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The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges and to determine what effect the planning had on selected climate factors. The data on strategic planning were collected using a questionnaire developed by this investigator and validated by a panel of 15 national experts. The presidents and the next-in-charge when it came to strategic planning at all 29 Michigan community colleges formed the population for the strategic planning aspects of the study. Administrators from 6 of the 27 responding colleges formed the population for the climate investigation. The Work Environment Scale (WES) questionnaire (Moos & Insel, 1974) was used to collect climate data.

Twenty-four of the 27 responding colleges (88.8%) were engaged in strategic planning. Most colleges used strategic planning for the first time within the last 4 to 5 years. The colleges mainly chose to engage in strategic planning to improve an already good situation.

The characteristics of strategic planning showing a strong presence were: mission identification, external analyses, and goal identification and achievement. Characteristic areas showing a weak presence were: consideration of alternatives, culture analysis, improved community understanding, adequate resource allocation for
plan implementation, and improvement of financial conditions.

No relationship was found between the size of a community college based on full-time equated enrollments and the existence of strategic planning. There was also no relationship found between the wealth of a community college and the extent of strategic planning.

The major problem community colleges in this study had with the strategic planning was a lack of time for the process. The major benefit reported was that strategic planning provided clarification of directions for change.

The scores for selected climate factors of colleges scoring high on the extent of strategic planning were compared to colleges scoring low. The results showed that there was no support for a relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the climate scores for the factors of task orientation, clarity, and involvement. There was a direct relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the climate factors of innovation and autonomy.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Planning is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of all managers. The noted management theorist, Drucker (1974), has stated that "management has no choice but to anticipate the future, to attempt to mold it, and to balance short-range and long-range goals" (p. 103).

Colleges and universities have frequently been criticized for their lack of formal planning. When planning has occurred in colleges, the "Process benefits of planning were mentioned far more frequently than substantive benefits" (Schmidleine & Milton, 1988-1989, p. 10).

This study investigates the extent of the existence of planning in community colleges. In particular, strategic planning, a type of planning that has gained great popularity in the private sector but is new to higher education, is the focus of this study. Further, this study addresses whether there are benefits to the process of strategic planning by assessing the organizational climate of community colleges that have a high extent of strategic planning characteristics and comparing the results to community colleges that show a low extent of strategic planning characteristics.
Statement of the Problem

Planning

The predominant approach to planning in colleges has been described as "incrementalism." The term incrementalism was described by Keller (1983) in his influential book, *Academic Strategy*, which was based on his national study of college management practices. Incrementalism was described as an approach to planning where changes occur only through many small steps carefully designed to avoid confrontations and major disagreements in the organization. Stufflebeam provided further insight to the meaning of the term incrementalism when he described the incremental setting as "trial-and-error" decision-making. The expected changes are small and the information available and the expertise are limited (Stufflebeam, as cited in Craven, 1980).

Incremental decision-making is not necessarily undesirable, provided it is tied to a strategic sense of direction (Bryson, 1989). This kind of decision-making is often referred to as "logical incrementalism," a term coined by Quinn (1980). However, the incremental planning that Keller was referring to in his book was not the kind that was linked to strategy but rather an approach laden with politics where concern over self-interests, and territorial boundaries are the norm.

Proponents of incrementalism claim that policy changes in organizations are usually so complex that there is almost never one best solution. One of the most influential proponents of incrementalism
was Lindblom, a political economist from Yale University. Lindblom was a strong critic of the rational-empirical approach to change and problem solving. He based much of his criticism on research he did at the Rand Corporation in the mid-1950s. He pointed out the flaws in the rational approach and explained that the preferred approach is to develop new policy that is only slightly different than what existed previously. After a trial period, that policy may be adjusted to accommodate reactions to it (Lindblom, 1959).

A new type of planning is being advocated for higher education. This type of planning is called strategic planning. This planning is an attempt to combine the benefits of the political nature of incremental planning with empirical methods. Care is taken to involve those key influentials who are stakeholders or who are going to be affected by the outcomes of the planning process. "Strategies that do not take stakeholders into consideration are almost certain to fail" (Bryson, 1989, p. 181). Strategic planning focuses on analyzing trends and on anticipating events in the environment external to the organization. The main reason for the focus on the external environment is to identify opportunities. The internal strengths of the organization are analyzed and matched with the opportunities in order to position the organization most favorably to take the greatest advantage of the opportunities.

Strategic planning has developed over the last 20-25 years "drawing heavily from the fields of policy analysis, marketing, and effectiveness evaluation" (Miller, 1983, p. 42). In the early years of the 1980s, strategic planning was viewed as "one of the most
revolutionary commercial sector developments in the last 10 years and promises to be a potent tool for use in nonprofit organizations" (Kotler & Murphy, 1981, p. 470). Peterson (1986) claimed that the changes in the planning function of colleges during the early 1980s were "best reflected in our recent interest in strategic planning, which focuses more externally and tries to deal with issues of institutional/environmental fit" (p. 10).

The decade of the 1980s was one where dramatic events occurred that meant significant changes would have to be considered by higher education. Just before the start of the decade, the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, commonly referred to as "Proposition 13," was passed in California. This tax reduction bill for higher education began a tax revolution that would cripple the financial base of many colleges nationwide (Georgakakos, 1989). There were other states including Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Washington, and Illinois that passed similar legislation (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Deegan, Tillery, and Associates (1985), in their historical analysis of the development of community colleges, found that community college fees had increased anywhere from 20% to 100% from 1975 to 1985. Studies also revealed a shift to increasing dependency for state support by the community colleges. State aid as a percent of income for public 2-year colleges rose from 34% in 1965 to 47% in 1986 (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Demographic studies predicted a drastic decline in the traditional market for most college enrollment. Projections of enrollment trends based on demographic studies by The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1980) indicated that enrollment declines
were going to be the most dramatic issue facing colleges over the next 20 years. The numbers of 18- to 24-year-olds in the population were to begin a steady decline towards the start of the decade that was not projected to stop until the mid 1990s. A population of 30.3 million 18- to 24-year-olds in 1980 was expected to decline 14.6% by 1990. Mason (1985), citing census reports of 1984, indicated that the decline was projected to continue until 1996 to under 23.3 million, a drop of 23.1% from its 1981 peak.

Other less dramatic conditions in the 1980s were also placing pressures on colleges to make plans to accommodate significant changes. Increased competition for students and an unfavorable relationship between the economy's rate of inflation and funding developed as major issues (Tack, Rentz, & Russel, 1984). Increased efforts to improve student retention also emerged as an issue as did human resource planning for academic staff and concerns about academic mission. An important emerging issue was student outcomes (Peterson, 1986). A related issue was more thorough and effective evaluation of academic programs both for the purpose of improved quality and to determine priorities for possible program reduction (Mason, 1985; Peterson & Cocoran, 1985).

Trends and events such as those described above should have provided major impetus to the development of strategic planning in community colleges. Strategic planning is designed to accommodate just the kinds of major changes that community colleges were facing during the 1980s. Bryson, an associate professor of Planning and Public Affairs at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
at the University of Minnesota, performed research on planning in organizations. Bryson (1989) claimed that "If the organization is only interested in minor variations on existing themes, then it is wasting its time on strategic planning" (p. 176). Perhaps the greatest warning that was sounded to colleges in reference to the importance of changing their approach to planning was issued by Keller (1983) who warned that "between 10 and 30% of America's 3,100 colleges and universities will close their doors or merge with other institutions by 1995" (p. 3).

Climate

Ray (1987) in his research on strategic planning in Texas community colleges indicated that there is a need for additional research to examine the impact of existing strategic planning processes on college personnel. A 3-year study of campus-wide planning was initiated in 1985 by the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. The researchers for this project, Schmidtlein and Milton, reported that process benefits were indicated by college personnel involved in planning as more important than the plan itself. The planning documents developed were also described as having a short shelf-life and were frequently ignored in decision-making (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989).

Richardson, an associate director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance at Arizona State University, described strategic planning as a process that considers the external environment of the organization as well as the internal environment...
including "the needs and aspirations of internal actors" (Richardson, 1988, p. 33). This consideration of the needs and aspirations of persons in the organization is important because "the perceptions of individuals in the organization reflect the values and belief systems in the environment of the organization" (Owens, 1987, p. 169).

Strategic planning has the potential to identify and alter the organization's culture which is a reflection of the dominant values of the organization.

One might go so far as to say that the unique function of "leadership" as contrasted with "management" or "administration" is the creation and management of culture. . . . A complex interplay of creative and constraining forces operates both inside the leaders and in the group. The resolution of such potentially conflicting forces becomes, then, one of the central tasks of leadership. (Schein, 1985, p. 171)

"The culture of an organization exerts powerful influence on the development of climate" (Owens, 1987, p. 169). Roueche and Baker (1987), two researchers who conducted an extensive research project on the climate of Miami-Dade Community College, explained that climate can be measured by using a scale and asking workers about selected attributes of the organization (Roueche & Baker, 1987).

Researchers have found important linkages between climate and worker morale. Pritchard and Karasick (as cited in James & Jones, 1974) studied 76 managers from two different organizations. These researchers reported that perceptions of organizational climate were correlated with job satisfaction. Similar findings linking climate with job satisfaction were reported in research by Moos (1986b) for a wide variety of work settings. Moos (1986b) and Anderson (1982) also reported finding relationships between selected climate factors and
In addition to the importance of strategic planning in relation to the organization's culture, climate, and performance, there are additional reasons for strategic planning being adopted by community colleges. The content of A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation: 1990-1992, published by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (1990) lists four evaluative criteria that are used to determine a college's accreditation status. One of these four refers to the college's climate and another refers to strategic planning. Criterion three addresses climate as a factor in effectiveness. An excerpt from this criterion follows: "Elements to be considered as an institution examines its effectiveness include but are not limited to student academic achievement, student development, program quality, community service, special constituencies, and the overall institutional climate" (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 1990, p. 16). Criterion four has strategic planning as one of the evaluative measures. Instructions for measuring this criterion state:

Long- and short-range planning combined with strategic planning provide most institutions with effective tools to meet the future. The Self-Study Report should identify the plans that exist as well as evaluate the institution's past record of planning. It should describe the various planning committees and processes at the institution and explain how the institution evaluates the usefulness of its planning process. (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 1990, p. 18)
Background and Purpose of the Study

Background

There was no research found on either the extent of strategic planning or organizational climates in Michigan community colleges. There was, however, one study on the planning histories of four community colleges in Michigan by Neumann (1983). Research was performed on strategic planning in Texas community colleges by Ray (1987), in California community colleges by Soder (1986), and in Maryland community colleges by Milton (1985). The Office of the Chancellor (1983) of California conducted strategic planning research in that state. Bogorya (1987/1990), Harris (1987), Keinath (1985), Evans (1987), Scharfenberger (1986), and Jaggers (1985) all researched strategic planning in colleges or universities. Further, no research was discovered that attempted to establish a relationship between the two variables of strategic planning and climate. Various research on the study of climates in community colleges was found but the availability of studies was limited. Studies linking climates to job satisfaction were reported by Smith (1989) and Jahanshani (1985). The most in-depth research found on community college climates was a study of Miami-Dade Community College by Roueche and Baker (1987) and a related study of the connections between leadership competencies and perceived climate at Miami-Dade Community College by Mullins (1985).

Perhaps the lack of studies on the extent of strategic planning in community colleges is due to the observations of many that little
planning occurs in colleges. Keller (1983) described the long-standing absence of planning efforts in colleges as early as the mid-1970s when he referred to Cohen and March's study of college presidents: "In our interviews, we never heard an administrator deny the importance and virtue of planning within the college... Moreover, it was generally accepted that the plan should be comprehensive... Despite this unanimous acceptance of the importance of planning, we saw little evidence of planning in American colleges and universities" (Cohen & March, as cited in Keller, 1983, p. 99).

Kotler, a professor of Marketing at Northwestern University and Murphy, an associate professor of Marketing at Marquette University (Kotler & Murphy, 1981) reported that based on their review of the literature, most colleges were not set up with strategic planning processes. They found the absence of strategic planning especially noteworthy because of strategic planning's great promise for helping provide direction through the troubled times that the colleges were experiencing.

Masoner, an associate professor of Higher Education Administration and Planning, and Essex, the area head and a professor of Administration and Planning at the University of Alabama, claimed based on their review of the literature that "many colleges and universities are not making any plans at all" (Masoner & Essex, 1986-1987, p. 31). These authors further reported that considerable attention was being given to 4-year colleges but "very little has been directed toward the junior/community college segment of higher education" (Masoner & Essex, 1986-1987, p. 31). An example of the focus on 4-year colleges
is the recent book edited by Steeples (1988) and entitled: Successful Strategic Planning: Case Studies. Seven case studies are described in this book. All seven of the colleges are 4-year colleges. Recent research by Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) has revealed that despite substantial time and money investments in planning, colleges and universities have been frustrated with the results.

Perhaps higher education's resistance to strategic planning is embedded in a deep-seeded reluctance to readily adopt management methods that have their roots in the military sector. The term "strategy" implies maneuvering tactics to outflank the competitor or the enemy. This way of thinking is offensive to many educators whose primary concern is the search for truth and the transfer of knowledge. Cope addressed this issue when he stated

the strategic concept places undue emphasis on competitive strategies, linked to "winning" in the marketplace. Just as industry uses the term, so this writer finds colleges advocating a "pricing strategy," a "marketing strategy," a "financial strategy" and "political strategies." In addition to the misuse and overuse of strategy, the concept is simply too limited to include the ethical and value dimensions of higher education. (Cope, 1985, p. 14)

Or perhaps the reluctance of colleges to adopt strategic planning is because of strategic planning's relationship to the business sector with its focus on seizing opportunities for survival in the competitive mentality. Cooperation with other educational providers is seen as more in keeping with the purposes of public education (Cross, 1983).

Another possible reason for the slow adoption of strategic planning in the colleges is the difficulty in breaking old habits and the changes from what colleges are used to doing when they plan.
Morrison and Renfro (1984) reported in their review of literature that most colleges and universities that had planning processes had used long-range planning as their way of approaching planning. Long-range planning is more oriented toward the internal operations of the college. Planners develop views of the future based on projections from past and current information. Long-range planning makes extensive use of data extrapolations frequently based on historical budget trends and applies incremental formulas to budget items to arrive at the next year's budget. This contrasts with strategic planning which is a much more creative and intuitive process. Long-range planning also assumes that tomorrow will not be that much different from today whereas strategic planning assumes a much more turbulent and changing environment (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1985; Drucker, 1974; Georgakakos, 1989; Morrison & Renfro, 1984).

There are other more general conjectures why strategic planning in colleges may not be more prevalent. Higher education is viewed as a difficult environment in which to manage. One reason given for the complexity of managing in colleges is linked to the view of many faculty that colleges should be run based on the collegial model. The collegial model is based on a "community of scholars" concept. "It is a rather ambiguous concept that favors full participation in decision-making, especially by the faculty. . . . It is essentially opposed to hierarchy and structure. . . . In the collegial model, the faculty's right to govern stems from its professional or technical competence, not from any formal or official authority" (Demareth, Stevens, & Taylor; Draper & Griffiths; Millett; as cited...
in Richman & Farmer, 1974, p. 28). Millett, a political scientist who wrote on administration in higher education, indicated that faculty who advocate the collegial model believe that "the collegial leader is expected to only facilitate the process of decision-making by consensus and not to lead, direct, or manage anything" (Millett, 1962, pp. 234-235). In her review of the historical development of educational administration, Harris (1987) found that administrators were originally intended to be stewards for the faculty and were not intended to manage the institution. However, this changed as administrative responsibilities grew over time. The collegial model is a myth that probably does not apply to most institutions of higher education. The collegial model might be found at small liberal arts institutions or within departments of large universities (Richman & Farmer, 1974).

The collegial model does not fit well with strategic planning concepts. Strategic planning requires a strong, committed leader to see the process through. This person is almost always the president of the college, although this is not a necessity as any person may lead the process. Eventually, however, the president must strongly endorse and display support for the process if it is to be successful (Steeples, 1988).

The failure to link planning with budgeting is also a reason why planning has lost credibility in colleges (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990). Linking budgeting to planning is especially a problem for strategic planning. Strategic planning does not deal with the specifics of operations. Strategic planning is more concerned with the
identification of the institution's mission, a vision of the desired future state of the college, and the values, hopes and aspirations of its members. Some of these items help to create a context for budgeting but do not provide the more explicit operational guidance desired in the budget development arena (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990).

There is also evidence that a lack of clarification of the role of the president of the college may also be a reason why strategic planning has been slow to be adopted in colleges. Most authors state that strategic planning is the primary responsibility of the president. Strong leadership is nearly always advocated. Miller (1983), a professor of Higher Education in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan, reviewing literature on strategic planning, indicated that an important question is whether strong leadership means leadership through influence or leadership through control. Cope, in citing the writings of Guskin and Bassis, indicated that the appropriate leader for the strategic planning process is a team player who supports an environment where "mutual influence is respected about where an institution should be going and how it should shape itself for and during the journey" (Cope, 1987, p. 7). Ray indicated that "There is a need to study the relationship between chief executive involvement and the outcomes of the planning process. It is clear that chief executive support is necessary for planning to be effective; however, further research is needed to describe the proper role of the chief executive officer in maximizing planning effectiveness" (Ray, 1987, p. 135).

Another question about strategic planning that may describe
reasons for resistance to the process in colleges is whether strategic planning rejects or excludes rational planning aspects from the process. Miller (1983) observed that "An explicit rejection of 'rational planning models' and of many of the techniques associated with them, such as quantification, modelling, and formal planning procedures pervades much of the strategic planning literature" (p. 43). Keller (1983) believed that strategic planning should be a blend of the rational and the political aspects of the college and claimed that this is actually what "led directly to the creation of the new field of strategic planning" (p. 108).

Many authors include the identification of organizational values as an important aspect of strategic planning (Bryson, 1989; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Deegan, Tillery, & Associates, 1987; Eaton, 1988; Keller, 1983; Knessel, 1980; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Miller, 1983; Moore & Langknecht, 1986; Peterson, 1986; Richardson, 1986; Steeples, 1988; Steiner, 1979; Tack et al., 1984). Most of these authors included value identification as one of the fundamental factors to the success of strategic planning. There are reasons given in the literature for doubting whether it is possible to reach consensus on values in education, and therefore, this may have caused problems with attempts at strategic planning. Lindblom (1959) claimed that if values were used as a basis for each decision that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to reach an agreement on alternative courses of action. He claimed that an individual working alone often struggles with personal values and does not know if he is making the right decision. When one adds other individuals to the
formula, the complexity prohibits value agreement. Strategic planning encourages innovative thinking and creative solutions. This often results in proposals for significant changes in the organization. If these changes challenge existing values, as they often do, then values or value rankings need to change for acceptance of the new way of doing things. Schein (1985) appeared to support Lindblom's thinking when he cautioned that changing values or gaining agreement on values is a very difficult task and that often persons are not even aware of their values until they are challenged.

There are other questions about strategic planning in colleges that are of interest. The size of the organization may be a determining factor on the extent of strategic planning. Ray (1987) found positive correlations between the extent of strategic planning and institutional size. The length of time that a strategic planning process has been practiced may determine the extent of strategic planning characteristics. Richardson (1986), in his study of selected United States businesses, found that private sector businesses that had engaged in strategic planning for a longer period of time tended to score higher on strategic planning characteristics. Another one of his findings was that business with greater participation in planning showed higher levels of financial performance. Ray's (1987) study indicated that this may not be true for community colleges as he found no relationship between wealth and the extent of strategic planning.

Harris (1987), in her study of strategic planning at Texas 4-year colleges and universities, reported that over half of the public
and independent senior colleges in Texas appeared to be involved in strategic planning. Ray (1987) reported that community college presidents rated their planning processes as containing many of the elements of strategic planning. Meredith, Lenning, and Cope (1988), in their study of strategic planning, surveyed 196 colleges nationwide. These researchers reported that 172, or 87.7% of these colleges reported that "yes" they were doing strategic planning. These are much higher levels of activity than was projected to exist when Keller (1983) released his book, *Academic Strategy*, in which he estimated that over 90% of the colleges used incremental approaches to planning and not strategic planning. Harris and Ray's findings also seem to contradict other authors such as Schmidtlein and Milton's (1988-1989) findings that little planning occurs in colleges. There is also a need to further investigate aspects of organizational cultures in education (Owens, 1987). The need for researching cultures is especially important for higher education (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Dill, 1982; Masland, 1985; Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989).

Research on climate, an aspect of an organization's culture, should be especially important to educational leaders who are accountable for performance. Research has linked climate to such critical areas as employee morale and performance and student achievement. Smith (1989), in her study of the climate of Tennessee community colleges, reported that climate was significantly positively related to job satisfaction. Jahanshani (1985) reported similar findings in research involving 175 academic administrators.
which included personnel from 42 community colleges. Recent manage-
ment books based on research in business such as Kanter's (1983) The
Change Masters and Peters and Waterman's (1982) In Search of Excel-
ience, describe a positive relationship between climate factors and
employee performance. Owens (1987), citing research by Brookover,
indicated that social climate was the crucial variable associated
with objective measures of student achievement. Anderson (1982),
citing research by Ellett, Payne, Masters, and Pool, reported that
teacher morale was significantly related to both attendance and
achievement.

Purpose of the Study

The importance of strategic planning to community colleges could
be significant. Bryson (1989) claimed that "The most effective
public and non-profit planners no doubt are now, and will be increas-
ingly in the future, the ones who are best at strategic planning" (p.
43). Community colleges are going to experience increased pressure
from external sources to justify their existence and to convince
others that they are doing their job well. This increased pressure
will come from such sources as state boards, legislatures, higher
education appropriations committees, business and industry, 4-year
colleges, and accrediting agencies (Deegan et al., 1985).

Increased external intervention requires responsible community
college leaders to be adept at explaining where they are leading
their institutions and why they chose that particular desired future
state. Strategic planning is designed to answer these two important
questions. Leaders must also be aware of the climates of their organizations and of factors that affect climates as climate has been found to be related to performance and motivation. This study investigates to what extent strategic planning is being utilized to identify futures for community colleges and what effect strategic planning has on certain selected factors in the college's climate.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research questions and related hypotheses are suggested by the literature. These questions and hypotheses along with references to some of the literature that led to their selection for investigation are outlined in this section. However, before stating the research questions and hypotheses, definitions of the two variables being studied need to be given. The definitions of the independent variable, strategic planning, and the dependent variable, organizational climate, are as follows:

**Independent variable**: Strategic planning is a highly participatory process where the conditions in the external and internal environment of the organization are analyzed. The external environment is analyzed for the purpose of identifying opportunities, threats, and constraints to the organization. The internal environment is analyzed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the organization. In addition to these analyses, the values of the organization are identified. These analyses are matched to develop a strategic vision of the future of the organization which includes: the mission, the clientele to be served, the program and service mix,
the comparative advantages, and the strategic objectives of the organization. This matching process is a creative effort where innovative and bold thinking are encouraged.

**Dependent variable:** Organizational climate is the "relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants, (b) influences their behavior, (c) can be explained in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the environment" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 24). Climate can be measured through the perceptions of those who experience the climate or who observe it.

Definitions of additional terms important in this study are given in the Glossary which can be found in Appendix K.

The literature suggests that several questions be addressed. The first of these is:

**Research Question 1:** What is the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges?

This question is answered by obtaining responses from community college presidents and their next-in-charge when it comes to the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges Questionnaire given in Appendix F. The following questions are related to Research Question 1:

1A. Which characteristics of strategic planning are most strongly present?

1B. Which characteristics are most lacking?

The second research question to be addressed is:

**Research Question 2:** What is the role of the president in
strategic planning?

Ray (1987) indicated in his research that the role of the president was not clear and should be further investigated. Miller (1983) questioned whether the president should lead by controlling the process or should lead by exercising influence in a less direct manner. Keller (1983) advocated a strong role but was not specific in describing what this meant. Answers to the question on the role of the president will be obtained through descriptive responses from responding colleges.

A third question relates the wealth of the community college to the extent of strategic planning.

_Research Question 3:_ Is there a relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning?

Ray (1987) reported in his research that he found no relationship between the wealth of a community college and the extent of strategic planning. This seems to contradict what one would logically conclude as the literature often mentions cost and available resources as important factors in strategic planning. Deegan et al. (1985) indicated that linking resource allocation to strategic planning lends legitimacy to the process and is important in making goals and objectives more than mere pronouncements of what the institution would like to do. Orwig and Caruthers (1980), in their review of the literature on planning, implied that budgeting constraints can discourage the important imaginative aspect of planning exercises when they stated: "Planning, when constrained by dollar limits too early in the decision-making process, tends to become a rather lifeless
exercise" (p. 343). Bryson (1989), in his studies of successful strategic planning in nonprofit organizations found that these organizations often have special contingency funding which is provided to help implement strategies out of sequence with normal budgeting. Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) noted that flexibility with finances is important to adjusting to unforeseen circumstances, an important factor in the success of strategic initiatives. The following hypothesis is investigated based on the literature:

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a direct relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning.

The literature also suggests that the extent of participation in strategic planning be studied. The question related to this is:

**Research Question 4:** What is the extent of the participation of faculty in strategic planning?

Masoner and Essex (1986-1987), in their call for strategic planning in 2-year colleges stated "Of extreme importance is the need for involvement of all personnel in the development of institutional direction" (p. 32). Of special concern is the recent research by Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) that implies that those involved in planning observe that the main benefits derive not from the plan but from the insights participants gain during the process. Cosand (1980) indicated that trying to impose change on others without their understanding will likely fail. Swain (1988), president of the University of Louisville, reported that based on his experience with strategic planning that "if strategic planning were to be effective, the faculty committee participants had to be our most imaginative,
most perceptive faculty" (p. 47). Tack et al. (1984) claimed in their review of the literature that faculty must be involved in every facet of the process and that without their endorsement and cooperation, the process will fail.

Another question for investigation concerns the size of the community college.

Research Question 5: Is there a relationship between the size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning?

Ray (1987) found in his research at Texas community colleges a positive correlation between planning and effectiveness and the institutional size. Cope (1987) indicated that larger institutions may find strategic planning more useful because they often have more strategic options. The following hypothesis will also be investigated.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a direct relationship between the size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning.

Two questions addressed are open-ended questions concerning the problems with, and the benefits of the strategic planning process.

Research Question 6: What are some of the problems involved with the strategic planning process?

