission was to combine access and equity with excellence. The scenario stressed an increase in the research, scholarly, creative and service activities of the University in accord with the charge given to the CSU in the *State Master Plan*; the development of assessment measures to ensure academic accountability; a focus on the arts reflective of the cultural diversity and creativity of the service area; the provision of programs to meet the needs of elementary and secondary education into the next century; an improvement in student services; increasing effectiveness in the use of resources; building an information technology infrastructure to advance the teaching, research and public service missions of the University; and the development of a strategic planning and management methodology.

THE PLANNING MODEL

In early 1985, the President appointed a representative Long Range Planning Committee chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and charged it to research and develop a planning process for CSLA. A grant of $25,000 was secured from the ARCO Foundation, with the assistance of a member of the President's Advisory Board, to underwrite expenses associated with developing

the planning procedure. Over a period of several months, half a dozen planning experts from higher education were brought to the campus to describe methodologies and to provide insight into planning perspectives.

The Plan-to-Plan

By Fall 1986, several significant decisions were made and the objectives of the process were clarified: (1) The process should be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. (2) It should promote change within the institution through the normal decision making structure. (3) Planning should be focused on decisions and actions rather than on documents. (4) The process should allow some flexibility and encourage innovation. (5) It should link unit plans with individual work plans. And, (6) it should be linked to the resource allocation process.

A planning model was chosen and adapted to the CSLA environment. The Shirley Model, developed for colleges and universities, best fit the objectives.[4] The original planning committee had been reconstituted to provide an oversight and review function. It would be co-chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Information Resources Management. Members of the senior administration were assigned responsibility for drafting planning documents and for designing feedback loops to ensure appropriate input and evaluation.

A document was provided and widely disseminated across campus that gave an overview of common planning pitfalls, listed what had been done to date, spelled out the elements of the planning model, and specified the next steps to be taken.[5] This was the "Plan-to-Plan."

Redefining the Mission

The Long Range Planning Committee had completed an external environment analysis identifying forces in the economic, social, technological, political and legal, demographic, and competitive areas that presented specific opportunities, threats, and constraints to the institution. That Committee also had drafted a new institutional statement of fundamental purpose.

The Shirley Model and the CSLA Plan-to-Plan called for an internal strengths and weaknesses analysis and an institutional values assessment to be done in addition to the environmental analysis. The pertinent findings from the external environmental scan, the internal strengths and weaknesses analysis, and the values assessment would contribute to the development of an extended mission statement for CSLA.

The *Institutional Goals Inventory*[6] developed by the Educational Testing Service was used for the values assessment. This standardized instrument captures perceptions of respondents toward goals in a variety of areas common in colleges and universities. For each question, respondents note their perceptions of "what is" and "what should be." The analysis allows for comparisons between institutional subgroups, e.g., administrators, full time faculty, part time faculty, staff, students, etc.; as well as comparisons with sets of other institutions, e.g., public comprehensive universities, research universities, etc. The questionnaire also allowed for twenty institution specific questions to be included.

Two Blue Ribbon Committees, one composed primarily of senior faculty supplemented by senior administrators, the other composed primarily of senior administrators supplemented by senior faculty, conducted the institutional strengths and weaknesses assessment. The first group focused on broad academic areas of the University (the Schools and the Library) and the second group examined the major administrative areas (areas reporting to executive officers). The Strategic Planning Coordination Committee (SPCC) provided general guidelines for the process. The Blue Ribbon Committees drafted their reports, shared them with the appropriate dean or senior administrator, then finalized the reports, taking into consideration any feedback received. If desired, the response from the dean or senior administrator was also included with the final report.

The SPCC was responsible for drafting the extended mission statement. It contained a statement of fundamental purpose, a definition of the primary service area, a focus on the basic programs of the campus, a reference to the institution's clientele, a listing of cocurricular activities, a commitment to ethical behavior, a collegial governance structure, and adherence to academic freedom and professional ethics. The extended mission statement, supplemented