The purpose of this question is to gather information that may be of help in the future to colleges that are considering using strategic planning. There are many potential problems. Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) discovered many problems in their nationwide study. One of the major problems was a serious lack of data about the external environment at many institutions. Examples of other
problems were an air of distrust between faculty and administrators and the view that the plans had little effect on campus actions and decisions. Bryson (1989) indicated that getting the attention of key people and getting them to focus on key issues at key places in the process can be a problem. Also, a common problem is treating planning and policy making as separate from implementation. "Too often planners plan and implementors implement and neither group talks to the other" (Bryson, 1989, p. 212). Steiner (1979) listed seven major problems or limitations to formal strategic planning. These problems vary in their importance in different organizations depending on circumstances. These problems are:

- Internal resistance—antiplanning biases can interfere with old ways of doing things, old rules, and old methods.

- Planning is expensive—the time of many people and the cost of special studies and information sourcing can be prohibitive.

- Planning is difficult—planning requires high levels of imagination, creativity, analytical skills, and fortitude. These skills are different from those normally employed in day-to-day operations.

- Environment may prove different from that expected—the uncertainties of forecasting future events may result in failed plans.

- Current crises—strategic planning should not be done when an organization finds itself in a sudden crisis, as is sometimes the case. The planning should be done to avoid future crises.

- Plans when completed limit choice—plans tend to reduce initiative towards alternatives not considered in the planning.

- Imposed limitations—the effectiveness of the planning efforts are reduced when managers try to delegate responsibility for involvement to staff, ignore developed plans in their decision-making, or focus more on short-range problems than long-range. (Steiner, 1979, pp. 44-46)
Research Question 7: What are some of the major benefits of strategic planning?

Steeples (1988), editor of a recent sourcebook on successful strategic planning, outlines five primary benefits to strategic planning in colleges. The first of these benefits was the communication of a strategic vision for the organization. The second major benefit given was the increase in external support resulting from a clear articulation of vision. The third key benefit results from the increased certainty for members of the organization. Improved image was a fourth primary benefit. The fifth, and final primary benefit was that strategic planning provided a context for resource allocation and reallocation. Kotler and Murphy (1981) indicated that the most important benefit of strategic planning may be that it forces decision-makers to "undertake a more market-oriented and systematic approach to long-range planning" (p. 409). Other benefits stated by Steiner (1979) were that strategic planning provides an orderly way of asking and answering key questions on a scale of priority and urgency; also, future opportunities and threats are revealed and clarified. Cope (1987) suggested that the benefits of strategic planning are relative to the nature of the organization. Organizations that have control over their pricing of services, location of operations, and the product/services mix will find the strategy concept more useful and beneficial.

The final area of attention for research is the relationship of the extent of strategic planning to the climate of the community college. The literature suggests that strategic planning could have
an effect on a college's climate. Leaders in organizations have as one of their main responsibilities the creation, maintenance, or modification of the organization's culture. "One might go so far as to say that the unique function of 'leadership' . . . is the creation and management of culture" (Schein, 1985, p. 171). An important aspect of organizational culture is the values that are cherished above all others. Peters and Waterman (1982) found that in excellent companies, "people way down the line know what they are supposed to do in most situations because the handful of guiding values is crystal clear" (pp. 75-76). One of the most important functions of strategic planning is values identification. In this sense, strategic planning is a culture building exercise. Climate was described by Owens (1987) as "the perceptions of persons in the organization that reflect . . . norms, values, and beliefs" (p. 166). Owens also explained that climate is "related to and subsumed under organizational culture" (Owens, 1987, p. 169).

Researchers have designed various psychometric measures to describe climates. Moos (1989) designed 10 subscales to measure the social environments of work settings. Four of these subscales have been selected for study as dependent variables. These four climate subscale factors as described by Moos are:

1. Task Orientation: the degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done, for example: how much attention people pay to getting work done, how often things get "put off until tomorrow," and how efficient and task-oriented the workplace is.

2. Clarity: the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies are communicated, for example: how well activities are planned, how clearly the responsibilities of
supervisors are defined, and how well the details of assigned jobs are explained to employees.

3. Involvement: the extent to which employees are concerned about and committed to their jobs, for example: how challenging the work is, the pride people have in the organization, and the effort they put into what they do.

4. Innovation: the degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches, for example: whether doing things in a different way is valued, whether new and different ideas are tried out, and whether the place is one of the first to try out a new idea. (Moos, 1989, pp. 2-4)

The Work Environment Scale (WES) developed by Moos and Insel (1974) and published by Consulting Psychologists Press of Palo Alto, California, is used in this study to collect the data for measuring the dependent variable, climate.

The following hypotheses are made using the subscales as described above.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of task-orientation between community colleges that have a high extent and those that have a low extent of strategic planning.

**Hypothesis 4:** There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of clarity between community colleges that have a high extent and those that have a low extent of strategic planning.

**Hypothesis 5:** There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of involvement between community colleges that have a high extent and those that have a low extent of strategic planning.

**Hypothesis 6:** There will be a difference between the scores
measuring the climate subscale of innovation between community colleges that have a high extent and those that have a low extent of strategic planning.

**Summary**

Strategic planning in the community colleges is very important to the future success of the organization. The trends and events experienced in the 1980s should have stimulated community colleges to adopt strategic planning which is designed to enable the organization to adapt to a rapidly changing environment. The process of strategic planning also has many characteristics that should have a positive impact on certain organizational climate factors such as: level of involvement, emphasis on innovation, clarity of role, and degree of task orientation. The purpose of this study is to analyze and describe the current status of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges. The climate of community colleges with high levels of strategic planning are compared to those with low levels to determine if there are differences.

In this study, Chapter II consists of a review of the relevant literature, and Chapter III describes the basic foundation of the study in terms of design, instrumentation, sampling, data collection, and statistical analysis. Chapter IV presents the findings of the investigation and Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study of the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges is designed to determine how prevalent the use of strategic planning methodology is compared to 10 years ago when strategic planning was relatively new to community colleges. Strategic planning is a process approach to analyzing an organization and the environment in which the organization exists.

The review of literature begins with an overview of strategic planning in colleges. Included in this overview is the concept of strategy, the historical development of strategic planning in colleges, and the context within which most colleges function. This is followed by a review of the other models and types of planning commonly encountered. Strategic planning is then described and a model presented that serves as the guide for this study. The concept of organizational climate is then described. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the linkages between strategic planning and climate and then a summary of the relevant research findings on strategic planning and climate.

General Overview of Strategic Planning

The Concept of Strategy

Important to the understanding of strategic planning is giving
meaning to the word "strategy." The concept of strategy is ancient. Strategy has its roots in the military application of the word to mean gaining an advantage over the enemy. Cope (1987) traced strategy to the writings of Sun Zi, a Chinese general who wrote about the art of warfare 2,500 years ago. The word strategy originates from the Greek verb "stratego" which meant to plan the defeat of one's enemies through the effective use of resources. Stratego combines the word "stratos," meaning the army, with "ago," meaning to lead (Morrison & Renfro, 1984). The Greek noun strategos means military general (Keller, 1983; Morrison & Renfro, 1984). The term has taken on additional meanings over time, not all of them attractive such as the connotation of trickery or deception (Cope, 1981). The biological use of the term is related to finding the niche within the environment where the organism can survive (Cope, 1987). Keller (1983) indicated that strategy has been used by governments in discussing strategy for jobs, strategy to reduce inflation and strategy for elections. The term has taken on much more positive meanings from use in such contexts as strategy for research on cancer and the war on poverty (Cope, 1981).

Strategy began to be used commonly for non-military connotation purposes in the 1940s. The term was first used extensively by business following World War II. Drucker (1977) noted that the first objective of strategy for a business is to optimize what exists or is in the process of being established. Beyond this, business should develop innovative strategy because "existing product lines and services, existing markets and distribution channels, existing
technologies and processes will sooner or later—and usually sooner—go down rather than up" (Drucker, 1977, p. 153). Keller (1983) gave meaning to the word in higher education when he explained "any organization with competitors, with aspirations to greatness, or with threats of decline has come to feel the need for a strategy, a plan to overcome" (p. 75). Cope (1987) further clarified the concept of strategy by use of analogy. Strategy is likened to a compass because it is "direction finding" (p. 7). He provided additional clarification when he described strategy as doing the right things and getting the organization properly positioned in the environment. The most encompassing definition of strategy was given by Bryson (1989) who stated that strategy is "a pattern of purposes, policies, programs, actions, decisions, or resource allocations that define what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it" (p. 59).

Planning in Colleges: Historical Development

Peterson (1986), a professor and the director of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan, found in his review of literature that there was little conscious planning done by colleges prior to World War II and for several decades following. The growth era of the 1960s was an opportune time to develop planning in the colleges but little occurred. The major planning took place in the facility planning and space utilization areas. "Only in the creation of new institutions were there clear signs of academic planning" (Peterson, 1986, p. 7).

The 1970s saw rapid growth in rational/empirical planning
approaches. A number of factors came together to move colleges towards the greater use of formalized planning. One of these factors was the advent of new, powerful, computer-assisted models (Keller, 1983; Peterson, 1986). As early as the mid 1960s Rourke and Brooks (1966), in their study of changing management practices, noted that we have seen a growing commitment to the use of automation in the routine processing of administration, an increased resort to data gathering and research as a basis for policy making, and an expanding effort to develop objective criteria for making decisions on the allocation of resources instead of leaving matters entirely to the play of campus pressures or the forces of tradition. (Rourke & Brooks, 1966, p. vi).

These computer-assisted models emphasized "quantitative analyses, projections, and simulations" (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989, p. 2).

Colleges also began to cope with increasingly unstable environmental factors during the 1970s. Impending enrollment declines, funding caps, inflationary pressures and increased demands for accountability were sources of external pressures (Peterson, 1986; Richardson, 1988; Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989). Colleges were being forced to focus on greater efficiencies and to plan for the three Rs of the 1980s, "Retrenchment, Reduction, and Reallocation" (Peterson, 1986, p. 9). In 1978, the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, commonly referred to as Proposition 13, was passed in California. This event, followed by a similar tax reduction in many other states, sobered educators to the reality that drastic tax reductions with long-reaching effects were possible and that the era of growth for higher education was over. "One crucial consequence of the tax revolt was a shifting of funding away from local governments more
toward the state. In California, the state's share of funding for the community colleges catapulted from 42% in 1978 to 80% in 1980" (Cohen & Brawer, as cited in Georgakakos, 1989, p. 7).

Computerized models were coupled with highly rational planning models in the 1970s. The more popular among these models were the planning, programming, budgeting system (PPB), the management by objectives system (MBO), and the zero-based budgeting system (ZBB) (Owens, 1987). These planning models had their philosophical underpinnings in the approach to management called "Scientific Management" which was popularized by Fredrick Taylor in the early 1900s (Owens, 1987). PPB was created by Charles Hitch and established in the Department of Defense in the early 1960s (Keller, 1983). These approaches to management fell under their own weight. However, they were important precursors to planning that linked long-range objectives, programs, and budgets (Keller, 1983). The complex quantitative models required extensive computer resources which few colleges had. Additionally, "the degree of goal consensus and hierarchical authority needed to effectively use structured approaches such as management by objectives was lacking on many campuses" (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989, p. 3).

By the 1980s, colleges became increasingly aware of the need for a new approach to planning. Kotler and Murphy (1981) in their study of planning practices at Beloit College in Wisconsin, saw strategic planning as holding promise as a "potent tool" for use in non-profit organizations. The realization of the increased importance of finding the best fit between the internal and the external environment
drew colleges to consider strategic planning (Peterson, 1986). In the early years of the decade, Keller (1983) released his landmark book, Academic Strategy, based on his national study of college management practices. In his book, Keller startled the academic world by stating "between 10% and 30% of America's 3,100 colleges and universities will close their doors or merge with other institutions by 1995" (Keller, 1983, p. 3). This book, with a well-articulated and logical argument for strategic planning, more than any other single factor, moved colleges to implement strategic planning.

Peterson (1986), in his review of the literature, presented a brief synopsis of the history of planning in higher education when he wrote

planning has moved from a set of activities that reflect a primarily reactive role in the fifties and sixties to a much more responsive role which tried to foresee problems during the 1970's. In the early 1980's planning seems to be playing a more adaptive role in helping an institution identify issues and select changes to improve the institution's fit with its environment. Strategic planning suggests such a role. (Peterson, 1986, p. 10)

Development of the Context

As described earlier, colleges tried a variety of approaches to planning which had their origins in either the military or the business world. These approaches were largely failures in the setting of higher education. Most of the early comprehensive planning efforts that were advocated were too complex or did not fit well with the realities of staffing limitations, inadequate computing power, and the organizational differences between higher education and the military and business settings.
In what follows, several important organizational characteristics that have been used to describe institutions of higher education are presented. Understanding these characteristics is important in comprehending possible explanations as to why planning in colleges and universities has been difficult and why efforts at planning are often viewed as failures. The various types of planning are then presented.

Colleges, according to the observations and review of literature by Cohen and March (1986), are "organized anarchies" (pp. 2-3). The ambiguities brought about by the existence of this condition have strong implications for approaches to planning in higher education. In particular, certain ambiguities get in the way of top leadership. Top leadership is important to effective planning (Alfred, Francis, & Peterson, 1986; Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983). There are four ambiguities which impede leadership in colleges:

1. The ambiguity of purpose: Goals are not clear and goals that do exist have poor predictive power. The process of choice depends little on shared direction.

2. The ambiguity of power: The college president probably has more potential for power than any other person. However, presidents have less power than is believed.

3. The ambiguity of experience: Phenomena are too complex and changes occur too rapidly to rely on experience as a teacher in college settings.

4. The ambiguity of success: The ambiguities of purpose, power, and experience conspire to obscure success. The president is like the driver of a skidding automobile. The judgments he makes, his skill, and his luck may make a difference. But whether he is credited with success is largely out of his control. (Cohen & March, 1986, pp. 195-203)

Owens (1987), in citing the writings of Cohen, March, and Olsen,
described three features of educational organizations related to the above leadership-connected concerns. These three features are:

1. Their goals are not specific and clear. Indeed the goals of educational organizations seem to shift often, are frequently in conflict with one another, are different for different groups of participants, and are difficult to translate into clear-cut programs of action.

2. Their technology is unclear and in important ways not well understood . . . considerably more technology is used in organizing educational organizations than is generally realized. But we are unable to specify in more than rather general ways the impact of educational technology on learners. A common dilemma in public schools, for example, is for teachers and supervisors to find methods and materials that will assure that students who are not learning well can be "reached."

3. Participation in them is fluid. Students move in and out, teachers and administrators come and go, parents become involved sporadically, and others in the community take interest in the schools when the spirit moves them. (Owens, 1987, pp. 24-25)

A second organizational characteristic that has been applied to colleges and poses problems for college planners is the concept of "loose coupling." Weick (1984), a professor of Psychology and Organizational Behavior at Cornell University, first applied this concept to the schools and caused many to change the way they thought about the schools as organizations. Loose coupling is described as coupled events that are responsive but each event also preserves its own identity, uniqueness, and some evidence of physical or logical separateness. It is Weick’s opinion that it is erroneous to believe that an organization does what it does because of plans, intentional selection of means that get the organization to agree upon goals, and all of this is accomplished by such rationalized procedures as cost-benefit analyses, division of labor, specified areas of discretion, authority invested in the office, job descriptions, and a consistent evaluation and reward system. The only problem with that portrait is that it is rare in nature. People in
organizations, including educational organizations, find themselves hard pressed to find actual instances of those rational practices or to find rationalized practices whose outcomes have been as beneficial as predicted, or to feel that those rational occasions explain much of what goes on within the organization. (Weick, 1984, pp. 66-67).

Weick claimed that organizational theorists had been preoccupied with organizations as highly bureaucratic entities and were "blinded ... to some of the attractive and unexpected properties of less rationalized and less tightly related clusters of events" (Weick, 1984, p. 68). In relating the concept of loose coupling to planning efforts, Weick claimed:

There is a developing position in psychology which argues that intentions are a poor guide for action, intentions often follow rather than precede action, and that intentions and action are loosely coupled. Unfortunately, organizations continue to think that planning is a good thing, they spend much time on planning, and actions are assessed in terms of their fit with plans. Given a potential loose coupling between the intentions and actions of organizational members, it should come as no surprise that administrators are baffled and angered when things never happen the way they were supposed to. (Weick, 1984, p. 69).

A concept related to loose coupling that is characteristic of colleges is called "pooled coupling." Thompson, the person who developed the term "coupling," described pooled coupling to mean situations where members of the organization shared resources in common, but otherwise work independently (Thompson, as cited in Owens, 1987, p. 23). Teachers may share buildings, equipment and supplies but work independently in their classrooms. There is little interdependency and a great deal of autonomy.

The organizational characteristics of colleges posited above present a very different perspective from the more traditional
bureaucratic, hierarchical organization usually envisioned when one thinks of colleges. This is not to say that colleges do not exhibit bureaucratic characteristics. Richman and Farmer (1974) found in their management research at 10 different universities and colleges that there are many situations where a bureaucratic approach is appropriate, such as where preprogrammed decisions are involved, where a quick decision is necessary, or when standardization makes sense. However, the bureaucratic model does not adequately accommodate human needs and does not work well in unstable environments.

Another characteristic of colleges is the political nature of governance. The political model of colleges is credited to Baldridge (1971). This model was first developed during research on the decision-making process at New York University. Baldridge described the power structure of colleges as "a hodgepodge of interacting, overlapping, and often conflicting influences" (Baldridge, 1971, p. 50). According to Baldridge, there are four levels of participation in college politics. The first of these is the administrators whose ideology and careers are centered around running the organization. Next are the "activist" faculty which is a relatively small group of people highly involved in the college's politics. Then comes the "spectators" who attend meetings and vote but stop short of being actively involved. Finally, there are the "apathetics" who never serve on committees and rarely attend meetings. In addition to these four levels, there are many subcultures that compete for attention and resources in colleges. Examples of these are occupational training, counseling, liberal arts, and remedial education (Zoglin, 1976).
Decision-making in colleges may not be as rational and systematic as previously thought. Owens (1987) contended that organizations in which the goals are hazy, the technology ill-defined, and the participation relatively fluid are not likely to solve problems in an orderly, rational manner. The conventional view of organizational choice, of course, is that some alternative solutions are generated; these are examined for likely consequences; then the alternatives are evaluated in terms of potential payoff in achieving the best solution to the problem; and, finally, a decision is reached. This model may be a poor description of what actually happens. (Owens, 1987, p. 25)

If the characteristics described by Owens are accurate representations of reality, then those who attempt planning efforts in colleges face extremely challenging conditions.

Models and Types of Planning

Many definitions, models and types of planning have been described in the literature. So many types and models of planning have been described that there is a great deal of confusion between the many models. In what follows, various definitions of planning are considered. The major models of planning are then described. This is followed by descriptions of the types of planning. Then, strategic planning is described and the model that forms the basis for this study is presented.

Planning has been defined differently for different settings. One of the earliest definitions of planning was given by the French industrialist, Fayol. Fayol was "the first modern organizational theorist. It was Fayol who defined administration in terms of five functions: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) commanding, (4) coordinating, and (5) controlling" (Fayol, as cited in Owens, 1987,
p. 6). Fayol explained that planning "means both to assess the future and make provision for it (Fayol, as cited in Steiner, 1979, p. 346). Planning was described by another writer and theorist with a business background when Drucker (1969) stated "Thus, the true definition of planning is a process of continual selection of actions to deal with the changing environment for the benefit of the corporation" (p. 104). In an educational context, Peterson (1980) defined planning as a conscious process by which an institution assesses its current state and the likely future condition of its environment, identifies possible future states for itself, and then develops organizational strategies, policies, and procedures for selecting and getting to one or more of them. (Peterson, 1980, p. 114)

Richman and Farmer (1974) also writing in an educational context defined planning as including the aspect of innovation. They defined planning as

the determination of goals and the plans, and of the strategies, policies, programs, schedules, procedures, tools, techniques, and methods for achieving them. Planning is decision-making for the future. . . . one must do some planning in order to innovate effectively. . . . Planning tends to be . . . the most crucial function with regard to the organization's external environment. (Richman & Farmer, 1974, p. 19)

This concept of innovation as an important part of the planning concept led this researcher to include the psychometric measure of innovation as one of the dependent variable measures of climate.

These definitions of planning and others like them have resulted in the development of many specialized types or models of planning, each with their own set of characteristics. "Although no model has proven the best model of planning nor a pure model, there are six quasi-models identified in the literature" (Peterson, 1980, p. 127).
There is some overlap in the characteristics of the models. The following is a summary outline of the six models identified by Peterson:

1. Formal-Rational Model. This model assumes a rational, comprehensive sequence of planning elements and includes formulation of institutional mission based on a situational appraisal, development of goals and objectives, establishment of broad program and resource strategies, selection and design of action programs, implementation, and review. The process is based on the rational assumption that mission and objectives can be clearly formulated and will guide the other cyclic activities. There is a similarity to program, planning, and budgeting (PPB) and formal management by objectives (MBO) systems.

2. Organizational Development Model. This model is far less concerned about the formality of the planning process and decisions about goals. The primary focus is internal and concerned with changing an organization's culture, management style, work structure, decision-making patterns, communication, interaction, and influence. The major planning issue is to understand the institution or group as a human system and to develop its capacity to plan as a means of improving individual, collective, and organizational well-being. The future planned for is one that maximizes member capabilities.

3. Technocratic/Empirical Model. Planning techniques are emphasized in this model. Examples of the techniques are: the Delphi approach; program, planning, and budgeting (PPB); and management information systems (MIS). The planning may be either internal or external. Recent developments such as large data bases, data on environmental trends, market analysis techniques have enabled a greater focus on the external environment than in the 1960s when this model was almost entirely focused on internal analysis. Problems are quantified and analyzed rationally usually by technical planning staff and administrative staff with analytical skills.

4. Philosophical Synthesis Model. Fundamental questions about the current and future nature of society, humankind, teaching and learning, and knowledge are asked. The purpose is to identify trends or assumptions in order to develop a mission that guides the college's decisions and programs. This approach is not considered by some as a planning approach for it does not occur regularly, is not linked to tactics, and does not lend itself to implementation or review. The approach serves mainly a maintenance
function, not an adaptive function. Fundamental change is usually not the outcome, rather the process serves to reinforce the role of the faculty by clarifying the rationale for their institution, curriculum, students and processes used.

5. Political Advocacy Model. Policy issues are the focus of this planning model. Mission and goals are not of prime concern. Interest groups and issues are the basic organizing units of the college. The approach is pragmatic and recognizes the political nature of colleges. Bargaining, negotiation, compromise, and coalition forming characterize the decision process. Rational approaches or consensus occur but are not necessary. Eventually, through a five-stage process identified by Baldridge (1971), the interest group is able to enact the policy the group has advocated. The conflict nature of the process helps focus on real issues which helps induce more change than the other models.

6. Coordinated Anarchy Model. This model supports as the concept that the basis for organizing the college is highly autonomous units which can be departments, separate colleges within the college or university, administrative units, or other similar entities. The assumption that drives this model is that professionals in these units are best able to decide change, that spontaneity should be encouraged and that there should be few constraints. The coordination and centralization of planning is limited. The model is pluralistic, attempting to accommodate diverse goals. (Peterson, 1980, pp. 127-139)

Organizations may use any one of these models, or a combination to accomplish their planning purposes. Keller (1983) believed that strategic planning would become a blending of the formal-rational model and the political advocacy model as the best solution to the planning problems in colleges and universities. Before describing strategic planning as found in the literature, several other types of planning need to be considered.

The field of planning suffers from confusion over the meaning of modifier terms connected with the word "planning." The most commonly confused types of planning are long-range planning and strategic
planning: "It is common to see documents proclaiming a 'strategic long-range planning process'" (Cope, 1985, p. 15). These two types of planning are so different that it is important that they be clearly distinguished from one another. There are many other types of planning that are commonly referred to in the literature. These will be described. Among this group are another pair of types that, like long-range and strategic planning, are often confused. These two types are comprehensive planning and master planning. As will be explained, some of the confusion results from uses of the same term to describe different phenomena.

Bryson (1989) indicated that based on his observations, the terms long-range and strategic planning are frequently used synonymously. However, there are four fundamental differences. First, strategic planning is more concentrated on issue identification and resolution than long-range planning. Long-range planning focuses on identification of goals and objectives and then coordinating budgets and work to accomplish the goals and objectives. Secondly, strategic planning is more likely to consider alternative futures different from what currently exists, whereas long-range planning assumes that current trends are likely to continue. The outside environment is given much greater consideration in strategic planning. Third, strategic plans often are "guided by a vision of success" (Bryson, 1989, p. 7) that requires shifts in direction for the institution. Long-range plans tend to be linear extrapolations of the present. Finally, strategic planners usually consider a range of possible futures and try to keep as many options open as possible. Long-range
planners identify a most likely future and use this as the basis for
decisions and planned actions to take them to this singular future
state (Bryson, 1989).

Morrison and Renfro (1984) provided additional clarification of
the differences between long-range planning and strategic planning.
These authors stated that

long-range planning is viewed as scientific, using detailed
and interrelated data sets, agency plans, and extrapola-
tions of current budgets. Strategic planning depends upon
intuitive and creative decision making as to how to guide
the organization over time in a turbulent environment.
(Morrison & Renfro, 1984, p. 5)

These authors claim that most colleges and universities are using
long-range planning but could augment this to strategic planning if
they would add environmental scanning methods.

Drucker (1974) explained that the terminology choice of long-
range planning is what confuses the issue. In effect, "It is true
that practically every basic management decision is a long-range
decision" (p. 121). Short-range and long-range are determined by the
time span over which the decisions are effective, not by the length
of time of the plan.

Additional descriptions of the characteristics of long-range
planning were given by Cope (1985) based on his review of the litera-
ture and his research. Long-range plans assume that the college has
relatively closed boundaries and are thus very internally oriented.
The long-range plans are usually 10 years in duration, are a
blueprint for the future, and are usually prepared by planning office
personnel. Strategic planning focuses more on the external environ-
ment, is a continual process and is based more on integrated,
participatory involvement of personnel (Cope, 1989). This observa-
tion by Cope is one of the reasons the dependent variable psycho-
metric measure of "involvement" was identified by this researcher as
an expected outcome of the strategic planning process. This observa-
tion is also related to the selection of "clarity" as a dependent
variable measure as higher levels of involvement in planning by more
college personnel should result in employees knowing better what is
expected of them.

Two other types of planning that are often confused are compre-
hensive planning and master planning. Bryson (1989) provides the
most detailed description of comprehensive planning concluding that
"comprehensive" is actually a misnomer. Comprehensive plans are
often channeled by legislation governing the use of the plans. The
plans are specifically tied to the particular focus of the agency
requesting or requiring the plan. In higher education, an example is
the U.S. Department of Education's Title III legislation for the
Strengthening Institutions Program. The manual for this grant pro-
gram, Instructions and Application for Grants Under the Strengthening
Institutions Program, contains language requiring that the college
submit a "comprehensive development plan" (U. S. Department of Educa-
tion, 1990, p. 14) in order to be considered for funding. These
instructions are very specific as to content of that plan, listing
nine areas that must be included. As with Title III, comprehensive
plans "often are prepared to meet legal requirements" (Bryson, 1989,
p. 8). There may be little difference between strategic plans and
comprehensive plans if the agency is directly tied to the key
governmental decision makers who will be using the plan. However, this is usually not the case.

When the master planning terminology is used in connection with community colleges, the reference is often to the college’s initial plan which was created when the college was established (Knoell, 1980). However, as an example of the confusion over planning terminology, Peterson (1980) identified the master plan as the plan that combines the environmental assessment, institutional assessment, and values assessment of an institution into a "strategic pattern, design, or direction for the institution" (p. 141).

The many different types of planning and the confusion of terminology often makes communication on the topic of planning very difficult and frustrating. Perhaps no other type of planning suffers more from misunderstanding than strategic planning.

There are several other types of planning that are commonly referred to in the literature that should be described before presenting a detailed description of strategic planning. These types are described by Schmidtlein (1989-1990), who has conducted national studies on planning practices in colleges and universities, as follows:

Facility planning. Determining the character of the physical facilities needed to implement effectively an institution’s programs.

Operational planning or tactical planning. Establishing short-range objectives (typically for a coming budget year or biennium), determining their relative priorities, and deciding the kinds and levels of resources to be devoted to each objective.

Issue-specific planning. Determining the policies and actions required to resolve issues affecting a specific
campus function or limited set of functions (e.g., computer planning, affirmative action planning, student retention planning, or faculty development planning.

Program planning. Determining the nature of the programs needed to implement the institution's vision and the types of structures and processes required to support these programs. The term "program" includes administrative, student service, and public service, as well as academic programs.

Budget planning. Determining the goods and services needed to implement desired programs, estimating their costs, determining potential sources of revenues, and reconciling competing claims for resources, given assumptions about revenue limitations. (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990, p. 10)

Strategic Planning Described

Strategic planning has nearly as many descriptions as it has proponents. However, a review of the literature revealed that there are some commonalities between the definitions of strategic planning among the many authors in the field. The commonalities described in what follows formed the basis for most of the questions included in the Strategic Planning at Michigan Colleges Questionnaire developed for this study and given in Appendix F.

Characteristics

Strategic planning is often described as a process that has as its primary purpose developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the organization and its environment (Ansoff, 1980; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Peterson, 1980; Schmidtlein, 1989-1990; Steiner, 1978). Also emphasized is the view that strategic planning is an iterative process of continual review and revision as the organization quickly adapts to changes, both external and
internal, to the organization (Cope, 1980; Drucker, 1974; Keller, 1983; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Peterson, 1980; Ray, 1987; Steiner, 1979). An approach to ensuring for the iterative process in organizations has been outlined by the theorist and researcher Ansoff (1980) of the European Institute for the Advanced Studies in Management, Brussels, Belgium. This approach is called "strategic issue management." A senior management group meets throughout the year between annual planning cycles to detect trends and evaluate their impact and timing, assess response time and alert decision makers about sudden and important issues. An impact/urgency matrix is used to assess the priority of issues (Ansoff, 1980).

Another characteristic mentioned in definitions is the importance of involving all the constituencies of the organization who will be expected to carry out the mandates in the strategic plan (Bryson, 1989; Deegan et al., 1985; Keller, 1983; Masoner & Essex, 1986-1987; Ray, 1987; Scott, 1986; Steiner, 1979). One author has described a good strategic planning process as one which "gets everyone involved" (Peters, 1988, p. 510). Both faculty and administrators are involved in decision-making with faculty representatives playing an important role at many colleges. The major reason for this participatory approach is that academic settings have a high concentration of professionals with opinions, and organizational inflexibility characteristics (Kotler & Murphy, 1981). In their interviews of presidents and administrators at 41 colleges and universities, Cohen and March (1986) found that benefits derived from interaction during the planning process were usually considered more
important than the actual plan that was developed through the process. A further reason for involvement of constituent groups in planning is "those who are involved in planning must anticipate that any plan imposed upon others without their understanding will probably be doomed to failure" (Cosand, 1980, p. 165).

Moore and Langknecht (1986) writing from their personal perspective as college administrators, indicated that under the stressful conditions of recent years, it is especially important that planning be perceived as credible. One way to accomplish this is to collaborate with campus constituencies who have special interests. Richardson (1988) stated that "there is no alternative to their (faculty) involvement if planning is viewed as part of a strategy for changing the organizational culture" (p. 34). The emphasis on involvement of faculty and other constituencies in strategic planning led this researcher to select "involvement" as one of the dependent variable measures of climate.

More recent literature is also stressing the importance of involving individuals from the community other than board of trustees in the strategic planning process. An example of this is the recent publication of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Building Communities Through Strategic Planning (McClenney, LeCroy, & LeCroy, 1991). The authors of this publication advocate a greater emphasis on communications and the development of partnerships with the community that the college serves. The authors stated:

The fostering of two-way communication, the articulation of college and community values, the honest acknowledgment of
tensions and diverse perspectives, the delineation of mutual goals, the nurturing of linkages and collaboration, the affirmation of multipartite commitments, all these elements are seen as essential to a strategic plan that promotes not just a single community college, but the overall educational development of the community. (McClenney et al., 1991, p. 2)

There are several other important characteristics of strategic planning that distinguish it from most other types of planning. The first is that there is not the emphasis on quantitative information but rather the emphasis is on qualitative information (Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Steiner, 1979). This does not mean that statistical data and forecasting are ignored but that they take a much more secondary role in the decision-making process. A second important aspect of strategic planning that is a distinguishing characteristic is the focus on the external environment (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Nolan, 1986; Peterson, 1980; Shirley, 1990). One of the techniques of environmental analysis that is gaining some in popularity is called ED QUEST. The QUEST acronym and technique is an invention of Bennis (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) and stands for "Quick Environmental Scanning Technique" (p. 166). The ED QUEST technique consists of a group of the planning team meeting to identify anticipated trends and events that might have strategic implications in the educational setting; thus, the addition of the prefix acronym, ED. The listing of trends and events are then weighed in terms of their likelihood of occurrence. A cross-impact matrix is developed to analyze the impact of events-to-trends and trends-to-events. Critical events and trends are identified and the impact on the college's mission and overall performance is conjectured. Scenarios are
developed and analyzed for planning purposes (Mecca & Morrison, 1988). Bennis and Nanus (1985), describing their experience with the approach, claimed that this process enables leaders, managers, and others involved in the planning process to "choose the high-priority options available for positioning the organization. In doing so, all the other factors contributing to trust—integrity, mutual respect, reliability, competence, and vision—are brought into play" (p. 166).

An aspect of external analysis in strategic planning that was distasteful to discuss by many in higher education prior to the issue of a declining student pool is the topic of competition. One of the reasons for the rise in popularity for strategic planning is that it recognizes competition as natural and much of the activity surrounding the planning effort is aimed at survival and the gathering of resources (Cope, 1987; Harris, 1987; Keller, 1983; Masoner & Essex, 1986-1987).

A final major aspect of strategic planning is its entrepreneurial nature. Strategic planning increases the risk-taking activity in organizations (Drucker, 1974; Keller, 1983). Risk-taking and the surrounding ambiguity is one of the major reasons for resistance to strategic planning in colleges. Steeple (1988), in his summary of seven case studies of strategic planning in colleges stated "many academicians are averse to ambiguity and risk and have chosen professional careers for the security they offer" (p. 103). Innovation is a characteristic related to risk-taking and is important to strategic planning. Peters and Waterman (1982) in their study of 43 companies they selected as representing excellence found that
"innovative companies are especially adroit at continually responding to change of any sort in their environments (p. 12).

Elements

Besides the characteristics mentioned above, strategic planning has certain elements that are part of most strategic planning efforts. The most common of these elements is the analysis of the internal strengths and weaknesses, and external opportunities and threats. This is often referred to as the "SWOT" analysis, "WOTS up" analysis, or environmental scanning, or environmental analysis and is found in nearly all models of strategic planning (Ansoff, 1980; Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Deegan et al., 1985; Peterson, 1980; Ray, 1987; Schmidtlein, 1989-1990; Steiner, 1979). The focus is on the analysis of the external environment as opposed to the internal environmental analysis and this is a distinguishing characteristic of strategic planning compared to other types of planning (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Nolan, 1986; Peterson, 1980; Shirley, 1990). The external environmental analysis is usually broken down into four categories: political, economic, social, and technological—referred to by the acronym "PESTs" analysis (Bryson, 1989) or "STEP" analysis (Cope, 1987; Morrison & Cope, 1985; Morrison, Renfro, & Boucher, 1984). Other related categories can be monitored. For example, the University of Minnesota added education (Bryson, 1989), and Owens (1987) showed that legal, demographic, ecological, and cultural categories can also be part of external analysis. A further expansion of the external environmental analysis exercise can occur.
if organizations add the analysis of day-to-day trends: superficial or surface trends, opinions (more deeply held values and beliefs), and structures (major shifts in organizations or society). This creates the acronym STEP-SOS sometimes found in the strategic planning literature which is a more complex and complete approach to environmental scanning (Cope, 1987).

A second common element of strategic planning is organizational or collective value analysis and clarification (Bryson, 1989; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Cope, 1981; Goodstein, Pfeiffer, & Nolan, 1985; Miller, 1983; Moore & Langknecht, 1986; Peterson, 1980; Shirley, 1990; Steiner, 1979). Values are usually thought of in relation to individuals. "A value establishes for a person a standard upon which basis important decisions are made. . . . They are fundamental beliefs and ideas held by an individual. They serve as criteria for choosing among alternatives" (Steiner, 1979, p. 119). However, in strategic planning, the institution's values are the focus of attention. "Institutional values are explicitly included on most lists of factors which should be included in an institution's self-assessment . . . the focus on them in strategic planning frequently is on their usefulness in realistically identifying an appropriate market niche--one which will successfully match the institution and its environment" (Miller, 1983, p. 43). The existence of organizational values and the understanding of these values was given by Peters and Waterman (1982) as one of the important characteristics of excellent organizations. Clarification of the organization's values are especially helpful to "people way down the line" (Peters & Waterman,
A third element found in strategic planning is the articulation of a vision for the organization. The organizational vision is important as a constant reminder to all members of the organization as to where the organization is supposed to be headed. This statement of vision is a more recent focus of strategic planning and was not nearly as common in literature that was over 5 years old. Vision was claimed by Steeples (1988) to be "the highest function of presidential leadership" (p. 6). The vision is usually stated by the president of the college and reflects the thoughts of others in the organization, not the president's alone (Georgakakos, 1989; Keller, 1983; Schmidtlein and Milton, 1988-1989). This vision is sometimes referred to as a "vision of success" (Bryson, 1989, p. 60) and is "a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization . . . that . . . articulates a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 89). The vision should be inspiring and sufficiently attractive to justify the cost of changing. Yukl (1989) in his survey of theory and research on leadership found that vision statements are important when leaders perceive that there is a need for major revitalization. In their study of the characteristics of transformational leadership in community colleges nationwide, Roueche et al. (1989) found that according to community college presidents, vision articulation was the most significant factor in successful leadership.

A fourth common element of strategic planning is the statement
of the mission of the organization (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Schaffer, 1987; Shirley, 1990; Steeples, 1988; Steiner, 1979). The mission statement has been called the cornerstone of the strategic planning process and no author who outlined their concept of strategic planning was found to have omitted mission statement importance. Effective mission statements address the following three questions: "(1) What function does the organization perform? (2) For whom does the organization perform this function? and, (3) How does the organization go about filling this function? (Pfeiffer, 1986). "Ideally, strategic planning . . . leads to agreement on an institution's mission" (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990, p. 11).

The last elements that are commonly found in strategic planning efforts are goals and objectives that are derived from the mission statement. Like the mission statement, authors who gave complete descriptions of the strategic planning process each included the statement of organizational goals and objectives as an important element of strategic planning.

Keys to Success

There are certain factors that are considered keys to success to strategic planning. Perhaps the most frequently mentioned is strong commitment and leadership of the college's chief executive officer (Deegan et al., 1985; Georgakakos, 1989; Keller, 1983; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Miller, 1983; Moore & Langknecht, 1986; Scott, 1986; Steeples, 1988). There seems to be considerable confusion on what is meant by strong leadership. The following quote from Cope based on
his research is representative of most of the literature on the role of the college president in strategic planning:

As an "architect of strategy" the president takes the lead in searching out and analyzing strategic alternatives, not alone but in concert with the administrative team, the faculty, the trustees, and the other constituencies. As a strategist, the president must above all be an analyst who must choose between alternative designs. (Cope, 1981, p. 110)

Moore and Langknecht (1986) from their viewpoint as college administrators caution that the organizational concept of the collegial model is alive today but is largely a myth. They agree with Richman and Farmer's (1974) research that collegiality may be found in very small colleges. However, some still believe that the role of the collegial leader in planning is "to only facilitate the process of decision-making by consensus and not to lead, direct, or manage anything" (Millett, as cited in Moore & Langknecht, 1986, p. 1). Collegiality is often considered the ideal by faculty associations. However, the reality is that these associations operate in the political systems and view administration as bureaucratic (Silverman, 1987). Moore and Langknecht (1986) agree that the more accepted model is the political model which recognizes that strong leadership in the president's role is more one of a skilled mediator and negotiator. Keller (1983), however, after studying management practices in higher education nationwide, advocated a much stronger role of the president as it relates to strategic planning. "The president ... is the final arbiter" (p. 149). Keller recommends that presidents utilize strategic planning as a means to assume more power. There seems to be a lack of congruence between the role of the president in
strategic planning and the perception advocated by the political model and this needs further clarification. The great diversity of opinions on the role of the president in strategic planning led this researcher to include inquiries about the role presidents are playing in the strategic planning questionnaire for this study.

Another factor in the success of strategic planning is the adequate funding of the process and adequate funding of the strategies that are developed (Ansoff, 1980; Bryson, 1989; Drucker, 1974; Georgakakos, 1989; Schmidtlein, 1989-1990). Budget development is the only planning that most organizations have and this is usually an incremental process that results in little change (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990). Bryson (1988) cautions that planners should "make sure strategic thinking precedes, rather than follows, budgeting" (p. 181). The true test of a plan is when management actually commits resources to action (Drucker, 1974). Schmidtlein indicated that one needs to be aware of the political process which greatly influences budgeting. The contents of the plans and the budgets "reflect the outcome of negotiations and the exercise of influence by a wide variety of actors having varying degrees of power and diverse sets of values and preferences. When there are changes in locations and degrees of influence and in values and preferences, earlier plans and budgets are also likely to change. The consensus represented by any plan or budget does not imply a moratorium on the political activities of participants who sought different visions of the future and different decisions. . . . issues that were 'decided' in plans are frequently reopened with greater fervor during budget negotiations where
resources are at stake, not just potential courses of action" (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990, p. 15).

The implementation of strategies for change in strategic plans are limited by budget constraints and tolerance levels for change. One of the main reasons Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB) failed in colleges was it had the potential for too much change which threatened long-standing political agreements (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990). Further, management needs to plan uncommitted resources for opportunities that cannot be anticipated but which often occur (Meisinger, 1989-1990).

Other factors for the success of strategic planning efforts are mentioned less frequently by authors. They are nevertheless significant. One of these is the identification of competitive advantages (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Porter, 1985). Another factor is the careful matching of opportunities with strengths while minimizing or overcoming weaknesses and threats (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Steiner, 1979). A third more subtle factor is the importance of strategic planning fitting in with other planning that has evolved over time in an organization. As strategic planning is relatively new to most colleges, it is being carefully monitored for acceptance or rejection. Miller (1983) of the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education summarized this situation as follows:

The selling of a reform usually necessitates claims to uniqueness; the permanent integration of a reform into an institution usually necessitates a degree of compatibility with existing practices sufficient to permit accommodation between the new and the old. Although such an accommodation modified existing practices, the distinction which typically governs whether the new becomes permanent is that the old is not so totally altered or displaced that
sufficient opposition, reasonable or not, can be marshalled to undo the reform. (Miller, 1983, p. 42)

Strategic Planning Model for This Study

The strategic planning model used for this study is the model endorsed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Services (NCHEMS) and described in their publication entitled: Strategic Planning in the Higher Education Setting. A diagram of the model is included in Appendix A. This model is the one used by Shirley (1990) who is a frequent presenter of seminars for NCHEMS. Shirley is president of the University of Southern Colorado and is an author, consultant, and practitioner of strategic planning.

In this strategic planning model, a core team is formed that is sometimes called the strategic planning committee or the core planning committee. This committee is usually composed of equal numbers of administrators and faculty along with several students. Colleges also may include others such as alumnae, board of trustees, or community-at-large members on the core, or strategic planning committee. The president of the college does not serve on this committee other than in an ex-officio capacity. This committee is responsible for developing and recommending to the president of the college a strategic vision for the college which includes: a mission statement; a description of the clientele that the college will be serving; the program and service mix; the comparative advantages that the college has or seeks over its competition; and the major objectives (or, major goals, which is the preferred term by some authors) that will guide the college efforts over at least the next 5 years. The
committee will frequently utilize task forces made up of volunteers from the employment ranks of the college to gather the information needed for developing the strategic vision. These task forces are usually led by a member of the strategic planning committee.

In order to provide the strategic vision, the strategic planning committee must analyze the external environment for opportunities, threats, and constraints to the college. The committee must also analyze the internal strengths and weaknesses of the college. The committee may use either an "outside-in" or an "inside-out" approach to the environmental analysis. The outside-in approach identifies major factors or trends in the external environment first and analyzes how these will affect the institution. The inside-out approach identifies strategic decision issues that are presently facing the institution and then determines the external factors that may impact the issues. In either approach, the committee must use the analyses to identify strategic responses necessary to cope with threats to the college and responses to capitalize on the opportunities identified.

The strategic planning committee also must identify the values that are going to help guide the organization before it develops the strategic vision. Values derive from the various cultural experiences of college employees, the various disciplines that are represented in the employment ranks of the college, and the diversity of roles that the organization's members experience. Value identification is an important time in the strategic planning process. This is the time when key individuals will usually attempt to exercise their influence (Shirley, 1990).
Once the analysis of the external opportunities and threats, the internal strengths and weaknesses, and the organizational values are identified, the strategic planning committee can set about determining the strategic vision for the college. This strategic vision creates the "linkage between the institution and its environment" (Shirley, 1990). The vision should present a "crisp and clear vision of the future that will be exciting. The overriding mind set must be boldness, creativity, and risk-taking" (Shirley, 1990).

Once the strategic vision is developed and approved by the president and the governing board of the college, the strategic plan is printed and distributed to the college employees to serve as a guide to future actions. Importantly, the strategic planning committee continues to function on a regularly scheduled basis with each member serving 3-year terms.

Using the strategic vision as a foundation, separate plans are then devised incorporating the strategies for such categories as: human resources, finances, facilities, enrollment, organizational development, and academic programs. Other areas such as research or public outreach plans may be added to this list depending on the institution and its programs. These plans guide the various academic units and the administrative support units in the development of their respective action plans which are basically operational in nature and 1 to 2 years in length. The plans are then supported by the budgeting of funds necessary to accomplish the annual goals of the units.

Evaluation of the progress on implementing the strategic plan is
the responsibility of the college president and the standing strategic planning committee. The strategic planning committee is also responsible for the on-going periodic review of the relevancy of the content of the plan. The committee should meet at least semi-annually to review and update various portions of the plan as the conditions in the internal and external environment develop differently from what was anticipated. The strategy should be good for up to 5 to 7 years with the entire process needing to be repeated after this approximate length of time (Shirley, 1990). This time may vary depending on such factors as the quality of the plan, unanticipated major events, and changes in leadership.

This model is presented with the full realization that there is no one model of strategic planning and no single approach to strategic planning. However, there are common components or characteristics that have emerged from the literature. These components have also emerged through case studies, such as those conducted by the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges (Deegan et al., 1985). The model used in this study reflects these characteristics which will be presented later in this chapter.

Organizational Climate

The study of climate has its conceptual roots in the work of Murray, a professor in Psychology at Harvard University. Lewin (1936) exercised great influence over Murray's writings with his book entitled Principles in Topical Psychology. In his book, Lewin, a professor of Child Psychology and theorist from the University of
Iowa, explained that

If one represents behavior or any kind of mental event by B . . . one can begin to describe the whole situation by roughly distinguishing the person (P) and his environment (E). Every psychological event depends on the state of the person and at the same time on the environment, although their relative importance is different in different cases. Thus, we can state our formula B = f (PE) . . . . This implies that it is necessary to find methods of representing person and environment in common terms as part of one situation. (Lewin, 1986, pp. 11-12)

Murray (1938) believed that, based on his research findings, great benefit could be derived from a better understanding of human behavior through the analysis of the environment. He claimed that it is not only possible but advisable to classify an environment in terms of the kinds of benefits . . . and the kinds of harms . . . which it provides. . . . it may be observed that in the vast majority of cases the organism tends to avoid the harms and seek the benefits. (Murray, 1938, p. 118)

Murray developed expressions in his study of psychology to help describe the environment. He chose the word "press" to designate a directional tendency in an object or a situation. He claimed that the power of a press does not usually depend on what the object or situation is actually doing to the person as much as what it might do. This condition he terms "pressive apperception" (Murray, 1938, p. 119). Importantly, these apperceptions are largely determined by the past experiences and interpretations of these experiences by the person.

Climate studies are the analysis of the nature of the presses that are characteristic of the situation. The press characteristics are applied to the individuals that live within an organization or belong to it. "Press may be classified . . . as positive or
Positive press are usually enjoyable and beneficial; negative press are usually distasteful and harmful" (Murray, 1938, p. 120). Alpha press was described as the actual press that exists as far as scientific methods can determine and beta press as the subject's interpretation of the phenomena that was perceived. When there is a wide divergence between these two types of press, there exists the condition of delusion (Murray, 1938). Most research on climate today has its fundamental origins in the early conceptual work of Murray and Lewin.

Anderson (1982) in her review of the literature and research on climate presented a model which described the possible interrelationships of the various dimensions of the environment. This model depicts the total environment of an organization as the complex interaction of four major dimensions identified by Tagiuri (1986), professor of social science in Business Administration at Harvard University. The four dimensions evolved from an important research conference held at Harvard University in 1968. This conference brought together psychologists who were active in research and writing on organizational climate and helped to clarify what was then a relatively new concept. These four dimensions are: ecology (the physical and material dimensions); milieu (the social dimensions concerned with the presence of persons and groups); social systems (the dimensions concerned with patterned relationships of persons and groups); and culture (the dimension concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structures, and meaning). The model of Anderson is given in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Interactive Model Showing All Possible Relationships Among Environmental Dimensions and Their Interactions With School Climate.

Anderson's model is similar to the environmental system described by Moos, a professor of psychology at Stanford University and Schaefer, a research health science specialist of the Social Ecology Laboratory of Stanford University (Moos & Schaefer, 1987). The system of Moos and Schaefer is composed of variables in four domains that are used to characterize settings and provide a context for climate studies. The four domains are: physical and architectural features, suprapersonal factors (aggregate characteristics of the individuals in a setting), organizational structure, and social climate (a result of the interplay of values and beliefs of individuals and the actual events and qualities of an organization) (Moos & Schaefer, 1987). These domains, though identified with different descriptors, are essentially the same as those given by Anderson (1982). Moos and Schaefer (1987) explained that "Individuals use a process of descriptive judgment to form global ideas about an environment from perceptions of specific aspects of it" (p. 101).

Thus, climate is influenced by and influences a complexity of intermingling variables from the four dimensions. Anderson's (1982) model helps to describe the immense complexity of an organization's environment and the difficulty in describing and measuring variables or combinations of variables that could affect climate conditions. Until recently, most researchers attempted to describe organizational climate by consideration of only a few dimensions. "Few, if any studies have looked at all of the environmental domains and connected them with each other and work performance" (Moos, 1986a, p. 21). For example, a researcher might have selected the milieu and cultural
dimension and attempted to predict the climate of a school from the combination of effects of such factors as teachers' social class, economic backgrounds of parents of most students, and the degree of emphasis on scholarship. "Usually, only a few dimensions are focused on, and they are seldom combined to form the essence of the climate" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 28). However, there is growing consensus that climate is a much more complex construct that cannot be simply understood by measurement of a few variables and that climates are unique to organizations.

Climate is described today in a variety of ways by different contemporary authors ranging from analogy to depictions of complex, interactive models related to the above model of Anderson. In their recent study of the climate of Miami-Dade Community College, one of the largest community colleges in America, the authors Baker and Roueche (1987) described climate in very general, simplistic terms as a "feeling" that one gets when visiting someone's home or an organization (p. 95). How a home or a school looks and how the members of the home or organization behave towards one another provides important clues about the climate of the setting. The authors Halpin and Croft (1963), who studied the organizational climate of schools, described climate as "personality is to the individual what 'climate' is to the organization" (p. 1). Or, "Climate . . . . could be used . . . to express the character of an enduring situation. A particular configuration of enduring characteristics . . . would constitute a climate, much as a particular configuration of personal characteristics constitutes a personality" (Tagiuri, 1968, pp. 22-23).
These descriptions of climate are perhaps helpful in narrowing the climate concept for general understanding purposes but are not specific enough to be useful in research.

Owens (1987), an author who reported on his reviews of organizational research in schools, provided a more useful description of climate when he described climate as the "perceptions of persons in the organization that reflect . . . norms, values, and beliefs" (p. 166). An important word in this description is "perception." Perception is "the meaningful interpretation of sensations as representatives of external objects. . . . Perceptions are the sole internal representative of external objects--the mind's reflection of matter" (Cohen, cited in James & Jones, 1974, p. 1,102).

Climate theorists and researchers have debated the use of individuals' perceptions as accurate representations of the environment. Data on perceptions has been seen to have several flaws. Perceptions are based in part on previous experiences, needs, and values (Anderson, 1982, citing Bloom; Davis; Hellriegel & Slocum; Mitchell). James and Jones (1974) of the Institute of Behavioral Research of Texas Christian University observed that perceptual climate measures "provide(s) descriptive information often contaminated by satisfaction" (p. 1107). Thus, perceptions of conditions in an environment will vary along with individual differences.

Some have advocated using objective measures of climate to avoid potential problems with perception (Anderson, 1982; James & Jones, 1974). However, if objective measures alone were used, the description of climate would be incomplete as the four dimensions of climate
given by Tagiuri (1968) and described earlier are replete with perceptual items. Observation by an outsider has also been suggested as a method of describing climate. However, observation has its drawbacks as well. The behavior that causes the perception to occur may be infrequent or it may take place regularly, but not in a location observable to an outsider (Moos, 1979). Because of these complications with alternative means of measuring climate, the use of perceptions has been the preferred method of describing climate.

Lending support to the use of perceptions, an experimental study by Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) showed that the subject's perceptions of climate were accurate representations of actual conditions. Pace, Astin, Centra, and Stern (as cited in Moos, 1974) indicated that data about perceived environment provided substantial additional information than that provided by objective measures alone.

Additionally, as Halpin and Croft (1963) pointed out in their landmark research on climates in schools, it is not so much the actual behavior of another that influences a person to act in a certain way but rather, how the behavior is perceived.

We have assumed that how the leader really behaves is less important than how the members of his group perceive that he behaves; it is their perception of his behavior that will determine the behavior of the group members, and will hence define the Organizational Climate. (Halpin & Croft, 1963, p. 13)

Tagiuri (1968) explained that the climate of the organization is interpreted in terms of shared meanings (with some individual variation around a consensus). Climate has the potential for behavioral consequences in that it acts on the attitudes, expectations, and
states of arousal that are determinants of behavior. Tagiuri defined climate as "the relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants, (b) influences their behavior, (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the environment" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 25).

Keefe, Kelley, and Miller (1985), as a result of their review of literature, offered a definition of climate similar to Tagiuri's (1968) when they defined climate as "the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members" (p. 744). Importantly, both definitions emphasize the relative permanence of the climate in organizations by use of the descriptor "enduring." Keefe et al. presented a highly interactive model of a school's environment which outlined in greater detail than the Anderson (1982) model given earlier the total context of personal, societal, and organizational variables which influence climate. The model of Keefe et al. (1985) is given as Figure 2.

The model provides an important visual separation of two constructs that are often confused: satisfaction or attitudes can be confused with climate (Halpin & Croft, 1963; James & Jones, 1974; Keefe et al., 1985; Owens, 1987). Satisfaction is more concerned with the morale of the individual respondent, it is "typically viewed as measurement of individual not situational properties" (James & Jones, 1974, p. 1,101). Questions related to satisfaction would start by asking what "I" believe as opposed to climate questions that inquire what "most people" believe (Keefe et al., 1985). The
Figure 2. An Interactive Model of the School Environment (with School Climate and Satisfaction as Mediating Variables).

importance of this distinction can be seen in data comparing survey responses to "I" and "most people" type statements. These responses can show differences in what the individual perceives and what people think others perceive about the organization (Keefe et al., 1985; Moos, Insel, & Humphrey, 1974). Leaders in organizations can determine these differences through the use of instruments designed to detect differences in the climate and individual perceptions of what ought to be. This can be very helpful to management in deciding what changes should occur in the organization (Moos et al., 1974).

James and Jones (1974) provided additional clarification between the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an evaluative reaction which asks for opinions such as "good versus bad" or "satisfied versus not satisfied." The judgment is based on the relationships between the environment and the personal needs and values of the respondent. Organizational climate on the other hand is the beliefs that people have about the organization (Schneider, as cited in James & Jones, 1974). Perceptions are not free from personal biases, however, and individual differences such as attitude can influence climate perception (Anderson, 1982; James & Jones, 1974; Moos, 1986b).

When individuals come together in a social group . . . they bring with them values, norms, and abilities. . . . The aggregate of the members' attributes . . . in part defines the subculture . . . and, in turn, the morale and behavior of its members. (Moos, 1986a, p. 20)

Linkages Between Planning and Climate

Climate has already been described as part of an organization's
culture. The literature describes leadership as extremely important in determining the culture, and thus, the climate of organizations (Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1969; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kanter, 1983; Leidecker, Bruno, & Yanow, 1988; Mauriel, 1989; Nixon, 1987; Owens, 1987; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Roueche & Baker, 1987; Schein, 1985). In effect, climate is a reflection of the culture, at least certain aspects of it.

Organizational climate is related to, and subsumed under, organizational culture inasmuch as the perceptions of individuals in the organization reflect the values and belief systems in the environment of the organization... The culture of an organization exerts powerful influence on the development of climate. (Owens, 1987, p. 169)

The concept of culture has been the center of much attention in management circles over the last 10 years. Perhaps the book that drew the most attention to the concept of culture was Theory Z by Ouchi (1981), a researcher of managerial practices from Stanford University. In his book, Ouchi defined culture as "a set of symbols, ceremonies, and myths that communicate the underlying values, and beliefs of that organization to its employees... Slowly individual preferences give way to collective consensus" (p. 35). A second influential book from the last 10 years that dealt with management forming cultures was In Search of Excellence. This book outlined summative findings from research at 43 American corporations by Peters and Waterman (1982). The organizations studied were identified as representing innovative and excellent corporations by an informed group of observers selected by the authors. Culture was described as "stories, myths, and legends... [that are] important
because they convey the organization's shared values" (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 75).

A content analysis of 10 of the most popular management books published in the United States in the last 10 years showed strategic planning and the creation of a functional culture as two of the top patterns of leadership that appeared to be emerging (Culpan, 1989). Schiemann (1989) described the interrelationship between strategic planning and culture alignment. Based on his review of the research, he listed seven steps for management to follow in order to align their strategy, culture, and communication. These steps are:

1. Carefully determine key organizational goals.

2. Clearly define a strategy that will enable the firm to reach these goals.

3. Determine which activities, plans, and behaviors are required in each unit to meet the defined strategy.

4. Assess the type of culture that will be required to support these behaviors.

5. Assess today's culture and analyze the gap between this culture and the one that will be needed to support tomorrow's strategy.

6. Define the changes needed in culture or strategy.

7. Clearly communicate and support the new goals, strategy, culture, and the reasons for the change. (Schiemann, 1989, pp. 11-12)

A further linkage of strategic planning, culture formation, and thus, climate formation, was implied by Schein (1985), a researcher and organizational consultant from Harvard University, who reported on longitudinal studies of leadership. Culture was described by Schein as a pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration -
that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (Schein, 1985, p. 9)

Thus, we see the leader as the person responsible for planning and climate formation or reformation within the organization. Strategic planning, as described earlier, is a participatory process by which the leader can identify changes. The leader, if he or she is to act in a moral fashion, must not force certain cultural and climatic changes on followers. Leaders observe and evaluate the behaviors of their followers and then engage the follower to identify the mutually acceptable changes (Burns, 1978). Strategic planning, properly carried out, should result in a more positive climate where organizational members have had a hand in and understand where their organization is headed.

Research on Strategic Planning and Organizational Climate

The review of research did not reveal any previous studies that considered both strategic planning and climate as variables. The literature did contain considerable findings on the subject of strategic planning in colleges and relevant related research in the private sector. Research on climate tended to be somewhat limited for college settings. Thus, the review of research on climate also includes findings from other settings which may be transferable to the college setting.

This review begins with an analysis of the research on the various important aspects of, and specific elements of, strategic planning. This is followed by more generalized research findings on
strategic planning. The review of the research on climate is then given divided on the four climate factors that are topics of hypotheses of this study: task orientation, clarity, innovation, and involvement. This will be followed by other relevant, related research.

Strategic Planning Research

Leadership Factors

Leaders are responsible for establishing conditions within the organization that are conducive to change (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kanter, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Roueche et al., 1989). Strategic planning for change in the community colleges frequently cites presidential leadership and support for the effort as an essential element in successful efforts (Deegan et al., 1985; Keller, 1983; Ray, 1987; Scharfenberger, 1986; Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989; Shirley, 1990).

The role of the president in strategic planning is a source of confusion. Most literature describes a strong, supportive role as the appropriate presidential role. However, Ray (1987) reported in his research on strategic planning in Texas community colleges that the role was not clear. He indicated that there were probable dangers in either too strong a role, which may be perceived as overly directive, or too weak a role, which could imply a lack of importance to the effort. Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) indicated that the role of the president may be more one of mediation than of leadership. They reported that "Presidents . . . . often preferred to let
others lead campus planning efforts so they could maintain a more neutral role in resolving disputes. Thus, they could avoid becoming so identified with a position that their room for maneuver and compromise was limited" (p. 12). Cohen and March (1986) in their research of 41 college and university presidents reported that the presidents usually did not dominate the decision-making in their institutions. Further, they found that "Outcomes depend heavily on factors other than the president's action" (p. 200). A finding by Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) related to presidential role was that central leadership is necessary for reduction or elimination of programs and for initiation of changes resulting from strategic planning that involved coordination between units. In their nationwide study of planning in colleges, these investigators also found that "In particular, new presidents tended to begin their tenure by devoting considerable attention to formal planning activities" (p. 8). These researchers also reported that the personal interest level of the president reflected the level of formal planning in the college. Because of the importance of leadership cited by many authors, and also because of disagreement in the strategic planning literature on a distinct role for the president, this researcher will include questions on the role of the president as part of this study.

Perhaps the most thorough recent research on leadership and planning for organizational change was the work of Kanter (1983). In her book The Change Masters, Kanter reported the results of ethnographic research at over 50 major United States corporations identified as successful organizations. Kanter utilized a variety of
methods including surveys, field observation, and open-ended un-
structured interviews in order to collect a vast amount of informa-
tion on change processes in these organizations. When she spoke of
change in organizations, Kanter preferred to use a term with broader
meaning. The term was innovation. The definition she gave to inno-
vation was "Innovation refers to the process of bringing any new
problem solving idea into use. . . . Innovation is the generation,
acceptance, and implementation of new ideas, processes, products, or
services . . . it involves the capacity to change or adapt" (Kanter,
1983, pp. 20-21). Related to this definition, Bennis and Nanus
(1985) found in their research on prominent leaders in both the
private and public sector that effective leaders encourage innova-
tion. Kanter also found that "leaders are innovative only if their
organizations' norms favor change; this is why the values of leaders
are so important. . . . There is more impetus to seek change when
this is considered desirable" (Kanter, 1983, p. 149). This finding
leads to the consideration of an important element of strategic
planning cited in the research, namely values clarification.

Values Clarification

One of the important responsibilities of leadership is value
clarification (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Chaffee & Tierney,
planning include organizational value clarification as an important
element of the process (Bryson, 1989; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Deegan
et al., 1987; Eaton, 1988; Keller, 1983; Knoell, 1980; Kotler &
Leadership does not mean imposing the leader's values on the follower. According to Burns, who studied the lives of great political leaders of history, the act of leadership is exercised when "leaders (are) inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values . . . of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values" (Burns, 1978, p. 19). In research related to the above position stated by Burns, Bennis and Nanus (1985) reported that leaders affect values by being able to "move followers to higher degrees of consciousness, such as liberty, freedom, justice, and self-actualization" (p. 218).

In spite of the importance assigned to identification of values in strategic planning, little was found in the research which specifically addressed the question of whether or not strategic planning resulted in value clarification. Perhaps this is because another focus of research on strategic planning is the identification of the mission of the organization which, according to the definition given earlier, can include the core values of the organization. A team of researchers who did specifically address the issue of values in the community college were Roueche et al. (1989). Their research focused on the values of the presidents. These three researchers found through their in-depth interviews of 50 of the top or "blue chipper" community college presidents that the following values characterized these leaders: a commitment to learning, a commitment to quality
education, a commitment to ethical behavior, openness and trust, consistent judgment, humor as a means of influence, and leadership through example" (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989, pp. 216-234).

Mission

Steeples (1988) reported in his observation of case studies on strategic planning at seven colleges that one of the greatest advantages perceived as an outcome of strategic planning was mission identification and clarification. Yukl, citing research by Roberts, reported that successful transformational leaders formulated a mission statement and made frequent reference to this during the change process (Yukl, 1989). Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989), on a negative note, reported in their research on planning in colleges that the mission statements "were not attempts to narrowly define the character of campuses and their programs in order to provide clear guidance for operational decisions" (p. 13). However these two researchers also found that when the plans did focus on overall mission that they had utility. Bogorya (1987/1990) reported that strategic planning methods have been found beneficial for clarification of the institutional mission. Because of the level of importance ascribed to mission identification in strategic planning, questions on mission are included in the strategic planning questionnaire.

Vision

In addition to leadership, value clarification, and statement of mission, the research also describes the importance of a fourth
element of strategic planning, the statement of a vision for the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bogorya, 1987/1990; Kanter, 1983; Roueche et al., 1989). Vision is an essential element of strategic planning (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Shirley, 1990; Steeples, 1988). In their research of successful American leaders, Bennis and Nanus (1985) reported that all 90 of their research subjects had a vision for their organization. A very similar finding was reported in a comprehensive study of community college leaders. In their study of 50 top community college presidents, Roueche et al. (1989) found that the ability to articulate a vision was the "central and paramount" attribute of these leaders (p. 13). Also, these authors found that these leaders had the ability to transform the beliefs and commitment of others to a shared vision.

The vision was usually stated by the chief executive officer of the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Effective statements of vision were found to be "right for the times, right for the organization, and right for the people who are working in it" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 107).

Research by Tischy and Devanna (cited in Yukl, 1989) showed that the visions in larger, more mature organizations are rarely the product of an individual. Rather, the vision results from a participative process involving important members of the organization (Yukl, 1989). This finding was supported by Bennis and Nanus (1985). Research by Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) supported this finding in colleges. The absence of a clear vision was found to be a major reason for organizational ineffectiveness (Bennis & Nanus, 1985;
Peters & Waterman, 1982). Because of the level of importance given to vision, a question directly related to the definition of vision given in the glossary (see Appendix K) was included in the strategic planning questionnaire.

Goal Formulation

An element of strategic planning that is highly related to mission is goal formulation. The statement of overall goals or, as Shirley (1990) prefers, "overall objectives" is a means of identifying the broad goals the institution seeks to accomplish for its students and society. Research by Ray (1987) on goals in community college planning in Texas showed that there was a correlation between the extent of strategic planning and the community colleges presidents' perception of effectiveness in reaching desired goals. Strategic planning research results in the for-profit sector showed a significant relationship between the formulation of dynamic (high degree of change) goals and the average rate of revenue increase achieved by the business. Also, there appeared to be an important linkage between strategic goal structures that are formalized and corporate financial performance (Ferguson, 1987). Goal formulation in colleges may pose more challenges than in the private sector. Cohen and March (1986) found that goals in colleges are often "either vague or in dispute" (p. 3). A question on whether or not strategic planning has helped enhance the accomplishment of goals has been included in the strategic planning questionnaire for this study to possibly lend further evidence to the important observation that
organizational goal identification and accomplishment are enhanced by strategic planning.

**Strategic Fit or "Niche"

Proponents of strategic planning claim that one of the most distinctive benefits of strategic planning is finding the proper "niche" or strategic fit between the organization and its environment (Ansoff, 1980; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Peterson, 1980; Schmidtlein, 1989-1990; Shirley, 1990; Steiner, 1979). The concept of niche was best described by Keller in citing Cyert, President of Carnegie-Mellon University who said

> The aim of strategic planning is to place a campus in a distinctive position. We must face the fact that colleges and universities are in a competitive market. . . . The key element in strategic planning is to get everyone in the organization to think that way. (Cyert, cited in Keller, 1983, pp. 92-93)

Very little was found in the research regarding strategic fit or niche. In one of the few findings, Steeples (1988) reported in summary observations of case studies of seven colleges strategic planning processes that the marketing concept of uniqueness, comparative advantage and niche were beneficial. This is more of an observation of a pattern than a true research finding and this was acknowledged by Steeples. The lack of research information on strategic fit as it relates to strategic planning will be addressed in the strategic planning questionnaire for this study.

**Participatory and Iterative Nature

Two related elements of strategic planning are the emphasis on
participatory and iterative processes. Yukl (1989), in his review of research on decision-making claimed that

Participation results in better decisions when the participants have relevant information and ideas lacked by the leader, when they are willing to cooperate in finding a good solution, and when there is ample time for the participative process to be carried out properly. . . . [Consultation] is more important for innovations and major changes in policies and strategies than for routine decisions. (Yukl, 1989, pp. 280-281)

Community college leaders must participate in strategic planning to show their confidence in the process. Leader participation was cited by Deegan et al. (1985) as an essential factor in moving from an incremental planning mode to strategic planning in studies conducted by the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

The participation of the faculty is particularly important in strategic planning. Cyert reported that "Planning works best when it is shaped to a great extent by faculty" (cited in Keller, 1983, p. 90). On a negative note, faculty often felt they were not effectively involved in planning at colleges and that their recommendations were often ignored (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989). An absence of adequate incentives to promote faculty support and involvement was also found by Milton (1985) in her study of academic division heads. Soder (1986) reported in his descriptive case study of strategic planning at four California community colleges that it was important to develop procedures to involve every member of the staff.

Perhaps demonstrating that strategic planning is more of a top-down process than a bottom-up, trustees reported the highest levels of involvement in strategic planning followed by administrators, then
faculty (Evans, 1987). A finding in the private sector related to effectiveness was that businesses that had greater participation in strategic planning exhibited higher levels of financial performance (Richardson, 1986). And finally, benefits derived from the interaction of the planning process were usually considered more important than the resultant plan. This finding was reported by Cohen and March (1986) in their study of presidents of 41 colleges and universities and more recently by Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) in their nationwide study of planning in colleges and universities.

Several researchers stated the importance of the iterative process as characteristic of successful strategic planning efforts. In their study of major United States corporations, Peters and Waterman (1982) found that a crucial factor in successful strategy was the continuous adaptation and flexibility of the organization. In the implementation of strategy, continual communication seemed to be the main element of success (Bogorya, 1987/1990; Ray, 1987). Seeing strategic planning as a continuing process was cited as important to the success in the case studies of four California community colleges' strategic planning efforts (Deegan et al., 1985).

Cohen and March (1986) reported finding that participation in college planning was fluid. Participants varied from one time to another as did the amount of time and effort expended. Although fluid participation is characteristic of other organizations, it appeared to be especially conspicuous in educational settings. Because of the importance assigned to participation and the iterative process as characteristic of successful strategic planning, questions
on these aspects have been included in the strategic planning questionnaire designed for this study.

External and Internal Environment Analysis

The analysis of the external environment is described in the strategic planning literature as an analysis of opportunities and threats. Steeples (1988) noted in the seven case studies of his book that strategic planning was most likely to win acceptance when "there are real and perceived external threats and opportunities" (p. 104).

Regardless of its importance to strategic planning, Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) reported finding that at 11 of the 16 colleges they visited to gain additional information for their nationwide study on planning that there was a serious lack of information on internal and external trends in the environment. Perhaps the reason for this lack of information are experiences like those of the 42 academic departments of the University of Minnesota during a period of decline and retrenchment. Research showed that priority settings for programs at the university were exclusively reputational and not based on future market demand or changes in knowledge requirements (Clugston, 1987). Support for this finding comes from Cohen and March (1986) who reported in their research on colleges that "Decisions appear often to be made without recourse . . . to explicit markets" (p. 3).

Despite the relative importance assigned to external and internal environmental analysis (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Mecca & Morrison, 1988; Peterson, 1980; Shirley, 1990; Steiner,
1979) there appears to have been little research done on this aspect of strategic planning. An attempt to remedy this situation is the inclusion of questions on the extent of external and internal environmental analyses in the strategic planning questionnaire for this study.

Budgeting

Once a strategic plan is derived, it is important that the results of the process are used to "drive the budget" (Deegan et al., 1985). Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) found that in order to link budgets and plans effectively, "Shared understanding and common expectations among participants are the important consideration" (p. 17).

The potential for conflicts over budgeting are considerable. Faculty resent budget office administrators who attempt to interfere in areas of substantive academic matters with the administrator's focus more on efficiencies (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989). Another source of conflict found was between the various units of the college and central administration. "Organizational units nearly always view planning as a means to enlarge their budgets, while central staff frequently seek reallocations and reduction" (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990, p. 15).

Lending support to Lindblom's (1959) theory of incrementalism mentioned earlier, Schmidtlein and Milton found in their national study of college planning that most college budgets were increasing in regular increments each year. As a result of this, department
members viewed planning as costly and largely ineffective. Department members rarely were given additional funds for plans and commonly were not told why budget requests were not supported. Further, strategic planning was found to be beneficial for providing a general context and set of assumptions for the college but was found to "rarely provide substantial operational guidance for particular budgetary decisions" (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990, p. 13). Even when budgets are agreed to during planning, issues that were decided in planning are reopened during budget negotiation time when direct access to resources are being finally decided (Schmidtlein, 1989-1990). Because of the problems with budgeting reported in the research and its importance in funding the process and outcomes of the planning effort, questions on budget were included in the strategic planning survey instrument of this study.

The final section on the research related to strategic planning in the community college is separated into three areas: benefits, problems, and general findings.

**Benefits**

Strategic planning methods were found to be beneficial for critical self-analysis, the ability to respond to change, flexibility, and the creation of a better balance in the organization between academic and administrative concerns (Bogorya, 1987/1990). In research on 90 United States corporations and cited by Steiner (1979), organizations that had long-range planning systems performed better financially than those who did not. Steiner also noted
another study, however, where there were some doubts raised about the benefits of formal planning in service industries.

In a study by Meredith et al. (1988), 17 institutions planning strategically were compared with 17 not following strategic planning methods. Those planning strategically were found to show greater satisfaction and more rapid gains in financial resources over a period of 6 years (1981-1987). Those institutions not following strategic planning practices were actually poorer. This last finding given on the benefits of strategic planning is of great interest to this researcher. Ray (1987) reported in his study of Texas community colleges that there was no relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning. This does not seem logical as strategic planning is usually costly to undertake, implement the results of, and sustain as an iterative process. One of the reasons given by writers on strategic planning for engaging in strategic planning is to help ensure for the prosperity of the college (Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983). Thus, this research compares the wealth of community colleges to the extent of strategic planning as part of the methodology.

Problems

Yukl (1989) reported in his review of literature that descriptive studies of the activities of managers showed they had little time for planning. The manager's day is spent full of many interruptions, making it difficult to devote the large amounts of time necessary for the development of long-term strategies. In reporting
on research of behaviors of top executives performed by Quinn, Yukl reported that

most of the important strategic decisions were made outside of the formal planning process, and strategies were formulated in an incremental, flexible, and intuitive manner . . . . Strategies were refined and implemented simultaneously in a cautious, incremental manner that reflected the need to develop a political coalition in support of a strategy as well as to avoid the risks of an initial, irreversible commitment to a particular course of action . . . . overall objectives and strategies . . . were more likely to be the result of a 'bottom-up' political process in which the objectives and strategies of powerful individuals and organizational subunits are reconciled and integrated. (Quinn, as cited in Yukl, 1989, p. 61)

This finding appears to contradict most strategic planning literature which advocates a strong role of the president in strategic planning and also the research by Clugston (1987) cited earlier which showed that the process was more top-down. The finding that strategic decisions are more a result of bottom-up was also contradicted by the finding of Harris (1987) that strategic planning was usually more of a top-down process. She also reported that since strategic planning is an iterative process, it may also have some bottom-up characteristics. Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) found that planning was a blend of both top-down and bottom-up with the mix dependent upon the nature of the issue under consideration. A question on the bottom-up versus the top-down nature of strategic planning has been included in the questionnaire designed for this study to help clarify some of the confusion of the true nature of the process in practice.

General Findings

The process benefits of planning were considered more important
than the substantive results of plans in college planning (Schmidt­
lein, 1989-1990). The same finding was reported in earlier research
by Cohen and March (1986) who reported that from their interviews of
41 college presidents that most of the presidents found the benefits
of planning to be in the process.

Strategic planning processes were also reported to vary consi­
derably from one community college to another (Ray, 1987). The
models being followed in colleges and universities were usually
designed specifically for that institution based on each institu­
tion's uniqueness (Harris, 1987). There appeared to be no single or
ideal way to begin and conduct strategic planning (Deegan et al.,
1985). Ray (1987) reported this same finding in his research on
Texas community colleges. At most college campuses, a particular
process survived from one to three cycles before being revamped

Large community college districts exhibited more of the elements
of strategic planning and planning had a greater impact on college
operations than at smaller college districts (Ray, 1987). Community
college presidents were asked their perception of their institution's
effectiveness in reaching its goals. Ray (1987) found that there was
a correlation between the extent of strategic planning and the per­
ceived effectiveness reported by the presidents.

Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) in their research found
evidence supporting the political nature of community colleges.
Plans were reported to be the outcomes of political processes on
campuses. The plans were not based on objective facts and analyses
led by central policy makers. Research by Janis and Mann (cited in Yukl 1989) supported this finding when decision processes in organizations were found to be highly political where important decisions required support and approval of many persons in many levels and from different subunits of the organization.

Community colleges should not engage in strategic planning without a careful self-analysis. One of the important first considerations is the relative health of the institution. Also, the college should assess the readiness of the institution for change (Soder, 1986). Deegan et al. (1985) cautioned on a related matter that strategic planning usually involves major new efforts in gathering reliable and useful information. The ability of the institution to produce this information needs to be carefully considered.

Climate Research

The review of research on climate revealed a confusing array of findings and methods used to identify relationships. This discovery is not surprising because, as indicated earlier in this chapter, when the four dimensional climate model of Anderson (1982) is analyzed on each dimension for possible factors, and when these factors are then combined as influencing climate, there is a very large number of combinations of variables that could affect climate differently.

In order to bring the scope of the analysis within the bounds of this dissertation, only social climate work factors identified by this investigator as possibly being affected by strategic planning are considered in this review. There are four social climate work
factors for which related research is reviewed. These four work factors are: task orientation, clarity, innovation, and involvement. These factors are among 10 identified by Moos (1986b) through extensive research with workers from a broad spectrum of work settings, including college environments. These factors are described by Moos as having the following characteristics:

- **Task orientation**: The degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done.
- **Clarity**: The extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies are communicated.
- **Innovation**: The degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches.
- **Involvement**: The extent to which employees are concerned about and committed to their jobs. (Moos, 1986b, p. 2)

The research shows that the benefits derived from emphasis on the factors in organizational climate are substantial. Also implicit in many of the research findings is the potential impact a well-carried out strategic plan could have on these climate factors.

**Task Orientation**

A study of school administrators by Hoff (cited in Moos, 1987a) related morale to task orientation. Hoff found that workers who saw the work milieu as task focused and cohesive tended to be more satisfied in their jobs. Moos and Schaefer (1987) in their review of research on climate also reported on task orientation and its influence on morale. These authors reported that "Work groups characterized by strong goal orientation and the opportunity for independent action tend to promote morale and performance"
Experimental research by Litwin (1968) showed that organizations where high productivity was valued significantly outperformed others who did not emphasize productivity. As with much climate research, there were other independent variables identified along with emphasis on high productivity that combined to produce high levels of performance. One of these variables also related to task orientation is goal setting by individuals. Remaining variables such as frequent feedback and creativity will be included in reviews that follow this review of task orientation.

Kanter (1983), in her ethnographic research findings at over 50 exemplary businesses, indicated the importance of a climate of task orientation in the organization when she noted

the importance of defining a clear direction, even if one is already almost at the destination, is to build commitment by reducing the plausibility of other directions, to reinforce pride people take in intelligence of the system . . . [and] to remove any lingering doubts about what the direction is . . . . Strategic plans are one of those symbols which are highly reassuring. (Kanter, 1983, p. 286)

Further, she found that focus on getting the job done meant that in order for changes to take hold, they must be reflected in "multiple, concrete manifestations throughout the organization. . . . It is when the structures surrounding a change also change to support it that we say change is 'institutionalized!'" (Kanter, 1983, p. 299). Kanter also noted that "strategic planning . . . can be extremely useful as a discipline and a structure for discussions resulting in plans" (p. 305).

Peters and Waterman (1982) in their research of successful
American businesses found that task orientation was one of the contributing climate factors in the success formula. These authors described this orientation as "A bias for action" (p. 13) and characteristic of these high-performing companies. "What is striking is ... the stultification that almost inevitably comes with size" (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 14). The emphasis on efficiency and getting the job done is illustrated by this observation of the authors: "one is more apt to see a swarm of task forces that last 5 days, have a few members, and result in line operators doing something differently rather than the 35-person task force that lasts 18 months and produces a 500 page report" (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 120).

Clarity

There are many findings in the climate research related to the climate factor of clarity. Billings and Moos (1982), in citing research by Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Purneau, Caplan and Jones, Kahn, and Miles) reported that lack of clarity about job roles and performance criteria has been associated with employee anxiety, job dissatisfaction and turnover. On the other hand, clarity of expectations about tasks and performance feedback combined with moderate organization and structure resulted in employee satisfaction and effectiveness. However, an overemphasis of these variables, especially when there is a lack of autonomy and cohesion in the working group, restricts personal development and can result in defiance and tension (Moos, 1987a).
As indicated above, feedback is important to climate perception. Moos (1986a) reported in his review of the research that the level of feedback and autonomy combined with the significance of the task and variety of skills needed are linked to higher levels of performance, work satisfaction, and less absenteeism. In the Litwin study mentioned earlier under Task Orientation, feedback was cited as one of the group of independent variables of the research that resulted in higher performance, more new products, higher profits, and reduced material costs (Litwin, 1968). Anderson (1982), citing research by Christie and Kurpius, reported that "good communication is important because it determines the use of feedback in decision-making which then affects the climate" (p. 400).

Communication of goals also affects the climate. Anderson (1982) reported that "clearly defined goals and behavior patterns are associated with exceptional schools" (p. 404). Moos (1987a), in his review of the research, reported that considerate supervisors who specify clear goals and encourage participation in decision-making tend to promote good employee morale and feelings of personal accomplishment. Smith (1989) in a study involving 13 Tennessee community colleges reported that as communications satisfaction increased, job satisfaction increased regardless of the college's existing climate.

Vision also has an impact on the clarity dimension. "Strong leaders articulate direction and save the organization from change via 'drift.' They create a vision of a possible future that allows themselves and others to see more clearly the steps to take" (Kanter,
Anderson, in citing the authors Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith, indicated that "consistent school values are the result of a sense of participation, trust, and a clear policy direction" (Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, as cited in Anderson, 1982, p. 404). Kanter (1982) found in her ethnographic studies of excellent companies that "A few clear signals, consistently supported, are what it takes to change an organization's culture and direction" (p. 298). Also, in connection with strategic planning, Kanter stated "discussions of corporate strategic planning are beginning to stress the intuitive side, the artful crafting of an image of possibilities out of the materials supplied by the organizational subunits--dealing in symbols, creating coalitions with shared understandings, building comfort levels" (Kanter, 1982, p. 304). Kanter (1982) also cautions that overdependency or overuse of existing plans to guide organizations prevents the benefits of departures that can produce entirely new strategies.

Innovation

The authors Bennis and Nanus (1985), in their 5-year study of effective leaders in public and private organizations, found that effective leaders encouraged innovation. These authors explained that "the leader must reinforce long-range thinking, innovation, and creativity" (p. 206). They gave the example of Walter B. Wriston of Citicorp as illustrative. In writing about Wriston, the authors said "almost any good idea that someone had was supported. Furthermore,
he convinced managers that this was the way to succeed" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 207).

The importance of innovation to climate in colleges was reported by Kelly in his study of the relationship of leadership to organizational climate at Humber College. Kelly reported among his findings that "if top administrators want to influence faculty in their group efforts more effectively, . . . they (should) . . . work through their middle managers . . . using and supporting innovative ideas coming from the ranks" (Kelly, 1988, p. 11). Kelly also contended that with a positive climate comes enhanced productivity and a greater sense of job satisfaction. Supporting this, Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-1989) found in their national study of planning in colleges that innovation flourished at campuses where administrators were perceived to be supportive of new ideas, were not apt to punish failures and assisted in finding ways to implement new ideas. Financial support is clear evidence of backing ideas "funds specifically designated for supporting faculty initiatives promoted faculty innovation as well as generated more positive overall faculty attitudes" (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-1989, p. 15).

If management wants to stimulate innovation, giving employees more freedom and latitude in decision-making and raising expectations can be beneficial. Moos (1987a) reported finding that when employees are allowed this freedom to make decisions about their own work, high job demands can be stimulating promoting problem solving and innovation.

In his experimental studies of simulated business organizations,
Litwin (1968) found that encouraging innovation was one of a cluster of variables that stimulated new products, higher profits, and reduced costs.

Innovation needs to be considered normal for organizations and there must be a culture and structure in place that integrates the changes into the system. Kanter (1983) who performed one of the most in-depth analyses of change in organizations, described integrative organizations as exhibiting "the willingness to move beyond received wisdom, to combine ideas from unconnected sources, to embrace change as an opportunity to test limits" (Kanter, 1983, p. 27). The integration of ideas is stimulated by overlaps in functions, teamwork approaches, and communication networks that keep ideas circulating. Kanter supported the findings of Bennis and Nanus, and also Litwin when she reported finding that innovation combined with integrative structures was a characteristic of effective organizations. Kanter described the importance of a climate for innovation when she stated

if the overall climate for innovation does not exist throughout the whole organization - a readiness to readjust in response to changes that the use of innovations will require - it is unlikely that even the best ideas will reach the economic mainstream. (Kanter, 1983, pp. 278-79)

Involvement

Kanter, in her research at over 50 exemplary business organizations, suggested a relationship between strategic planning and employee involvement. She emphasized that effective organizations knew the importance of defining a clear direction. One of the outcomes of such action is the building of commitment by reducing the
plausibility of other directions. The statement of clear direction also helps reinforce a "culture of pride" (Kanter, 1983, p. 152) for it shows that an intelligent network was at work resulting in specific directions to guide the organization. Leaders can improve employee involvement if they can make the employee feel an emotional and value commitment to the organization. Leaders need to make people feel that they "belong" to a meaningful entity and can realize cherished values by their contributions. . . . There is a sense of uniqueness and joint-ness that is supported by a feeling of being a member as much as being an employee. (Kanter, 1983, p. 149)

Leaders can also enhance commitment to new strategies by providing employees with needed resources and non-material support (Kanter, 1982). In a related finding, Moos (1987a) reporting on research by Seiter, indicated that facilitative leadership by department chairpersons which contributed to better work relationships and task orientation was associated with stronger faculty commitment. This facilitative leadership was also related to more explicit and predictable work environments which promoted educational effectiveness.

Administrators should also focus on means to improve relationships between faculty members. The Phi Delta Kappa study of 1980 cited by Anderson (1982) indicated that faculty in exemplary schools displayed a high degree of teacher cooperation and concern.

Billings and Moos reported on a study by Cooper and Marshall of managerial and white-collar stress. They found that a combination of factors combined to reduce stress levels of persons. One of these was the level of involvement of employees in their work. This involvement, along with cohesive relationships with co-workers and
supervisors who encouraged job involvement through innovation and participation in decision-making, helped to lower stress levels (Cooper & Marshall, as cited in Billings & Moos, 1982).

Related Research

Research on climate in organizations has produced important findings regarding characteristics that influence effectiveness. One of the most in-depth studies was by Kanter (1983). Kanter, in her ethnographic study of over 50 companies, found that organizations that are able to adapt to change display certain characteristics. The organizations are characterized by "cultures of pride . . . and . . . climate(s) of success" (Kanter, 1983, p. 151). These organizations make people feel important and show confidence in employees' ability to solve problems and make the necessary changes to adapt to changing conditions. Members of the organization are willing to cooperate with each other. They feel they belong and can realize values important to them. "Cultures of pride, coupled with cultures of change, provide the context encouraging managers and professionals to reach for new, improved ways of operating" (Kanter, 1983, p. 152).

The organizational values and norms are very important and reflect the importance and acceptance of innovation as basic to organizational success.

Pritchard and Karasick studied 76 managers from two organizations. The managers were asked for their perception of organizational climate and these perceptions were correlated with satisfaction and performance. These researchers found that climate scores
correlated with individual satisfaction and subunit performance, but not individual performance (Pritchard & Karasick, as cited in James & Jones, 1974).

James and Jones reported on laboratory experiments by Frederikson with middle managers. Frederikson found that performance was more predictable for subjects in innovative climates and that subjects in different climates used different methods to solve problems (Frederikson, as cited in James & Jones, 1974).

A study by Litwin and Stringer created different environments for student subjects. The environments created were described as (a) an authoritarian-structured business, (b) a democratic-friendly business, and (c) an achieving business. Subjects' perception of their environments were in agreement with the actual situation, thus, lending support to the ability of participants in organizations to accurately assess their own climate. Further, subjects in the more democratic-friendly business were more satisfied. The performance of subjects in the high-achieving business was higher (Litwin & Stringer, as cited in Campbell et al., 1970).

Schneider and Bartlett analyzed 228 employees from two companies. These authors found that employees in different hierarchical levels did not agree on the nature of the climate (Schneider & Bartlett, as cited in James & Jones, 1974).

A study by Friedlander and Greenberg on perceived organizational climate found that the climate factors of supportiveness were correlated significantly with work effectiveness and behavior. Supportiveness was described as support from peers, support from
supervisors, and attention to new worker treatment (Friedlander & Greenberg, as cited in James & Jones, 1974).

The many research findings cited in this review of climate research points to the extreme importance of climate to organizational health. The major factors of work climate that the literature and research shows could be most affected by strategic planning are: task orientation, clarity, innovation, and involvement. These four climate factors were selected by this researcher as dependent variable measures that are used to analyze four of the major hypotheses of this study concerning strategic planning and its effect on organizational climate.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study of the relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the organizational climate of Michigan community colleges was conducted as a field study. "Field studies are non-experimental scientific inquiries aimed at discovering the relations and interactions among sociological, psychological, and educational variables in real social structures . . . that are done in life situations like communities, schools, factories, organizations, and institutions" (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 372). The study consisted of three phases. The first phase involved verifying a strategic planning questionnaire utilizing a panel of experts. The second phase was a survey of Michigan community colleges on the extent of strategic planning at the colleges. The third phase was a comparison of the results of a survey of the organizational climate of selected colleges that ranked in the top third and the bottom third of the respondent colleges on the extent of strategic planning.

Phase 1

The study began with the verification of a strategic planning questionnaire developed by this researcher. The questionnaire was partially based on an instrument developed by Ray (1987) in his study on the extent of strategic planning in Texas community colleges.
Parts of Ray's questionnaire were modified to fit the purposes of this study and to reflect recent developments in the literature on strategic planning. Permission to use and modify this instrument has been obtained. The permission letter is given in Appendix E. Parts of the questionnaire were also based on an instrument developed by Meredith et al. (1988) entitled: *Characteristics of Strategic Planning at Your Institution*. Permission to use portions of that instrument was given in the letter from Meredith included in Appendix E.

The strategic planning instrument was validated by a panel of experts on strategic planning. For the purposes of this study, an expert is one or more of the following:

1. A person who has authored or edited a book, or books that have been published on strategic planning.

2. A person who has conducted research and written articles that have been published on strategic planning.

3. A person who is both a practitioner and a consultant, and has authored articles on strategic planning that have been published.

The names of the experts selected by this researcher are listed in Appendix I along with their credentials. The list was developed based on several factors. First, the authors most frequently cited in the literature on college planning were identified. Second, recommendations were sought by the researcher through face-to-face or telephone contact with authors. Approximately half of the list are frequently cited authors.

The experts served as an authority-jury panel and established the content validity of the instrument. In January of 1991, the
experts were sent the initial draft of the strategic planning questionnaire given in Appendix D, along with the transmittal letter of Appendix C, and an abstract of the study given in Appendix J. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included in the mailing. Questions were judged as either clear or not clear, and as either appropriate or not appropriate, by the expert. Questions judged as either not clear or not appropriate by over 50% of the experts were rejected. Kerlinger (1986) explained that "Content validation is guided by the question: Is the substance or content of this measure representative of the content or universe of content of the property being measured? ... Content validation ... is basically judgmental" (pp. 417-418). The experts were given 3 weeks to respond. When the response was not received within this period, a personal phone call was made by this researcher to request a response, and a second mailing of the questionnaire was made if necessary. Three additional weeks were allowed for the second request for a response.

The returned questionnaires were then tabulated and the questionnaire was modified, as necessary. The questionnaire was then taken to a professional printer for preparation for mailing in Phase 2. The revised questionnaire and the one used to collect data for this study is included as Appendix F and is entitled: Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges.

Phase 2

The Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire was mailed in April of 1991 with a transmittal letter (Appendix
H) to each Michigan community college president and was also mailed to the person who was next-in-charge when it comes to responsibility for strategic planning at the college. The listing of presidents was obtained from the Michigan Community College Association (MCCA) and is given in Appendix B. The individual who was next-in-charge was determined through phone calls made in March of 1991 to the president's office for each of the 29 Michigan community colleges.

When a response was not obtained within 3 weeks, a second letter and questionnaire was mailed in an attempt to obtain a return. Several personal telephone calls were also made, especially if no one from the college had responded. An additional 3 weeks was allowed from the time of a second mailing.

Section 1 of the completed strategic planning questionnaire was used to determine whether or not each respondent college was actually utilizing a planning process that reflected the essential characteristics of strategic planning. The questionnaire was further used to determine the extent of strategic planning characteristics present at each respondent college.

The extent of strategic planning was determined by taking the sum of the scores from Section 2 of the questionnaire which included 25 questions on the characteristics of strategic planning. Respondents were asked to judge the relative strength of the presence of the characteristics at their college. This sum of scores was used for ranking each respondent college on the extent of strategic planning present at the college.

Section 3 of the questionnaire was a request for each respondent
to rank the top five community colleges in the state that they thought planned effectively. The respondent could include their college in this listing. This information was used to help verify the data collected in Section 2. The combined rankings of colleges were totaled for each college mentioned and ranked in Section 3. This total was then divided by 29, the total number of community colleges in the state. Spearman's rho was used to determine if there was a relationship between the self-rankings of the colleges and the ranking given by colleagues at other colleges in the state.

Section 4 of the questionnaire was used to collect a myriad of information related to strategic planning such as: How long the college had engaged in strategic planning, the extent of faculty involvement, the extent of community involvement, the major reasons for strategic planning, the role of the president, and the major benefits and problems resulting from the process. The analysis technique for the responses to the questions in Section 4 varied depending on the question. For example, Question 6 asked how long the college had engaged in strategic planning. Analysis of these results involved recording the mean, median, and mode of the responses. Question 13 on the reasons why the college engaged most recently in strategic planning resulted in the analysis of the "frequency of mention" of responses given.

Care was taken to limit the length of the strategic planning instrument to not be so long as to jeopardize the rate of return nor so brief that the purposes would not be fulfilled. The instrument was designed to concisely consider all important items that reflect
the major research questions related to strategic planning given in Chapter I and Chapter II. The content of the survey and the length was compared to surveys developed for similar purposes by Meredith et al. (1988), Harris, (1987), Steiner (1979), and Ray (1987). The content was similar to most items from other surveys with the exception of questions related to values, and vision, which have received greater emphasis in the more recent strategic planning literature. The questionnaire also had additional emphasis on the involvement of the community in the process. The questionnaire is comparable in length to Ray's (1987) questionnaire which resulted in an initial rate of return of 44%. This initial return was improved to 70% by a telephone contact to non-respondents followed by a second mailing. The length is also close to Harris' (1987) which produced a 66.7% return in one mailing.

Information not collected from the questionnaire, but which was necessary to answer two to the research questions, was obtained from the Michigan Department of Education. This information was data on the individual size and the wealth of the Michigan community colleges. The size data was available from an annual report entitled The Activity Classification Structure Data Book for 1989-90 (Michigan State Board of Education, 1991). The total fiscal year equated students (FYES) for 1989-1990 was used as the size measure. The wealth was determined using the combined total income and liquid net worth (the excess of current assets less current liabilities) for 1989-1990 and dividing this by the FYES. These figures were obtained by visiting the offices of the Michigan Department of Education and
reviewing the public audit files of the colleges. A more complete
description of the contents of the formula for determining relative
wealth is included in Chapter IV. These two informational items were
compared to the extent of strategic planning at the community col-
leges for all colleges that responded to the strategic planning
questionnaire to determine if there was a relationship between either
size and the extent of strategic planning, or wealth and the extent
of strategic planning. Spearman's rho was the statistical test used
to compare the rankings.

Phase 3

Phase 3 consisted of surveying two groups of three colleges
derived from Phase 2 of the study. The purpose of Phase 3 was to
compare the organizational climates of community colleges that showed
a high extent of strategic planning to those that showed a low extent
of strategic planning.

The population for Phase 3 of the study was all colleges who
responded to Phase 2 of the study. Colleges from Phase 2 whose
combined scores on section 2 of the strategic planning questionnaire
resulted in the college falling into the lower third on the extent of
strategic planning were compared to colleges falling into the top
third. Three colleges from the top third and three colleges from the
bottom third comprised the sample and comprised Cluster 1 and Cluster
2, respectively. The sample was selected to ensure for a balance of
size and type of college between the pairs. One college from the top
third, one from the middle third, and one from the bottom third in
size were selected to comprise each of the two comparison sets of colleges. These size selections were based on the 1989-1990 FYES totals as reported in The Activity Classification Structure Data Book for 1989-90 (Michigan State Board of Education, 1991). The two sets of colleges were also matched on a second criteria, type of college. The types were selected from these categories: small-rural, medium-sized and urban, and large-urban or metropolitan, as identified by the Michigan Community College Association. The colleges identified as possible pairs were selected from as high up in the top third ranking and from as low in the bottom third ranking as possible in order to increase the possibility of finding a difference in the effect of strategic planning on college climate. The college presidents from colleges in the top and bottom third of the rankings were then contacted either in person or by phone to determine their willingness to participate in a study of the organizational climate at their college. All six college presidents of the initial group identified consented to participate.

The colleges that agreed to participate in the climate study phase required on-site visits to administer the climate instrument. The Work Environment Scale (WES) survey by Moos and Insel (1974) was selected as the climate measure instrument (see Appendix G for sample items). No instrument was found that was specifically designed to measure community college environments. The instrument that was closest in description to meeting the criteria was the College Characteristics Index by George G. Stern (Stern, 1970). This instrument was rejected based on reviews in The Seventh Mental Measurements.
Yearbook (Layton, 1972). Reviewer Wilbur L. Layton (1972) criticized the instrument for psychometric inadequacies and the instrument development for haphazard sampling techniques. Of particular concern was the confusion that resulted when Stern attempted to use methods appropriate to distinguish between individuals with methods for differentiating between groups (Layton, 1972). The WES was selected because the instrument "can be used to describe or contrast social environments of work settings" (Moos, 1986b, p. 12). "The instrument was developed to be appropriate for any kind of work setting. . . . The instrument has been mainly used in the health care related settings, but also in a wide variety of other settings" (Finney, telephone communication, January 14, 1990). The instrument has been used in educational settings, including colleges (Moos, 1986b).

The WES was used to obtain responses from the administrators of the six colleges chosen for the climate study. An administrator was defined as any employee of the college whose primary function is to manage a functional area and/or supervise other employees. Each college visited decided who would participate based on this definition. Faculty, whose primary function is to teach, were not surveyed nor were support staff such as secretaries, maintenance workers, or technicians. This singular grouping of administrators was chosen for the purposes of accessibility, controlling the scope of the size of the study, and also because different groups within an environment tend to perceive the environment slightly differently.

Managers or supervisors . . . perceive work settings . . . more positively than employees on each of the [climate] subscales, with the exception of Work Pressure and Physical Comfort. Differences, which are about one-half of a
standard deviation in magnitude are apparent in most work settings; . . . the differences between managers and employees are relatively small. (Moos, 1986b, p. 7)

The WES is comprised of 10 subscales that measure the environment. The instrument was developed initially in 1974 by Moos and Insel (1974) by using a sample of 624 employees and managers from 44 work settings, including workers in college environments.

The researcher personally visited and administered the questionnaire to the administrators of the six colleges. Arrangements for the administration of the WES were made with the college president or their designate prior to the visitation. The instructions for administration as outlined in the WES by Moos (1986b) were followed.

The results of the climate survey were computed by the machine scoring of the "mark sense" WES answer sheets by Consulting Psychologists Press, Incorporated of Palo Alto, California, distributors for the WES. Four of the 10 subscale scores provided were utilized in order to determine answers to Hypotheses III through VI concerning organizational climates. These four subscales were: involvement, task-orientation, clarity, and innovation. The individual scores on each of the four subscales for the three colleges in the top third were then compared to the scores of the three colleges in the bottom third to determine if there was a difference in the climates of the two groups of colleges on each of these four subscales. The t-test for independent samples was used to test the difference of the two groupings on each of the four climate subscale measures.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The findings related to each of the research questions and hypotheses stated in Chapter I are presented in this chapter. The research questions, as well as the hypotheses, are presented in the same order as found in the first chapter. In addition to the research questions and hypotheses, other findings of interest are reported. The chapter begins with an explanation of how the survey instrument to measure the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges was developed. This explanation is followed by an analysis of the data collected with the strategic planning survey. Related data collected through the administration of a climate questionnaire at six community colleges, follow-up telephone interviews, and analyses of actual college planning documents at selected colleges are also included.

The statistical software used in the analysis of data was SAS version 6.06. The software is a product of the SAS Institute, Incorporated of Cary, North Carolina (1990). The computer operating system used was the VAX/VMS.

Strategic Planning Questionnaire Development

Findings directly related to strategic planning at Michigan's 29 community colleges were obtained from responses to a survey
questionnaire developed and distributed by this researcher. The draft questionnaire that was developed from a review of the literature and a review of questionnaires created for similar purposes is included as Appendix D. This draft questionnaire was sent to 15 national experts on the topic of strategic planning in colleges for the purpose of content validation. The basis for expert identification was whether the person had published books or articles on the topic of strategic planning. Additional criteria were whether the person had conducted research on the use of strategic planning or had actually been involved as a practitioner responsible for strategic planning, either as a consultant or for regular employment.

The list of experts selected for the content validation of the strategic planning survey instrument is given as Appendix I. All 15 of the experts responded to the request for validation. Each expert, with one exception, reviewed the draft questionnaire. The one exception responded with a personal letter explaining that circumstances at work and at home did not allow time to prepare an adequate response to the request for validation.

Each expert was asked to evaluate the specific questions of the instrument and to judge whether each question was clear and appropriate to the task. An abstract of the purpose of the instrument and the purpose of the dissertation were included with the mailing of the draft strategic planning survey instrument. This abstract is included as Appendix J. The experts were also asked to provide commentary on each question.

The questionnaire was revised based on expert's rating of each
question and the associated commentary. The ratings and associated commentary served as a guide to the revision of selected questions and to a format restructuring of the draft questionnaire. The revised questionnaire used to collect the data for the measurement of the independent variable of this study, the extent of strategic planning, is included as Appendix F. This questionnaire is entitled: Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges.

**Research Questions and Hypothesized Findings**

The strategic planning questionnaire was sent to all 29 of the community colleges in the state of Michigan along with a transmittal letter given as Appendix H. Two copies of the questionnaire were sent to each college. One was sent to the president of the college and one to the person who was the next-in-charge when it comes to strategic planning. The list of presidents is included as Appendix B. The list of presidents was obtained from the Michigan Community College Association and the listing of next-in-charge was obtained through telephone inquiries by this researcher to the office of the president of each community college.

Responses were received from 27 of the 29 Michigan community colleges. The questionnaire was returned by 24 of the 29 presidents and by 26 of the 29 next-in-charge. Table 1 is a summary of the return rates. When the responses were split into sectors of approximate thirds, according to size of college, a nearly equal proportion responded from each sector. The total of community colleges in the
Table 1
Michigan Community Colleges Return Rate for Strategic Planning Survey
(N = 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Returned Surveys</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>24 of 29 colleges</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next-in-charge</td>
<td>26 of 29 colleges</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Return Rate by Size
(N = 58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Returned Surveys</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest colleges</td>
<td>17 of 22 surveys</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-sized colleges</td>
<td>16 of 18 surveys</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest colleges</td>
<td>17 of 18 surveys</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The colleges were not split into exact thirds according to size as there were 29 community colleges. The largest-sized college sector had 11 colleges, the middle-sized had 9 colleges, and the smallest-sized had 9 colleges. At least one response was received from 27 of the 29 community colleges for a rate of 93.1%.

state of Michigan is 29, which is not evenly divisible by three. Thus, this researcher split the colleges into three groups based on logical break-off points determined by college size. This separation into three groups resulted in 11 colleges in the category of largest, 9 in the category of middle-sized, and 9 in the category of smallest. The percent difference in size between the 11th and 12th ranked colleges was 31%. The average percent difference for the three colleges ranked above the 11th ranked college was 6.7% and the average percent difference for the three colleges ranked below the 12th ranked college was 9.4%. Thus, the break-off point was decided...
between the two colleges with the dramatic difference in size, the
11th and the 12th ranked colleges.

Responses were received from either the president or the next-in-charge, or both, from 10 of 11 of the largest-sized colleges. Of the middle-sized colleges, 8 of 9 of either the president or the next-in-charge, or both, responded. In the smallest size sector, responses were received from all 9 colleges from either the president or the next-in-charge, or both.

The responses to the survey on strategic planning were used to answer the research questions posed in Chapter I. A summary of the findings follows.

Research Question 1. What is the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges?

Section 1 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges survey provided information which helped to answer Research Question 1. A description of strategic planning served as the introduction to Section 1. This description was as follows:

Strategic planning is a process of planning that impacts the overall organization. Conditions in the external environment are analyzed to identify opportunities, threats, and constraints to the college. The internal environment is analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the college. In addition to these analyses, organizational values are identified.

These conditions are matched to develop a "strategic vision" for the future which includes: the mission, clientele to be served, program and service mix, comparative advantages of the college over its competition, and the strategic goals for the college.

Alternative courses of action are formulated for achieving the strategic goals. The proper balance between encouraging individual entrepreneurship and consideration of institution-wide implications for actions is sought. Courses of
action are selected. Resources are directed to help assure successful performance.

Results are evaluated to monitor the appropriateness of the courses of action chosen. Modifications to the strategies are made based on the success of the actions and based on changes that may have occurred since the plan was last adopted.

This description of strategic planning was followed with the question: Does your college currently, or has it recently, engage(d) in some form of strategic planning that would approximate the description given above?

The summary for the 27 colleges from which at least one response was received is given in Table 2. The results show that strategic planning practices were present in at least 20 of the 27 community colleges that returned surveys. Seventeen of these colleges had both the president and the next-in-charge return surveys and both answered affirmatively to the above question. An additional three colleges had only one respondent and this person responded affirmatively. In addition to the 20 colleges from whom only affirmative answers were received, there were three cases where there was disagreement between the president and the next-in-charge over whether the college was involved in strategic planning. Each of these three cases was further investigated by this researcher through telephone interviews to either the president of the colleges or the next-in-charge. In two of the three cases it appeared that the college was borderline in terms of whether there was a formal, college-wide strategic planning process in place. In one of these two borderline cases, strategic planning was taking place at the college although not in a highly structured fashion. The college was one of the smaller colleges in
Table 2
Presence of Strategic Planning in Michigan Community Colleges (N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Inquiry on the Presence of Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where there were two surveys returned and both respondents answered &quot;yes.&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges with only one survey returned with the response of &quot;yes.&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where there were two surveys returned and one responded &quot;yes&quot; and one responded &quot;no.&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where there were two surveys returned and one responded &quot;yes&quot; and one &quot;not sure.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where there were two surveys returned and both respondents answered &quot;no.&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges with only one survey returned with the response of &quot;no.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the size of the college and the district it served, the administration chose to approach planning in an informal way. The college's planning process did fit the description given in the survey even though the college did not use much of the terminology in the description which caused one of the respondents to indicate that the college was not involved in strategic planning. This college ranked 17th out of 27 in the extent of strategic planning. In the second of the two borderline cases, once again the college was one of the smaller colleges in the study. The possible confusion over whether the college was involved in strategic planning resulted mostly from the fact that the college did not have a formalized...
approach to environmental analysis. Also, the college did not have stated values or a vision statement in place. This college scored the lowest of the colleges where there was disagreement over the extent of strategic planning with a ranking of 21 out of 27. The third college where there was disagreement resulted from one of the respondents taking a highly literal interpretation of the description of strategic planning given in Section 1 of the strategic planning survey. This researcher interviewed both respondents at this college and reviewed the written plan for that college. The college was clearly engaged in strategic planning. This college ranked the highest of the three colleges on the extent of strategic planning with a rank of 16 out of 27.

There was also one case resulting from the strategic planning survey where the president responded "yes" and the next-in-charge responded "not sure." The follow-up on this discrepancy revealed that the college was pursuing strategic planning that approximated the definition outlined in the survey. The reason for the "not sure" response was that the college had been engaged in the strategic planning only recently and had not completed the formalized process. This situation led one of the respondents to be uncomfortable with stating that the college was involved in strategic planning to the extent that was described in Section 1 of the strategic planning survey. This college ranked 23rd out of 27 on the extent of strategic planning.

Section 2 and Section 4 of the strategic planning survey instrument were designed to determine the extent of strategic planning
characteristics present in Michigan community colleges. Section 2 contained 25 questions reflecting the characteristics of strategic planning. Respondents could answer each of the 25 questions by circling a score of 1 through 4 which indicated the strength of the presence of the characteristic. The description for each of these possible scores is as follows: 1 = Disagree Strongly, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Agree Strongly. The highest possible score for a college was 100.

Section 4 of the survey included a total of 16 questions designed to collect additional data on elements of the strategic planning process that were present at the Michigan community colleges.

Responses to these two sections provided the foundation for answering many of the research questions and hypotheses identified in Chapter I. The data helped to answer two additional questions related to the Research Question 1. These questions follow as Questions 1A and 1B.

Research Question 1A. Which characteristics of strategic planning are most strongly present?

The characteristics of strategic planning are reflected in each of the 25 questions of Section 2 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire. Respondents could circle any one of four possible answers for each of the 25 questions. Characteristics which are most strongly present as determined by the top five mean scores for responding colleges are reported in Table 3. There are several characteristics which the literature supports as an important characteristic of strategic planning that are not listed in
Table 3
Top 5 Strategic Planning Characteristics From
the List of 25 Characteristics in Section 2
of the Strategic Planning at Michigan
Community Colleges Questionnaire
(N = 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question Statement</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The college's mission was reviewed and clarified in terms of &quot;What business are we in?&quot;</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>External opportunities and threats to the college were identified.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Goals were identified to take the college from its present situation to a desired future state.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>External trends and events were forecast to estimate their potential effect on the future of the college.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The achievement of our college goals was greatly enhanced through strategic planning.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When two responses were received from a college, the mean of the responses was used to determine that college's score for the item.

the top five items that deserve mention. These items are the identification of institutional values, the statement of a vision for the organization, and the result of a better "strategic fit" between the college's programs and services and the wants and needs of the college's constituency. The item related to value clarification was Question 5 of Section 2 and was ranked at number 9 of the 25 characteristics with a score of 3.15. The item related to vision ranked
11th out of 25 with a score of 3.02. The third item concerning strategic fit ranked 10 out of 25 with a score of 3.08. The maximum possible mean for an item is 4.0.

Research Question 1B. Which characteristics of strategic planning are most lacking?

The bottom ranking five items based on mean scores of the total of 25 questions from Section 2 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire are given in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Question Statement</th>
<th>Mean Score SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alternative courses of action for reaching the goals were considered before actions were decided upon.</td>
<td>2.73 .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The culture of the organization was analyzed to determine its appropriateness to the future needs of the college.</td>
<td>2.71 .62 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The community has a better understanding of the purposes of the college as a result of strategic planning.</td>
<td>2.71 .81 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Adequate resources were provided to implement the plan in a timely manner.</td>
<td>2.67 .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The college is better off financially now than when it began strategic planning.</td>
<td>2.47 .81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. When two responses were received from a college, the mean of the two responses was used to determine that college's score for the time.
Research Question 2. What is the role of the president in strategic planning?

The role of the college president was obtained through the narrative responses to Question 16 of Section 4 of the questionnaire. This question was stated: What role did (does) your college president play in college-wide strategic planning?

The responses were analyzed and placed into categories by this researcher. Brief descriptive statements of the categories of the responses are outlined in Table 5. The categories are summarized for any response that was mentioned more than once.

Research Question 3. Is there a relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning?

The wealth of the 27 Michigan community colleges in this study was obtained through a review of the financial audit records on file at the Michigan Department of Education in Lansing, Michigan. Each community college is required to submit their annual audit to the department. Audit figures were able to be used for 26 of the 27 colleges in this study. The 27th college was part of a K-12 system and financial records included a mix of college and K-12 information. The financial figures for this college that were necessary to provide accurate comparisons to the other 26 colleges were not able to be separated from the joint statement of finances on file with the department.

In order to obtain the wealth of the community college, this researcher utilized a section of the community colleges' 1989-1990 audits entitled "Statement of Changes in Fund Balances." First, a
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Table 5

Role of the President in Strategic Planning
(N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Next-in-Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very active/major role</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated the process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the plan to the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board of trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Of the 50 returned surveys, 12 had no response to this inquiry; 8 of the 12 were due to the respondent stating that the college did not do strategic planning.

determination was made of what the college had as a remaining balance at the end of the 1988-1989 fiscal year. This was obtained from the section entitled "Current Fund" and the line entitled "Fund Balance at the Beginning of the Year." In addition to this figure, additional restricted funds that could be accessed by the board of trustees for operations and unrestricted funds acquired during 1989-1990 were added. A similar procedure was followed for the "Plant Funds" section audit. When adding available funds from the Plant Funds section, "Debt Service" and "Physical Properties" columns were
excluded as these funds are not usually available to colleges or easily convertible for expenditures on operations.

The total funds available for each of the community colleges in this study, with the exception of the one college whose audit was not able to be used, were divided by the full-time equated enrollment at each college for 1989-1990. The full-time equated enrollment figures were obtained from the Michigan Department of Education's publication, The Activities Classification Structure Data Book for 1989-90 (1990). The resultant figure gave the dollar amount available for each full-time equated student, which is defined by this researcher as the wealth of the college.

The 26 colleges for which the wealth of the college figure was ascertained were ranked. This ranked list was compared to the same 26 colleges for which strategic planning scores were obtained. A comparison of these two lists was made using the Spearman rho correlation coefficient as described in the SAS Procedures Guide (SAS Institute, Inc., 1990b). The results of this analysis are given in Table 6.

Research Question 6. What is the extent of the participation of faculty in strategic planning?

The extent of faculty participation in strategic planning will be analyzed from the responses to several questions in Section 4 of the questionnaire. The first of these questions (Question 8) asked whether there existed at the college a group of people which is sometimes called a "core planning committee." The core committee was described as a group of people whose responsibility it is (was) to
Table 6

Relationship Between the Wealth of the Community College and the Extent of Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rho Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,612</td>
<td>1,695.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is no support for the existence of a relationship using an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero.

In Question 9 of Section 4 of the strategic planning questionnaire, college respondents were to indicate if faculty were on the core planning committee. Twelve of the 27 colleges indicated faculty were on their core planning committee. There were seven colleges where the president and the next-in-charge, when it came to strategic planning, disagreed over whether faculty were on the core planning committee. At eight of the colleges, either both of the respondents or the sole respondent from the college stated there was no faculty on the committee. Table 8 summarizes these findings.
Table 7
Existence of a Core Planning Committee
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to the Inquiry on the Existence of a Core Planning Committee</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said there was a core planning committee.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where only one responded and said there was a core planning committee.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed on whether there was a core planning committee.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge agreed there was no core planning committee.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said the college was not engaged in strategic planning.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges where either the president or the next-in-charge responded and said the college was not engaged in strategic planning.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges for which no response was received.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents who indicated that strategic planning was not present at their college were precluded from responding to the inquiry on the existence of a core planning committee by survey design.*

As a second part of Question 9 of Section 4, respondents were asked to indicate what percent of the core planning committee were made up of faculty. Table 9 gives a summary of the responses. This data is reported with the cautionary warning that there were many discrepancies between the president and the next-in-charge on the percentages reported. There were only two instances where the president and the next-in-charge agreed on the percentages. Discrepancies
Table 8
Presence of Faculty on the Core Planning Committee
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to the Inquiry on the Existence of Faculty on the Core Planning Committee</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said that faculty were on the committee.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or the next-in-charge responded and indicated faculty were on the committee.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed whether faculty were on the committee.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said there were no faculty on the committee.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or the next-in-charge responded and indicated that faculty were not on the core planning committee.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents who indicated that strategic planning was not present at their college were precluded from responding to the inquiry of whether faculty were on the core planning committee by survey design.

ranged from two instances of one reporting a percentage for faculty and the other saying faculty were not on the committee to one case where the president said there were 33% faculty on the committee and the next-in-charge saying there were 10%. In several instances, the percentages for the groups involved on the core planning committee did not add up to 100%.
Table 9
Respondents' Estimates of Percentage of Faculty on the Core Planning Committee
(N = 50a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThere were 7 respondents who indicated that faculty were on the core planning committee but did not give the percentage. There were 15 respondents who did not answer this question because they said there were no faculty on the committee and 8 respondents who said there was no strategic planning at the college which would have precluded them from answering this inquiry.

Question 12 of Section 4 of the questionnaire also provided information that could be used to help answer Research Question 6. This question concerned whether the college planning process could be considered top-down, bottom-up, or a fairly equal balance of top-down and bottom-up processes. A summary of the responses is outlined in Table 10.

Research Question 5. Is there a relationship between the size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning?

In order to measure the independent variable, size, the full-time equated (FTE) number of students was determined for each of the 27 community colleges from which questionnaires were received. This information was used in conjunction with the ranking of the 27 community colleges on the extent of strategic planning characteristics to answer Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 2. There will be a direct relationship between the
### Table 10

**Colleges That Reported Having Strategic Planning Processes That Were Either Top-Down, Bottom-up, or Balanced**

\( (N = 27) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to the Inquiry on Whether the College's Planning was Top-Down or Bottom-up or Balanced</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said the process was balanced.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said the process was top-down.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said the process was bottom-up.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only one responded and indicated that the process was balanced.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only one responded and indicated that the process was top-down.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only one responded and indicated bottom-up.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges not responding.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Presidents favored reporting the process as bottom-up, the next-in-charge as top-down. The breakdown is:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top-Down</th>
<th>Bottom-up</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next-in-Charge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included are colleges where respondents indicated that strategic planning was not present at their college. This precluded the respondent from answering this inquiry.*
size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning.

The Spearman rho correlation coefficient was determined between the rankings by size and the rankings by the extent of strategic planning for the 27 community colleges who participated in the study. The procedure for determining the rho is described in the SAS Procedures Guide (SAS Institute, Inc., 1990a). The findings are given in Table 11.

Table 11
Relationship Between the Size of the Community College and the Extent of Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rho Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,290.04</td>
<td>4,157.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Strategic Planning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is no support for the existence of a relationship using an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero.

Research Question 6. What are some of the major problems with strategic planning?

This open-ended inquiry is given in Question 15 of Section 4 of the strategic planning questionnaire. Table 12 is a summary of the narrative responses where more than one respondent gave the item as a response. The statements used are summary statements developed by this researcher of the contexts of the actual responses, after a review of all responses.
Table 12

Major Problems With Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Middle Sized</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Frequency of Mention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to get everyone to feel a part of the process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of the process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness to address program cutbacks or program elimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some respondents listed more than one problem.

Of the 50 surveys returned, 15 did not provide any response to the inquiry about problems the college was having with strategic planning. This 15 includes the eight surveys where respondents indicated in Section 1 that their college was not engaged in strategic planning that approximated the definition given in the questionnaire. By responding negatively, the respondents were precluded from advancing to Section 4 in the design of the questionnaire.

Research Question 7. What are the major benefits of strategic planning?
planning?

This question was posed in Section 4 of the strategic planning survey as Question 14. As for the previous research question on the major problems with strategic planning, the responses were charted by this researcher based on the nature of the response. The summary of the responses is outlined in Table 13.

Hypothesis 3. There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of task-orientation between community colleges that have a high extent and those who have a low extent of strategic planning.

Hypothesis 4. There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of clarity between community colleges that have a high extent and those who have a low extent of strategic planning.

Hypothesis 5. There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of involvement between community colleges that have a high extent and those who have a low extent of strategic planning.

Hypothesis 6. There will be a difference between the scores measuring the climate subscale of innovation between community colleges that have a high extent and those who have a low extent of strategic planning.

The Strategic Planning in Michigan Community Colleges survey was sent to both the president and the next-in-charge at Michigan's 29 community colleges. All colleges from which responses to the survey were received were ranked according to the extent of strategic
Table 13

Major Benefits of Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Middle Sized</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Frequency of Mention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of directions for change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective distribution of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a shared sense of purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focused efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of mission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a focus on major goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the staff and the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a strategic thinking approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some respondents listed more than one benefit. Of the 50 respondents, 16 did not respond to Question 14 regarding the benefits of strategic planning in Section 4 on the questionnaire. This includes the 8 surveys where the respondent indicated in Section 1 of the questionnaire that their college was not engaged in strategic planning that approximated the definition given on the questionnaire. Planning at the college. The basis for the rank was the total score for Section 2 of the survey. In instances where two responses were received, the scores were averaged for each of the 25 items in...
Section 2 and totaled.

In Section 2 of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the college on a scale of one to four relative to the strength of the presence of strategic planning characteristics. A score of 1 was the weakest response and a score of 4 was the strongest. The maximum possible score for this section was 100. The actual scores ranged from a high of 93 to a low of zero. The zero score was assigned to colleges where respondents indicated that their approach to planning did not approximate the description given in Section 1 of the strategic planning survey instrument.

In order to help verify the ability of the survey instrument to distinguish between colleges that have high and low extents of strategic planning, this researcher selected three colleges from the top third of the rankings and three from the bottom third. Each college was then contacted either in person, or by telephone interview, or both, to verify the relative level of strategic planning present. The colleges selected from the top third ranked 1, 4, and 5, and the colleges selected from the bottom third ranked 23, 25, and 26 out of the total of 27 colleges that were ranked.

The colleges that were in the top third all had extensive planning processes in place that met all of the criteria described in the definition of strategic planning given in Section 1 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges survey instrument. All three of these colleges sent this researcher a copy of their written strategic plan. Each of the plans showed evidence of extensive analysis of the college's external environment and the internal environment.
All had done an in-depth SWOT (or WOTS-up) analysis. This analysis is a study of the strengths and weaknesses of the college’s internal environment and the opportunities and threats of the external environment. All three of the colleges did competitor analysis. Each plan included a strategic vision as described in the definition of strategic planning used in the survey instrument. The colleges all had a college planning committee that regularly convened to review progress on the strategic plan and to modify the plan when necessary. The planning processes were designed to encourage input and creative ideas from all sectors of the college community. These three colleges appeared to be very deserving of a high ranking.

The colleges that were in the bottom third appeared to be appropriately placed. None of the three colleges had a written plan. None of the colleges had done a SWOT (or WOTS-up) analysis. All three reported that their planning was mainly operational dealing with day-to-day challenges with very little attention given to the future. Their planning was not based on an in-depth analysis of what the best course of action for the future of the college should be. Their planning was more tactical and operationally oriented, largely an extension of what was currently being done with only incremental changes in existing programs and services. One of the colleges reported that many years ago, their college had embarked on an approach to planning that was similar in nature to strategic planning but that the president had experienced a conflict with a board member over an issue related to the process and chose not to ever again pursue the approach. Another college reported that based on previous
experiences of most of the executive level personnel, they did not believe in strategic planning because it only resulted in "glossy charts and fancy publications . . . that a lot of time and effort was expended and that nothing came of it." Two of the three colleges by their own admission had made a conscious decision not to engage in strategic planning and the third admitted that they were "definitely a border line case," with very few of the characteristics of strategic planning present.

The 27 colleges from which responses were received were placed in rank order according to their total scores for items in Section 2 of the survey instrument. The listing was then split into thirds, with the top third being designated as colleges demonstrating a high extent and those in the bottom third as demonstrating a low extent of strategic planning.

Two clusters of three colleges each were then selected from both the top third and from the bottom third by this researcher for the purpose of organizational climate study. Cluster 1 colleges formed the top third and Cluster 2 colleges formed the bottom third. The colleges were selected to ensure for a balance of size and type of location. There was one large, one medium, and one small-sized college in each cluster. Each cluster also had one metropolitan area, one urban area, and one rural area college. The presidents of each of these six colleges were then approached either in person or by phone for permission to do climate studies at their organization. All six consented.

This researcher then visited each of the six colleges and
administered the climate questionnaire, the WES, to the administrators from the colleges in the two cluster groups. The return rate for the two clusters is summarized in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Climate Questionnaire Completion Rate (N = 153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1 colleges</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2 colleges</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for each of the clusters were obtained for each of four climate variables: task orientation, clarity, involvement, and innovation. The scores of the two clusters were then compared using the t-test for independent means as described in the SAS/STAT User's Guide (SAS Institute, Inc., 1991b). The results of the t-test comparison for each of the four variables are summarized in Tables 15 through 18. These four climate variables are described as follows:

Task-orientation measures the degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done, for example: how much attention people pay to getting work done, how often things get "put off until tomorrow," and how efficient and task-oriented the workplace is.

Clarity measures the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies are communicated, for example: how well activities are planned, how clearly the responsibilities of supervisors are defined, and how well the details of assigned jobs are explained to employees.

Involvement measures the extent to which employees are
concerned about and committed to their jobs, for example: how challenging the work is, the pride people have in the organization, and the effort they put into what they do.

Innovation measures the degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches, for example: whether doing things in a different way is valued, whether new and different ideas are tried out, and whether the place is one of the first to try out a new idea. (Moos, 1989, pp. 2-4)

The results show that there is no support for the hypothesis stating there will be a difference between colleges scoring high and low on the extent of strategic planning and the climate variables of task orientation, clarity, and involvement respectively. Thus, hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 are not supported.

The results for Hypothesis 6 indicate that there is a difference between colleges scoring high and low on the extent of strategic planning and the climate variable of innovation.

Table 15

Results of the t-Test Analysis of the Scores on the Climate Variable of Task Orientation of Colleges With High Strategic Planning Scores and Low Strategic Planning Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-Test Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.1843</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is no support for the existence of a difference in the mean scores on the climate variable of task orientation between colleges that rank high on the extent of strategic planning and those that rank low using an alpha level of .05.
Table 16
Results of the t-Test Analysis of the Scores on the Climate Variable of Clarity of Colleges With High Strategic Planning Scores and Low Strategic Planning Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-Test Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is no support for the existence of a difference in the mean scores on the climate variable of clarity between colleges that rank high on the extent of strategic planning and those that rank low using an alpha level of .05.

Table 17
Results of the t-Test Analysis of the Scores on the Climate Variable of Involvement of Colleges With High Strategic Planning Scores and Low Strategic Planning Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-Test Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is no support for the existence of a difference in the mean scores on the climate variable of involvement between colleges that rank high on the extent of strategic planning and those that rank low using an alpha level of .05.
Table 18

Results of the t-Test Analysis of the Scores on the Climate Variable of Innovation of Colleges With High Strategic Planning Scores and Low Strategic Planning Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-Test Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is a difference between colleges that rank high on the extent of strategic planning and those that rank low for the climate variable of innovation. The mean of the innovation scores at colleges that ranked high on the extent of strategic planning is higher than colleges ranking low. This finding is supported using an alpha level of .05.

Other Findings

1. Climate factors other than those hypothesized for which there may be a relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the selected climate factor.

The results from the climate study provided data on a total of six other climate factors. These climate factors were:

Peer Cohesion measures the extent to which employees are friendly and supportive of one another, for example: the effort people make to help a new employee feel comfortable, the interest they have in each other, and how frank they are about their feelings.

Supervisor Support measures the extent to which management is supportive of employees and encourages them to be supportive of one another, for example: how often supervisors compliment an employee who does something well, how often they give full credit to the ideas contributed by
employees, and whether employees feel free to ask for a raise.

Autonomy measures the extent to which employees are encouraged to be self-sufficient and to make their own decisions, for example: how much freedom employees have to do as they like, how much they are encouraged to make their own decisions, and whether people can use their own initiative to do things.

Work Pressure measures the degree to which the press of work and time urgency dominate the job milieu, for example: how much pressure there is to keep working, how often there seems to be an urgency about everything, and whether people can afford to relax.

Control measures the extent to which management uses rules and pressures to keep employees under control, for example: how much following policies and regulations is emphasized, whether people are expected to follow set rules in doing their work, and how closely supervisors watch employees.

Physical Comfort measures the extent to which the physical surroundings contribute to a pleasant work environment, for example: how good the lighting is, how stylish and modern the place appears, and whether the colors and decorations make the place warm and cheerful to work in.

Autonomy measures the extent to which employees are encouraged to be self-sufficient and to make their own decisions, for example: how much freedom employees have to do as they like, how much they are encouraged to make their own decisions, and whether people can use their own initiative to do things. (Moos, 1989, pp. 2-4)

Only one of the six additional climate factors listed above showed a statistical difference between the colleges scoring high on the extent of strategic planning and those scoring low. This factor was "autonomy." The difference is statistically different between the two groups, but is slight when compared to the earlier analysis on the factor of innovation. The difference for the mean scores for the two groups on the factor of innovation was 2.37 on a 9-point scale. The difference for the mean scores of the two groups on the factor of autonomy was less than a point at .81. The statistical analysis
should be treated with caution because the difference, while statistically significant, may have little meaning in the real world. Additional research on the effect of strategic planning on this factor is recommended. Table 19 is a summary of the statistical findings.

**Table 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t-Test Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is a difference between colleges that rank high on the extent of strategic planning and those that rank low for the climate variable of autonomy. The mean of the autonomy scores at colleges that ranked high on the extent of strategic planning was higher than colleges ranking low. This finding was supported using an alpha level of .05.

2. College's self-scoring on the extent of strategic planning compared to how other colleges in the study ranked colleges.

In Section 3 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire, respondents were asked to list colleges they believed to be the top five community colleges that planned effectively. Of the 29 community colleges, 20 of them were identified by either themselves or by other colleges as planning effectively. The
number of times a college was mentioned in the ranking varied from a high of 20 times to a low of one time. Nine colleges were not mentioned by themselves or by any other college as being in the top five in planning effectiveness.

The sum of the ranking positions given for each college was divided by 29, the total of the number of community colleges in Michigan. The resultant ranking of community colleges was then compared to the ranking resulting from totaling the scores for Section 2 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges survey. The Spearman rho correlation coefficient was used. The summary results are given in Table 20. The findings indicate that there is a direct relationship between how other community colleges rank community colleges in the state on their effectiveness of planning and how community colleges are ranked based on the sum of their self-reported scores on the strength of strategic planning characteristics.

3. What is the average length of time community colleges in Michigan have engaged in strategic planning?

Most of the reporting community colleges have been using strategic planning for 5 years or less. Eighteen of the 22 (81.8%) colleges that responded to this inquiry reported using the process for 5 years or less. Only 18.2% or 4 of the 22 colleges that responded to this inquiry reported using the process more than 5 years. This total of 22 colleges that responded did not include the 3 colleges that indicated they did not do strategic planning. There were many instances where there were two respondents who gave estimates of the
Table 20

Relationship of the Ranking Resulting From Scores of Colleges Self-Reporting on Their Extent of Strategic Planning to the Ranking Resulting From How Other Colleges Rank Colleges on the Effectiveness of Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges self-reporting on the extent of strategic planning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>.5910</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How other colleges rank colleges on the effectiveness of strategic planning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is support for the existence of a relationship using an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero.

number of years that the college had engaged in strategic planning and these numbers were not exactly the same. In these instances, the two estimates were averaged. Table 21 is a summary of the responses for the 22 colleges that responded and for the 38 surveys where the respondent indicated the number of years the college had engaged in strategic planning.

4. What is the percentage of colleges who sought the help of an outside consultant?

Of the 27 colleges from whom at least one survey was returned, 13 colleges (48.1%) reported that they had used the services of an outside consultant with expertise in strategic planning. There were
Table 21

Michigan Community Colleges' Length of Time Engaged in Strategic Planning
\( (N = 27) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 years or less</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges engaged in strategic planning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages and Ranges of Lengths of Time Respondents Said the College was Engaged in Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.77 years</td>
<td>5.0 years</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td>0-13 years(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.66 years</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td>0-13 years(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Calculations for this row include respondents who reported that their college does not do strategic planning. A zero was used for the years engaged in strategic planning for those respondents. \( N = 47 \) for this row.

\(^b\)Calculations for this row include only respondents who reported that their college had engaged in strategic planning. \( N = 38 \) for this row.

seven instances where the president and the next-in-charge, when it came to strategic planning, disagreed over whether a consultant was used. In five of those seven instances, the president indicated there was a consultant and the next-in-charge indicated there was not.

5. What are the reasons given by respondents why colleges have not engaged in strategic planning and what other planning approaches are being used, if any?
Reasons for not engaging in strategic planning:

There was not a distinct set of responses to the reasons given by the respondents for their college not engaging in strategic planning. Two of the respondents reported that strategic planning was too costly and time-consuming. Two also reported that the process they were using seemed to be serving their college well or that the college was doing well. One interesting response was that the college had "a faculty-dominated institution where the faculty had no one, until recently, to share the value of strategic planning." And finally, one college reported that previous efforts of this kind were not successful or beneficial.

Other planning approaches:

There were eight respondents who indicated that their college's method of planning did not approximate the description of strategic planning given as the introduction to Section 1 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire. Of these eight, there were five who indicated that their college did planning within the context of a traditional long-range plan (a blueprint or map of the future looking say, 3 to 10 years out). Two of the respondents indicated that their planning was more characterized as annual, year-to-year, incremental planning and one indicated that their college was in the process of "planning to plan."

6. What are the titles of individuals other than the president who have college-wide strategic planning as a major functional responsibility?

Question 1 of Section 4 of the Strategic Planning at Michigan
Community Colleges survey used in this study asked the respondent whether or not the college had an individual, other than the chief executive officer, who had college-wide strategic planning as a major functional responsibility. If the college responded affirmatively, the job title of that person was requested.

There seemed to be no repetition of titles to warrant reporting all of the different job titles given by the respondents. However, the titles given were nearly all of the vice-president or dean prefix. Specifically, there were three colleges where deans were listed and six colleges where vice-presidents were listed. There were also several directors, one special assistant to the president and one president of a branch campus where there was a chancellor or CEO for a multi-campus operation. Of the 24 respondents who indicated that "yes," there was someone other than the president who had a major responsibility, 22 said the person reported to the president or the chief executive officer of the college. Other positions listed were development director, and executive vice-president. This researcher also decided to investigate if the size of the college was related to whether the college had someone other than the president who had major functional responsibility for strategic planning. Table 22 shows that the larger the college, the more likely that one would expect to find someone other than the president with major functional responsibility for strategic planning.

7. Who serves on the core planning committees (make-up)?

The existence of a core planning committee was common at the respondents' colleges. According to the earlier analysis of Research...
Table 22
Comparison of the Size of the Community College to the Existence of a Person Other Than the President Who Had Functional Responsibility for Strategic Planning (N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of College</th>
<th>Colleges where all respondents said &quot;yes&quot;</th>
<th>Colleges where all respondents said &quot;no&quot;</th>
<th>Colleges where the respondents disagreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-sized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5, at least one respondent at 20 of the 27 colleges responding to the survey reported they had a core planning committee. Respondents indicated that faculty, administration, and support staff were often on the core planning committee. Somewhat less common were board of trustee members, and members from the community-at-large. At times, the presidents and the next-in-charge disagreed whether certain groups were on the committee. The group with the greatest representation was the administration both in terms of average percentages and frequency of mention. This group was followed by faculty with a nearly equal frequency of mention but with considerably smaller percentage representation on the average. Faculty are closely followed by support staff in frequency of mention; but support staff show a much smaller average percentage representation. The next most commonly mentioned group is the students, the board of trustees, and the community-at-large in that order. The analysis of
core planning committee make-up is given in Table 23.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>President and next-in-charge agreed(^a)</th>
<th>President only reported</th>
<th>Next-in-charge only reported</th>
<th>President and next-in-charge disagreed</th>
<th>Total(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-at-large</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The president and the next-in-charge agreed on the presence of these categories of membership on the core planning committee.

\(^b\) 27 minus the totals for each row gives the number of colleges where respondents indicated there were no members of that category either by blanks in the responses, or by stating that there was no strategic planning in Section 1 of the survey which would have precluded the respondent(s) from answering the inquiry.

8. Were there opportunities for the board of trustees to be involved in developing the plan prior to formal adoption?

This question was analyzed using responses to Question 11 of Section 4 of the survey. The wording of the question was as stated above. Most of the colleges, 15 out of 27, indicated that there were
opportunities for their board of trustee members to be involved prior to their formal adoption of the plan. Seven of the colleges stated that their board members were not involved in developing the strategic plan prior to adoption—this total included two colleges where no strategic planning was reported. At four of the colleges the president and the next-in-charge disagreed over board involvement prior to plan adoption. One respondent indicated that the board of trustees was not involved but this was about to change. Another respondent noted that their board was involved "all along the way." One college did not respond. Table 24 is a summary of the results.

9. Were there opportunities for community groups or individuals to be involved in developing the strategic plan?

The question above is identical to Question 10 of Section 4 of the strategic planning questionnaire. Responses from colleges show relatively low levels of community involvement. Of particular note is the high number of cases where presidents and next-in-charge disagreed on the involvement of community groups or individuals. A partial explanation for this may be the notations of two of the respondents who indicated that they were uncertain if surveying the community constituted involvement and whether membership on on-going vocation-technical program advisory committees constituted community involvement. There was no distinct pattern as to whether the president or the next-in-charge most often claimed community groups were involved with the other contradicting. Respondents at two colleges indicated that although there were not community groups or individuals involved at this time, they were planning to include them in
Table 24
Involvement of the Board of Trustees in the Development of the Strategic Plan Prior to Final Adoption
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge indicated the board of trustees were involved in plan development.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or the next-in-charge responded and indicated the board of trustees was involved in plan development.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed whether the board of trustees was involved in plan development.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge indicated that the board of trustees were not involved in plan development.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or the next-in-charge responded and indicated that the board of trustees was not involved in plan development.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges which there was no response to this inquiry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aIncluded colleges where respondents said their college was not involved in strategic planning.

the future. One person indicated that community groups or individuals had been helpful in identifying goals as far back as 1980. A summary of the responses to this inquiry is given in Table 25.

10. Was there a difference between the total strategic planning characteristics scores of colleges and the extent of disagreement between the presidents and the next-in-charge on the scores each gave
Table 25
Involvement of Community Groups or Individuals in Developing the Strategic Plan
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge indicated community groups or individuals were involved in plan development.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or the next-in-charge responded and indicated that community groups or individuals were involved in plan development.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed whether community groups or individuals were involved in plan development.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge indicated that community groups or individuals were not involved in plan development.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges where only the president or next-in-charge responded and indicated the community groups or individuals were not involved in plan development.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of colleges that responded to the survey but for which there was no response to this inquiry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included 3 colleges where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed whether strategic planning existed at the college.

*Included 2 colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said that strategic planning did not exist at the college.

In order to determine if there was a difference and in what
direction, the scores given by the president were compared to the scores given by the next-in-charge for all 25 questions given in Section 2 of the questionnaire. There were 18 colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge responded to the questionnaire. A determination was made on the percent of times there was disagreement for each college. Disagreement was defined as cases where one of the respondents answered either positively or negatively and the other responded the opposite. These percents were compared to the scores of the colleges on the extent of strategic planning. Table 26 is a summary of the results.

Table 26
Correlation of Strategic Planning Scores for Colleges to the Percent of Disagreement Between the President and the Next-in-Charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rho Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of strategic planning score</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of disagreement between the president and the next-in-charge</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There is support for the existence of a relationship using an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero.

The analysis given in Table 26 indicates that there is an inverse relationship. As strategic planning increases, the level of disagreement between the president and the next-in-charge decreases.
11. What are the reasons community colleges chose to engage in strategic planning?

As some community colleges had been engaged in strategic planning for a number of years, the question used to collect data asked why the college "most recently" chose to engage in strategic planning. Some colleges cited several reasons but the overwhelming response was "To improve an already good situation." Table 27 summarizes the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve an already good situation</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid an impending crisis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To correct an existing crisis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Some respondents provided more than one response. The following additional reasons were written in by respondents:
- To maintain the status quo
- Because I am a new president and require strategic planning
- To integrate all workings of the college
- To give the college a plan
- Academic
- To do the right thing! Plan
- Organizational renewal
- Only with advisory boards attached to various programs

**Summary**

This chapter included an analysis of the results of responses to a questionnaire developed by this researcher called Strategic
Planning at Michigan Community Colleges. This questionnaire was sent to the 29 Michigan community college presidents and the next-in-charge at the college when it came to strategic planning. Responses were received from 27 of the 29 colleges.

The information collected with the questionnaire enabled the analysis of the extent of strategic planning in the colleges. The strength of the presence of various characteristics of the planning process supported in the literature was analyzed. Spearman's rho correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the college and the extent of strategic planning. No relationship was found. The same statistical procedure was used to analyze if there was a relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning. There was also no relationship found between these two variables. In addition to these analyses, patterns in the nature of the planning processes were summarized from the information gathered on the strategic planning questionnaire.

The extent of strategic planning and its effect on selected organizational climate factors were reported. Six of the 27 colleges were identified for climate studies. These six colleges were placed into two clusters with three colleges from the top one-third ranks on the extent of strategic planning and three from the bottom one-third ranks forming Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 respectively. The clusters were balanced as closely as possible based on size and location factors. One large, one middle-sized, and one small college were selected for each of the two clusters. There was also one
metropolitan, one urban, and one rural college in each cluster. The $t$-test for independent means was used to determine if the extent of strategic planning had an effect on four selected climate factors. The hypotheses that the extent of strategic planning had an effect on the climate factors of task orientation, involvement, and clarity were not supported. The hypothesis that the extent of strategic planning had an effect on the climate factor of innovation was supported. Other non-hypothesized findings from the climate research performed in this study showed that the extent of strategic planning did not have an effect on the climate variables of peer cohesion, supervisor support, work pressure, control, and physical comfort. The extent of strategic planning did have an effect on the climate variable of autonomy.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Purposes of the Study

This investigation was designed to explore strategic planning at the community colleges in the state of Michigan. More specifically, the study was developed to determine the extent of the characteristics of strategic planning in these colleges. Through a questionnaire developed by this researcher called Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges, scores were obtained for 25 questions that related to the extent of the presence of the characteristics of the strategic planning process. The sum of the item scores from these 25 questions served as a measure of the extent of strategic planning at each college.

The following questions were posed for investigation to help explain relationships: (1) Was there a relationship between the size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning? (2) Was there a relationship between the wealth of the community college and the extent of strategic planning? (3) Does strategic planning have any effect on college climate?

These and other questions investigated have important practical purposes. One purpose is to determine if the criticisms regarding the lack of planning in the college setting, especially strategic planning, are any longer justifiable. Another purpose is to
determine if certain conditions such as size or wealth might provide some predictability as to the existence of strategic planning at a community college. Identification of climate factors that are enhanced by strategic planning could help colleges to improve conditions in these areas through the effective implementation of strategic planning.

Another important purpose of this study was to identify some of the developmental and structural aspects of the colleges' strategic planning efforts. This included such considerations as: Who is on the influential core planning committee that finalizes and recommends strategy to the board of trustees? How involved was the community in the plan development? Were outside consultants brought in to help? How long has the college been engaged in strategic planning? What are the problems and the benefits colleges have experienced as a result of strategic planning? The answers to these questions may prove helpful to colleges considering implementing a strategic planning process.

This chapter begins with a summary of the methodology used in this study. This is followed by the conclusions based on the findings of the research. The implications of the findings are then discussed. The chapter ends with a summary of the study.

Summary of Methodology

Population and Sample

The population for the analysis of the extent of strategic planning included the president and the next-in-charge when it came
to strategic planning at each of Michigan's 29 community colleges. Each individual was mailed a questionnaire designed to measure the extent of strategic planning at the college resulting in 58 total questionnaires being distributed.

The population for the climate study was the administrators at each of six community colleges. The six colleges were selected based on their total score on the section of the strategic planning questionnaire which measured the extent of strategic planning present at the college. In this section, respondents were asked to rate their college on their strength of agreement on the presence of strategic planning characteristics. Twenty-five items could be rated from 1 to 4, depending on the strength of the characteristic, with the maximum total score of 100 for all 25 items. Three colleges were selected from the top one-third rankings and three from the bottom one-third rankings on the extent of strategic planning to form two clusters. The colleges were selected for the clusters to ensure for a balance of relative size with a college from the top third, middle third, and bottom third in size based on full-time equated enrollment figures. The two groups were also balanced on a second factor, location. One college from a metropolitan area, one from an urban area, and one from a rural area were represented in both the high and the low scoring clusters.

The administrators of each of these six colleges were given a climate survey called the Work Environment Scale (WES). In Cluster 1 representing colleges scoring high on the extent of strategic planning, a total of 81 administrators from the three colleges formed the
population. In the second cluster representing the colleges scoring low on the extent of strategic planning, 72 administrators were in the population. The response rate for Cluster 1 was 90.1% with 73 administrators responding and the response rate for Cluster 2 was 83.3% with 60 responding.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used to measure the extent of strategic planning was the Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges survey developed by this researcher. The questionnaire was content validated through responses to a draft survey sent to 15 national experts on strategic planning in colleges. Fourteen of the 15 experts responded. The instrument was further validated in the study by comparing the community colleges' actual ranks based on the extent of strategic planning to the ranks resulting from asking respondents to list the top five community colleges in the state on planning. A direct relationship was found using Spearman's rho with an alpha of .05.

The instrument used for measuring the college's climate was the WES. This instrument was developed by Moos and Insel (1974) of the Stanford University Social Ecology Laboratory and is distributed by Consulting Psychologists Press, Incorporated, of Palo Alto, California. The instrument was designed to measure social environments of different types of work settings (Moos, 1986b). The WES comes in three forms: the Real Form (Form R) which measures respondent's perceptions of existing work environments, the Ideal Form (Form I)
which measures respondent's conceptions of what the ideal work environment should be, and the Expectations Form (Form E) designed to measure expectations of what a new work setting will be like. Form R, or the Real Form, was used in this investigation.

Data Collection

The Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire was mailed to all 58 of the presidents and the next-in-charge when it came to strategic planning. Two mailings took place. The first mailing occurred on April 21, 1991. This first mailing resulted in 36 returned surveys. The second mailing took place on May 14, 1991 and was sent to those who had not yet responded to the first mailing. This second mailing produced an additional 14 replies to bring the total responses received to 50 out of a possible 58 returns.

The WES questionnaire was given to each administrator at the six colleges selected for climate study purposes. This was accomplished through personal visitations to each college by this researcher. The questionnaires were administered under the direction of this researcher at each of the six colleges. The greatest concern of this research phase of the data collection was to ensure for the anonymity of the respondents. Great care was taken to remove the threat of disclosure of respondent's answers. The subjects were instructed not to put their names on the answer sheet. The only information written on the sheet was the name of the college, thus ensuring for the anonymity of the individual respondents. Research conducted by Moos,
the designer of the WES showed that under low threat of loss of anonymity, there was little or no difference in responses. Under conditions of high threat, there was a moderate amount of positive distortion, between one-third and one-half a standard deviation. The studies involved psychiatric patients because the designer of the instrument thought they might react most strongly to the possibility of having their answers linked to them (Moos, 1986b).

Statistical Procedures

The Spearman rho (rank) correlation coefficient was used to test the direction and the degree of linear relationship of the independent variable of size with the dependent variable, the extent of strategic planning at the community colleges. The same test was performed for the relationship of the independent variable of wealth with the dependent variable of the extent of strategic planning. The computer software used was SAS with the test described on pages 207-235 of the SAS Procedures Guide (SAS Institute, Inc., 1990a).

The t-test for independent means was used to determine if colleges scoring high on the extent of strategic planning scored differently on selected climate measures than colleges that scored low on the extent of strategic planning. The computer software for this test was also SAS and is described in the SAS/STAT User's Guide (SAS Institute, Inc., 1990b).
Limitations

The research conducted in this study was of ex-post facto design. The variations in the independent variables of wealth, size, and extent of strategic planning had already been determined through the natural course of events that preceded this study. This investigator did not have direct control over the independent variables.

The effects of extraneous variables were not controllable in this design. There remains the problem of trying to determine the "antecedents of the observed consequences" (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985, p. 356). Inferences of a relationship between the independent and the dependent variables are made with caution and the realization that the possibility of undiscovered extraneous variables may be causing the effects observed.

Conclusions

The conclusions for this research are presented in this section for the research questions and hypotheses stated in Chapter I of the study. Also presented are other findings related to the investigation. These conclusions for the research questions and hypotheses are presented in approximately the same order as they are presented in Chapter I. Other findings follow the same order as they appear in Chapter IV.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Strategic planning appears to be far more prevalent in Michigan community colleges than would have been expected as recent as 10
years ago. Twenty-nine colleges were sent two questionnaires on strategic planning entitled, Strategic Planning at Michigan Colleges. The questionnaires were sent to the president and the next-in-charge when it came to strategic planning. Twenty of the 27 colleges from which at least one individual responded were reported to be engaged in strategic planning. In addition, there were three colleges where the two respondents were in disagreement over whether their college was practicing strategic planning. Follow-up telephone interviews and review of the college's written planning documents that were available showed that all three were engaged in strategic planning, although two of the three were borderline cases. There was one college where the president responded "yes" and the next-in-charge "not sure." Strategic planning had been initiated only recently at this college and the college was not yet through the stage of a completed plan. This results in a total of 24 of the 27 colleges (88.8%) who responded to the survey to be engaged in using the strategic planning process. This figure compares favorably with the findings of Meredith et al. (1988) who discovered in their national survey of colleges that 87.7% reported that they were engaged in strategic planning. Only three of the 27 colleges in this study indicated that they were not engaged in strategic planning.

Strategic planning appears to be a relatively new process to Michigan community colleges. The most frequently given length of time respondents reported that their college was engaged in strategic planning was only 4 years. The mean length of time reported by respondents was 4.66 years when the number of years for colleges that
indicated they were engaged in strategic planning was calculated. The longest time a college was reported engaged in strategic planning was 13 years with the majority (81.8%) indicating that they had engaged in strategic planning 5 years or less.

The Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire was designed to measure the extent of the presence of strategic planning characteristics. Section 2 of this questionnaire posed 25 questions on the presence of strategic planning characteristics to which respondents answered on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 meaning "disagree strongly," 2 meaning "disagree," 3 meaning "agree," and 4 meaning "agree strongly." The characteristic that was revealed as the strongest was "The college's mission statement was reviewed and clarified in terms of 'what business we are in.'" This item's mean score was 3.54, placing it approximately midway between the "agree" and "agree strongly" options. This item was followed closely in mean score by the statement "External opportunities and threats to the college were identified" which had a mean score of 3.46. The third highest ranking item concerned goal identification and was stated "Goals were identified to take the college from its present situation to a desired future state." This item's mean score was 3.44. The next highest ranking item with a score of 3.33 concerned forecasting of external trends and events and their potential effect on the future of the college. The fifth highest was the statement "The achievement of our college goals was greatly enhanced through strategic planning" scoring a 3.31.

These findings on the items showing strength of presence support
the descriptions of strategic planning found in the literature (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983; Steiner, 1979). Strategic planning was described as an effective means for organizations to better understand their mission— their "raison d'etre," or justification for existence (Bryson, 1989). "The cornerstone for effective planning is a clear understanding of institutional mission" (McClenney et al., 1991, p. 2). The strategic planning process needs to be externally oriented (Deegan et al., 1985). With regards to the strategic planning purpose of goal identification and enhancement of goal achievement, strategic planning appeared to be fulfilling what authors claim to be an essential characteristic, direction finding (Bryson, 1989; Cope, 1987; Steeples, 1988).

The characteristics of strategic planning that were most lacking were identified by the five items scoring the lowest of the 25 item characteristics of Section 2 of the questionnaire. The lowest scoring item with a score of 2.47, a score between "agree" and "disagree" on the side of "disagree," was the statement that "The college is better off financially now than when it began strategic planning." This finding implies that strategic planning may not be fulfilling the purpose that many writers indicate is one of the reasons for engaging in strategic planning— prosperity (Cope, 19878; Keller, 1983; Shirley, 1988). This low ranking may have resulted from the timing of the questionnaire. Michigan was in the midst of a recession when the questionnaire was mailed in the Spring of 1991. Tax revenues were declining at the state level and there were legislative discussions of withholding state payments owed to the community.
colleges. The state of Michigan was in a deficit situation by most estimates exceeding $300 million.

The state recession in Michigan may also be part of the explanation for the second lowest scoring item, also linked to finances. This item stated that the college provided adequate resources to implement the plan in a timely manner. The low rank of this item may also be due to the newness of the process to the colleges. Strategic planning properly executed, ensures that strategic thinking precedes budgeting. Adjusting budgets to fit strategies and goals rather than the reverse is a new experience for many organizations (Bryson, 1989). Another possible explanation is that political maneuvering intervened to block or delay new initiatives identified in the plan. Schmidtlein (1989-1990) warned that issues that appeared to be decided during planning were frequently reopened by individuals who had a different vision from that which evolved from the planning. This issue of inadequate resource allocation requires further study to be conclusive.

The third lowest ranking of the characteristics of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges was stated "The community has a better understanding of the purposes of the college as a result of strategic planning." This item was tied at a score of 2.71 with a question related to organizational culture which will be discussed in the following paragraph. A low score on this characteristic is in agreement with responses to Question 10 in Section 4 of the questionnaire. Only 7 of the 27 colleges responded affirmatively to the Section 4 question asking if there were opportunities for community
groups or individuals to be involved in developing the strategic plan. This finding needs to be treated with caution as there was disagreement in an unusually high number of cases between the president and the next-in-charge over community involvement. There is cause for concern, however, over the low score on the community understanding characteristic of Section 2. A recent publication of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges on strategic planning includes the statement:

The fostering of two-way communication, the articulation of college and community values, the honest acknowledgment of tensions and diverse perspectives, the delineation of mutual goals, the nurturing of linkages and collaboration, the affirmation of multipartite commitments—all these elements are seen as essential to a strategic plan that promotes not just a single community college but the overall educational development of the community. Institutional planning often becomes a process whereby the college simply talks to itself about its future. (McClenney et al., 1991, p. 2)

The very essence of a community college as the name implies is the emphasis on community. Citizens in the communities that the college serves need to better understand the purposes the college fulfills and, in turn, should inform the college of what the community needs are so that the college can consider adjusting its programming and services to fit those needs.

Analysis of the culture of the organization and its appropriateness to the future needs of the college was tied in rank with the aforementioned item and was amongst the lowest scoring items on the characteristics of strategic planning. These two items were tied at the rank of 22 out of 25 items. This relative inattention to organizational culture in strategic planning is cause for concern. Schein
(1985) expressed the view that one of the unique functions of leadership should be attention to creating a desired culture in the organization. There may have been a lack of understanding among the survey respondents as to what is meant by culture. A clue to this confusion was a questionnaire where the respondent wrote a question mark next to the question on culture and circled the word "culture." Culture has been recognized in the literature as difficult to analyze because the elements are "subtle, unseen, and so familiar to persons inside the organization as to be considered self-evident and unworthy of discussion" (Owens, 1987, p. 175). An item related to culture, Question 5 of Section 2, asked if institutional values were identified. This item had a mean score of 3.15 and had a rank of 9th out of 25 items. Values are an important aspect of the organizational culture. Value identification scored much lower than expected given the importance assigned to value clarification in the literature as part of the strategic planning process. Perhaps values identification was not a stronger part of the strategic planning process at the colleges for reasons similar to why the more encompassing concept of the analysis of organizational culture was not considered. Values derive from several sources. Personal values are culturally derived, discipline based, and role based (Spanger, as cited in Shirley, 1990). When the values of an individual are then mixed with the values of others involved in the planning process, the task of sorting which values shall be agreed upon as the organization's values becomes extremely complex. Groups are often not aware of what their values are until they are presented, challenged, and tested as
solutions to actual problems (Schein, 1990). There are other aspects of the organization's culture, however, besides values that need to be analyzed and strategies considered for alterations of these elements. These aspects include, but are not limited to, such important items as the traditions, rituals, behavioral norms, beliefs, and assumptions that are unique to the organization.

The final characteristic ranking in the bottom 5 of the 25 items with a score of 2.73 was the statement that "Alternative courses of action for reaching the goals were considered before actions were decided upon." The low rank of this item contrasts with the high rank (number 3 out of 25 and number 5 out of 25) of goal identification and goal achievement enhancement through strategic planning. This item fell between the rating of "disagree" and "agree." There are many plausible explanations for this item scoring low. It may be that once the goals were set, alternative actions were considered by individuals at a lower level in the organization than that of the respondent. An explanation may be found in another section of the questionnaire where major problems with strategic planning were given. Here, the most often mentioned major problem was lack of time. The idea generating process necessary for developing alternatives is a very time-consuming effort.

An item other than values identification mentioned earlier that ranked lower than would be anticipated based on the importance assigned the item in the literature is the presence of a clear and compelling vision as part of the planning. The statement of vision was described as an essential element to the strategic planning
process yet it ranked almost in the middle in terms of relative strength of elements with a rank of 11th out of 25. Research has shown the articulation of a clear and compelling vision as a characteristic of both strong leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1986; Roueche et al., 1989; Steeples, 1988) and organizational effectiveness (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Steeples, 1988). Perhaps the low rank of this item is due to the relatively recent appearance in the strategic planning literature for colleges of this concept. Vision has received emphasis in the literature only within approximately the last 5 years and has become common in only the last several years. Since the mean length of time that community colleges in this study had been engaged in strategic planning was about 5 years, it is possible that the guides that colleges were using did not include vision as an important part of the strategic planning process.

The final item that was described in much of the literature as a major reason for engaging in strategic planning but which ranked lower than expected was the concept of "strategic fit." Strategic fit occurs when the programs and services of the college match the wants and needs of the college's constituency. This item ranked 10th out of the 25 items on strength of presence of the characteristic. Perhaps one of the reasons for this ranking rests in an observation by Cope (1985) that the concept of strategy is simply too limited to include the many ethical and value dimensions that are considered important in higher education. Thus, when a question is posed using the marketing terminology of strategic fit which is more common to
the private, for-profit sector, the response may reflect a lack of familiarity with or orientation towards the concept. Regardless, the result of obtaining a better strategic fit should score higher as a characteristic if the literature is to be supported on the importance of this aspect of strategic planning.

The role of the president was another of the research questions for inquiry. The role was most often identified as providing leadership and taking responsibility for initiating the process. The role of the president was also described as one of taking a very active, major role in the strategic planning process. Less often mentioned roles were providing vision and facilitating the process. This information helped further clarify the actual role of the president which other researchers had begun (Harris, 1987; Ray, 1987; Steeples, 1988). However, the role of the president still seems to be ambiguous. For example, it was unclear what was meant by those who responded that the president should "provide leadership." Also, eight different and sometimes divergent roles were identified which reflect the diversity of views on the role presidents play in strategic planning.

The role of the faculty in strategic planning was also investigated. Less than half of the colleges appeared to have faculty on the core planning committee. This committee was described in the questionnaire as "a designated group of people whose responsibility it is (was) to finalize and recommend strategy to the president and/or board of trustees." Where faculty were on the committee, the average representation was about one-third of the committee. More
than one in four colleges said that faculty were not on this committee. These findings contradict the literature on strategic planning which portrays a more involved and important role for the faculty. There were seven of 27 colleges in the study where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed over the presence of faculty on the core planning committee. This disagreement is an indication that the involvement of the faculty may not have been significant or clearly defined.

These findings are cause for concern as faculty are often the ones responsible at the implementation stage for actions resulting from planning. Many activities and programs at colleges are intertwined and overlapping; good communication and mutual understanding between academic departments are important when changes are anticipated. Certainly faculty should have a say in their future destinies and the destiny of their respective programs which are the topics considered in strategic planning. Often, the faculty are the best source of knowledge about trends and expected events in their fields—vital information to strategic planning. Deegan et al. (1985) have pointed out that more faculty involvement in strategic planning is desirable for three major reasons:

1. Probable need to reduce or terminate programs (as distinct from imminent requirement).

2. The need to change behavior and attitudes in instructional programs, such as adapting new instructional technology, increasing advisement activity, or adapting courses to more effectively support an objective such as writing across the curriculum.

3. The desire to prevent or moderate conflict where this priority is more important than achieving specific goals. (Deegan et al., 1985, p. 295)
Most community colleges described their strategic planning approach as a fairly equal balance of top-down and bottom-up processes as opposed to top-down or bottom-up. Top-down means that decisions are made at the top of the organizational hierarchy and are passed down through successive layers as a guide for action. Bottom-up refers to the flow of information from lower levels to the top of the organization for decision-making purposes. The least used approach was the top-down. There were eight of the 27 colleges in this study where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed over whether the process was top-down or bottom-up. The presidents favored reporting the process as bottom-up or a balance. The next-in-charge favored reporting the process as top-down or balanced. The reasons for these discrepancies in responses can only be speculated for no additional information on this topic was collected to help explain the differences in responses. One possible cause could be that the president may wish the process was bottom-up and may only see that which goes on as bottom-up. The next-in-charge may be too focused on the goal setting and the plan approval aspects of strategic planning which occur later in the process and are, by their nature, more top-down type of activities. A possible clue to the discrepancy which could lead one to favor the accuracy of those who reported top-down was Question 8 of Section 4 on the make-up of the core committee. The group with the greatest representation on the committee was the administration reflecting a top-down orientation. Also, in response to Question 11 of Section 4, over half of the colleges (15 of 27) reported that the board of trustees were involved
in plan development prior to their formal role of reviewing and adopting the final version of the strategic plan.

No support was found for a relationship between the wealth of community college and the extent of strategic planning. This finding supported an earlier finding by Ray (1987) on strategic planning in Texas community colleges. This finding contradicts a finding by Meredith et al. (1988) where strategic planning resulted in increased funding per student. The difference may rest on the factor that the Meredith et al. study was based on a national sample whereas this study was based on a single state. Also, the Meredith et al. (1988) study compared two groups of colleges, one doing "bona fide" and one doing "not bona fide" strategic planning. Further study of this relationship is desirable.

No relationship was found between the size of a community college and the extent of strategic planning. This finding contradicts the research of Ray where "a positive relationship between the extent of strategic planning and size" (1987, p. 90) was reported. A possible explanation for this difference in findings may reside in the timing of the two research projects. Ray collected his data in the Spring of 1987. The data for this study was collected 4 years later in the Spring of 1991. As time goes by, more colleges are apt to initiate new processes as expertise is developed and sister colleges share experiences. This investigation found that larger colleges are more likely to have a person other than the president who has functional responsibility for planning. This was verified by the data collected with Question 1 of Section 4 of the Strategic Planning at
Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire. Thus, it seems probable that a person who is less occupied with the multitude of responsibilities facing a president would be more able to investigate, organize, and help implement a strategic planning process. This may have been what was occurring in Texas in 1987—the larger colleges were more advanced due to the presence of a person with direct responsibility for and the time to develop the strategic planning process. This may also have been the case in Michigan at that time. However, over time this advantage of the large colleges over the smaller colleges would be overcome through sharing and learning.

Research Question 6 asked "What are some of the major problems with strategic planning?" The context of the most frequently mentioned reply was "lack of time." Lack of time seemed to be a greater problem for small colleges than large. Larger colleges reported problems with getting everyone to feel a part of the process. Middle-sized colleges most often reported problems with the complexity of the process. A problem that another researcher found to be the major problem with strategic planning in senior colleges in Texas was a lack of commitment (Harris, 1987). This problem was mentioned by only one of the small colleges in this study. Again, the reason for this difference in findings may be timing. Harris did the study 4 years ago when strategic planning may have been relatively new to colleges. This study, as evidenced by the high percentage of colleges reporting that they were engaged in the process, reflects stronger acceptance and greater use of the process.

The question on problems was followed by an inquiry about the
major benefits of strategic planning. The context of the most popular response was that strategic planning "clarified directions for change" in the organization. This response was most common from respondents of large schools followed by small colleges. Only one middle-sized college gave this response. There were three responses tied as the second most common replies to the benefits of strategic planning with the frequency of mention of eight each. Both large and small colleges replied that strategic planning helped to "focus efforts." No middle-sized school gave this as a benefit. Large colleges reported the benefit of "more effective distribution of resources" more often than middle and smaller colleges. "Development of a shared sense of purpose" was mentioned by four large colleges, three small and one medium-sized college. Other benefits were: "Clarification of mission" (frequency of 7), "involvement of the staff and the community" (frequency of 6), "evaluation of programs" (frequency of 5), and "development of a strategic thinking approach" (frequency of 3).

Small and large-sized community colleges listed far more benefits than medium-sized colleges. The proportion of the number of mentions of benefits for colleges in order of size was 31 for the largest-sized: 10 for the middle-sized, 24 for the smallest sized. A partial explanation for this was that two of the colleges where both the president and the next-in-charge said there was no strategic planning present at their college were in this middle-sized group. This negative response would have precluded the respondents from answering the question on benefits due to the design of the
instrument. This fact would have changed the proportion of respondents in the size groups from 17 in the largest-sized college group, 16 in the middle-sized college group, and 17 in the smallest-sized college group to 16:12:17 respectively. This still does not account for the wide discrepancy in the original proportion of the frequency of mention of benefits between the middle-sized colleges and the large and small colleges. This researcher cannot derive other possible explanations either from the data collected or from the literature. This discrepancy remains an area for further investigation.

There were four hypotheses that sought to reveal whether there was a relationship between the extent of strategic planning and selected climate factors at the community colleges in this study. The climate scale scores were compared for colleges ranking high on the extent of strategic planning to those ranking low using the t-test for independent means. For three of the climate factors, task orientation, clarity, and involvement, there was no support for a relationship. The three factors are described below:

Task orientation: the degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done.

Clarity: the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies are communicated.

Involvement: the extent to which employees are concerned about and committed to their jobs. (Moos, 1986b, p. 2)

The analysis of a fourth factor, innovation, did reveal the existence of a direct relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the degree of innovation at the community college using an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of the difference between the
means being equal to zero. The climate factor innovation was given the following description by the author of the WES climate instrument: "Innovation: the degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches" (Moos, 1986c, p. 2). This finding should provide encouragement to leaders to consider using strategic planning and to develop the process to the extent possible. Leaders are responsible for establishing conditions within the organization that are conducive to change (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kanter, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Roueche et al., 1989). One of the findings in a nationwide study of exemplary leaders was that effective leaders encourage innovation (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Litwin (1968) in his experimental studies of simulated business settings found that organizations that encouraged innovation stimulated new products, higher profits, and reduced costs. This finding linking strategic planning and innovation also implies that colleges exhibiting a high extent of strategic planning may also be found to be adaptive. Peters and Waterman reported in their research on 43 exemplary companies that "innovative companies are especially adroit at continually responding to change of any sort in their environments" (1982, p. 12).

Other Findings

This section contains other findings not already alluded to in the previous section. The findings are presented in the same order as in Chapter IV.

A climate factor other than innovation that showed a relationship to exist between the extent of strategic planning and the factor
was autonomy. This finding was supported using the t-test for independent means with an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of the t-test being equal to zero. Autonomy was described by Moos (1986b), the co-designer of the WES climate instrument as follows: "The extent to which employees are encouraged to be self-sufficient and to make their own decisions" (p. 2). There is support in the literature for the development of autonomy as one of the outcomes of strategic planning (Cope, 1989; Keller, 1983). Most of the arguments for increased autonomy are grounded in the belief that when there are definite strategies in place that are well understood by members of the organization, supervisors are more comfortable delegating decision-making. Also, with the advent of the information worker recording data and creating reports in all levels of the organization, it is often impossible for top management to make as informed a decision as lower level workers due to the volume of information. Thus, greater autonomy is given to the workers who are the best informed and able to act in a timely manner. This finding that colleges that show higher levels of strategic planning demonstrate higher levels of autonomy in their organization than those demonstrating lower levels of strategic planning should be used with caution. The difference between the means of the highest ranking colleges and the lowest ranking colleges on the extent of strategic planning on this climate factor is slight.

The Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges questionnaire was used in this study to sort high and low ranking colleges on the extent of strategic planning. In order to help validate the
questionnaire, the rankings resulting from the use of the Section 2 responses of the questionnaire were compared to the rankings resulting from Section 3 responses on how other colleges perceived the top colleges in the state in planning effectiveness. A direct relationship was found between these two sets of rankings using Spearman's rho with an alpha of .05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero. This finding helped give this researcher greater confidence in the newly designed questionnaire and should help others who might consider using the questionnaire in future research.

Nearly half of the community colleges participating in this study had at least one of the two respondents claim that a consultant had been used to assist the college in strategic planning. This finding is not surprising when a finding which will be reported on later in this section showed 11 of the 27 colleges stating that the president bore the sole functional responsibility for strategic planning. Unless the president was knowledgeable through prior training, experience, or self-instruction, a task as formidable and complex as strategic planning would probably have moved the president to seek the advice of a consultant. Another possible clue as to why approximately half of the colleges used consultants is the highest ranking of the major problems mentioned earlier—"Lack of time." Presidents and high ranking next-in-charge individuals are often busy with operational challenges day-to-day and have little time for what was a relatively new process to most of the colleges in this study.

There was not enough information collected to draw conclusions on why some community colleges have chosen not to engage in strategic
planning. Only 8 respondents answered that their college was not engaged in strategic planning and there was not a pattern to the reasons given.

The titles of persons other than the presidents who had college-wide strategic planning as a functional responsibility were almost always high-ranking titles. Most titles were either vice-president or dean level. At some of the smaller colleges, deans are the first line administrators while at others, they may be one level below vice-president. No information was collected to clarify whether the deans indicated were first or second line administrators. There were several director titles which are usually considered mid-management in community colleges in Michigan. The highest ranking title was president of a branch campus. These titles are an indication of the high level of importance given to strategic planning in Michigan community colleges. A person other than the president having functional responsibility for strategic planning was more likely to be found at the larger colleges--colleges that ranked in the top one-third in size--than in middle-sized or smaller colleges.

A very important committee in most community college's planning is the "core planning committee." At least 17 of the 27 colleges in this investigation have such a committee whose major responsibility was described as finalizing and recommending strategy for the college to the president and/or board of trustees. This committee most commonly had administrative members, followed by faculty, and then support staff. Much less common on the core planning committee were students, board of trustee members, and members of the
community-at-large.

The results from this data are of greatest concern in the lack of involvement of the community-at-large on the committee. An item related to this lack of community involvement was discussed earlier when the low scoring items on the characteristics of strategic planning from Section 2 of the questionnaire were presented. The item referred to is Question 24 of Section 2 of the strategic planning questionnaire. This item showed a relatively low score for the community gaining a greater understanding of the community college as a result of the strategic planning efforts. Only 7 of the 27 colleges, or 25.9% had community-at-large members on this committee.

These findings conflict with the recommendations found in the recent publication of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. In Building Communities Through Strategic Planning: A Guidebook for Community Colleges, the authors discuss a group analogous to the core planning committee of this investigation only the committee was called the "planning council." The authors stated that "the (Planning) Council should . . . have roughly equivalent numbers of college and community leaders" (McClenney et al., 1991, p. 6). Among the areas to consider for community representation are the following: influential community leaders, key segments of community life, geographic service areas, persons who understand broad-based social issues, and underrepresented population (e.g., handicapped, minorities, disadvantaged, and women).

A related question posed following the inquiry on the composition of the core planning committee was "Were there opportunities for
community groups or individuals to be involved in developing the strategic plan?" Again, only 7 of the 27 (25.9%) answered this inquiry affirmatively. Nine of the 27 colleges responded "no" to this question. There were another 10 colleges where the president and the next-in-charge did not agree which may have resulted from confusion over what was meant by "involvement." Some may have interpreted this as meaning filling out a survey whereas others may have interpreted this as a higher degree of involvement such as membership on a college advisory committee that helped provide information for the overall planning effort. Regardless, the fact that there was disagreement indicates the possible lack of a clear role for community groups or individuals in the strategic planning process at many colleges.

The involvement of the board of trustees in plan development (prior to formal adoption) was an improvement over the level of involvement of community groups and individuals but still remained low. Over half of the colleges, 15 of 27 (55.5%), stated in response to the inquiry on board involvement that their board of trustees was involved in the development of the strategic plan. Seven colleges or 25.9% indicated their board was not involved in the plan development with only four colleges showing a disagreement between the president and the next-in-charge over whether the board was involved in the development stages. On the separate question asking for the composition of the college's core planning committee, only eight colleges reported that the board was represented on the core planning committee. Thus, there appears to be other ways in which the board was
involved in the plan development prior to adoption that were not
brought out in the questionnaire design.

These findings, like the finding on lack of community participa­
tion, reveal planning activity that is contrary to the recommenda­
tions found in the publication Building Communities Through Strategic
Planning: A Guidebook for Community Colleges (McClenney et al.,
1991) where board membership on the planning council is encouraged.

One of the possible explanations for this relative lack of board
participation is the view that the board of trustees is a policy­
making body and should only be involved when these types of decisions
are being made. Another possible explanation is that board members
may feel hesitant to get too involved in what they might view as
operations, believing this to be the purview of the administration.

These reasons are conjectures and would need further study to be more
conclusive.

A correlation this investigator became interested in researching
as the study progressed was the extent of agreement between the
president and the next-in-charge. As the data was being summarized
and analyzed, it was apparent that there were often instances where
there was disagreement in the responses of the two individuals. In
order to identify a possible pattern, Spearman's rho was calculated
for the ranking of colleges on the extent of strategic planning score
and the percent of disagreement on responses to the 25 questions on
the characteristics of strategic planning in Section 2 of the ques­
tionnaire. An inverse relationship was discovered using an alpha of
.05 in testing the null hypothesis of rho equal to zero. The rho was
-.47 which shows that there was a general downhill trend in the level of disagreement as the scores on the extent of strategic planning increased. The relationship shows that it may be possible that strategic planning does result in improved communications and mutual agreement in community colleges. In related research, Ray (1987) reported that there was a positive relationship between the extent of strategic planning and communications in Texas community colleges. The finding was significant at the .01 level. Harris (1987) observed in a study of senior colleges and universities that strategic planning provides for greater unification. Other authors have stated that strategic planning should result in greater understanding across the institution (Cope, 1987; Deegan et al., 1985; Keller, 1983; Steiner, 1979).

The final other finding in this study was a summary of the reasons given by the respondents from colleges as to why their college chose to engage in strategic planning. Four specific options were listed on the questionnaire in this order: to avoid an impending crisis, to correct an existing crisis, to maintain the status-quo, and to improve an already good situation. These options were followed by a blank line with the word "other" to provide the opportunity for responses other than those listed. The response to this inquiry was overwhelmingly "to improve an already good situation." Twenty-eight persons checked this response. The next most common response with three responding was "To avoid an impending crisis." The response "To correct an existing crisis" had only two persons selecting it and "To maintain the status-quo" had only one person
selecting that option. There was no pattern to the write-in "other" response option.

A possible explanation for the strong response for the "To improve an already good situation" option was the circumstances surrounding the time when the college last engaged in developing their strategic plan. The mean for the number of years Michigan community colleges had engaged in strategic planning was less than 5 years. The time period between Spring of 1991 when this study was conducted and Spring of 1986 was one of improved conditions in most of the Michigan community colleges. The conditions were more favorable than the first half of the 1980s when Michigan was in the grips of a severe recession and the colleges were experiencing "executive cutbacks" through governor mandated state funding reductions in order to balance the budget. Another possible explanation to the response was that 17 of the 27 community colleges in the study were known to have passed millage during the 5-year period which significantly improved their overall financial situation (telephone conversation between Thomas Bernthal, executive director of the Michigan Community College Association and Dr. Philip G. Ward, president of Glen Oaks Community College, September 19, 1991).

Implications

Programmatic

There are a number of implications related to this study's research questions and hypotheses and their conclusions. The relative strength of the characteristics show that the community colleges
in this study may not be allowing enough time for the process. The consideration of alternative courses of action which is a time-consuming process was one of the weakest of the 25 strategic planning characteristics. Another area for improvement is the need for more consideration to be given to the culture of the organization. The identification of values, which are an important aspect of the organization's culture, did seem to be included in the strategic planning process but was not as strong an element as the literature advocates. Culture is more encompassing than just values, however. Culture includes other aspects that need consideration such as traditions, assumptions, beliefs, and rituals, all of which are important factors to the successful functioning of an organization. There also needs to be a greater focus in the strategic planning processes of the colleges on obtaining a better strategic fit between the programs and services of the college and the wants and needs of the college's constituency.

The community colleges could also improve the strategic planning process by including community representation on a much larger scale than appeared to be occurring. If community colleges in Michigan are going to support the mission outlined in the 1988 report of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges's Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, community groups and individuals are going to need to become more directly involved in the process (McClenney et al., 1991).

Another group deserving more representation in key positions
such as the core planning group that recommends strategy to the president and/or the board of trustees is the faculty. Of all the employee groups in the college, the faculty are closest to the student or the "customer," to use the marketing vernacular. Faculty are best positioned to be aware of student attitudes and perceptions. They also must bear the burden of implementing and explaining action initiatives resulting from planning. Peters and Waterman, in their landmark book, In Search of Excellence, cited Texas Instruments, Incorporated's Patrick Haggerty who said "those who implement the plans must make the plans" (Peters & Waterman, 1983, p. 31).

An element of strategic planning that has been shown to be important to organizational effectiveness that needs to be given more consideration is the development of a clear and compelling vision for the organization. The statement of the vision for the organization, even though it usually results from the participative aspects of the planning process, is the responsibility of the president of the college and needs to be included as part of the strategic planning process.

There also seems to be a void between the development of plans and the matching of resources for implementation. Perhaps improvements in the consideration of alternatives would help improve this situation by providing more viable options. Another improvement would be providing adequate resources for more timely plan implementation, although this may be a very difficult task in a state with as volatile an economy as Michigan. Meisinger (1989-1990) recommended setting aside funds ahead of the planning process to help ensure
support for opportunities that arise. One of the high-ranking colleges in the study indicated that the board of trustees had committed to a set-aside of $100,000 a year for 3 years to provide for the implementation of new projects.

Community colleges that want to improve their climate for innovation may want to consider implementing strategic planning or strengthening existing strategic planning programs. This research revealed that colleges scoring high on the extent of strategic planning scored higher on the climate variable of innovation than colleges demonstrating a low extent of strategic planning.

Agreement between the president and the next-in-charge when it comes to strategic planning may be increased as the strategic planning process is improved. If agreement is important to the president or the board of trustees, the implementation of strategic planning or the improvement of the existing strategic planning process might be a wise investment.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

This investigation found that there was not a direct relationship between the size of the community college and the extent of strategic planning. This finding contradicted an earlier study by Ray (1987) of Texas community colleges. Another study of the relationship between these two variables would help to clarify the issue. Other variables that could also be analyzed to determine if there is a relationship to the extent of strategic planning are: the location of the college, the number of years the president has been in office,
and the existence of a planning officer position at the college.

This study also revealed instances where the president and the next-in-charge disagreed over key issues related to strategic planning. A case study approach with on-site interviews would help to clarify whether the disagreements were real or whether they were due to such factors as differences in interpretation of terminology or how the questions were presented. A further improvement would be to conduct an ethnographic study which would provide greater detail of the actual evolution of strategic planning processes and the outcomes as they occurred. This would be especially helpful in better defining the role the president and other key individuals and groups play in the strategic planning process at community colleges.

Summary

This study used as its foundation a description of strategic planning based on the description developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (Shirley, 1990). Institutions may use somewhat different approaches to strategic planning with varying emphases and levels of involvement of college personnel and community individuals. However, there are characteristics common to strategic planning that the literature supports.

A questionnaire was developed in this study and verified by a panel of 15 national experts. This questionnaire was used to analyze 25 item characteristics of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges.

Strategic planning was found to be far more common in community
colleges than would have been predicted 10 years ago. Twenty-four of the 27 colleges (88.8%) were engaged in strategic planning. Most colleges used strategic planning for the first time within the last 4 to 5 years. The colleges mainly chose to engage in strategic planning to improve an already good situation, perhaps reflecting good economic times in Michigan when the colleges implemented the process.

The characteristics of strategic planning showing a strong presence were: mission identification, external analyses, and goal identification and achievement. Characteristic areas showing a weak presence were: consideration of alternatives, culture analysis, improved community understanding, adequate resource allocation for plan implementation, and improvement of financial conditions.

No relationship was found between the size of a community college based on full-time equated enrollments and the existence of strategic planning. There was also no direct relationship found between the wealth of a community college and the extent of strategic planning.

An area of concern that requires further research is the apparent lack of involvement of faculty and the community in the strategic planning process, especially on such key bodies as the core planning committee that finalizes and recommends strategy to the president and/or the board of trustees.

The major problem the community colleges in this study had with strategic planning was a lack of time for the process. The major benefit was that strategic planning provided clarification of directions for change.
The investigation revealed that there was no support for a relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the climate scores for the factors of task orientation, clarity, and involvement. There was a direct relationship between the extent of strategic planning and the climate factors of innovation and autonomy.
Appendix A

The Strategic Planning Model
A STRATEGIC PLANNING SYSTEM FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Environmental Assessment

Identification of External Opportunities and Threats

Personal Values

The "Matching" Process Relating External Opportunities and Threats to Internal Strengths and Values

Identification of Internal Strengths and Weaknesses

Evaluation of Programs, Finances, Facilities and Other Resources

Determination of:
- (1) Basic Mission
- (2) Clientele
- (3) Program/Service Mix
- (4) Comparative Advantage
- (5) Objectives

Academic Plan
- General Education
- Unifying Themes
- Assessment Program
- Strategies for Expansion/Contraction of Programs
- Other

Financial Plan
- Overall Financial Planning Parameters
- Strategies for Expansion/Reallocation of Resources

Facilities Plan
- Overall Physical Planning Parameters
- Strategies for Expansion/Reallocation

Enrollment Management Plan
- Target Mix of Students
- Recruitment and Retention Strategies

Human Resource Development Plan
- Strategies for Faculty Development
- Strategies for Staff Development

Organizational Plan
- Development of Organizational Structure
- Development of Policies and Procedures (including handbooks)

Development of Plans by Academic Units

Development of Plans by Administrative Support Units

Budgeting Process

Implementation and Evaluation

Appendix B

Listings of Michigan Community Colleges
and College Presidents
MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

1990-91

Dr. Donald Newport
Alpena Community College
666 Johnson Street
Alpena, Michigan 49707

Dr. Dwight Link
Bay De Noc Community College
Danforth Road
Escanaba, Michigan 49829

Mr. David Moore
C.S. Mott Community College
1401 E. Court Street
Flint, Michigan 48502

Mr. Donald J. Carlyon
Delta College
University Center, Michigan 48710

Dr. James Grote
Gogebic Community College
E-4946 Jackson Road
Ironwood, Michigan 49938

Mr. Richard Calkins
Grand Rapids Junior College
143 Bostwick, N.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503

Dr. Andrew Mazzara
Henry Ford Community College
5101 Evergreen Road
Dearborn, Michigan 48128

Dr. Comer Heath III
Highland Park Community College
Glendale at Third Avenue
Highland Park, Michigan 48203

Dr. Clyde E. LeTarte
Jackson Community College
2111 Emmons Road
Jackson, Michigan 49201
Dr. Marilyn J. Schlack
Kalamazoo Valley Community College
6767 West O Avenue
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49009

Dr. Paul R. Ohm
Kellogg Community College
450 North Avenue
Battle Creek, Michigan 49016

Dr. Dorothy Franke
Kirtland Community College
R. 4, Box 59A
Roscommon, Michigan 48653

Dr. Anne Mulder
Lake Michigan College
2755 E. Napier Avenue
Benton Harbor, Michigan 49022

Dr. Abel Sykes
Lansing Community College
419 N. Capitol Avenue, Box 40010
Lansing, Michigan 48901

Mr. Albert L. Lorenzo
Macomb Community College
14500 Twelve Mile Road
Warren, Michigan 48093

Dr. Charles Corrigan
Mid Michigan Community College
3175 S. Clare Avenue
Harrison, Michigan 48625

Dr. Gerald Welch
Monroe County Community College
1555 S. Raisinville Road
Monroe, Michigan 48161

Dr. Donald C. Burns
Montcalm Community College
1464 W. Sidney Road
Sidney, Michigan 48805

Dr. James L. Stevenson
Muskegon Community College
221 Quarterline Road
Muskegon, Michigan 48443
Mr. Robert Graham  
North Central Michigan College  
Petoskey, Michigan  49770

Dr. Timothy Quinn  
Northwestern Michigan College  
1701 E. Front Street  
Traverse City, Michigan  49684

Dr. Richard Thompson, Interim Chancellor  
Oakland Community College  
2480 Opdyke Road  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan  48013

Dr. Richard W. McDowell  
Schoolcraft College  
18600 Haggerty Road  
Livonia, Michigan  48152

Dr. Earnest Dear  
St. Clair Community College  
323 Erie Street  
Port Huron, Michigan  48060

Mr. David C. Briegel  
Southwestern Michigan College  
Cherry Grove Road  
Dowagiac, Michigan  49047

Dr. Gundar A. Myran  
Washtenaw Community College  
4800 E. Huron River Drive  
P.O. Box D-1  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  48106

Dr. William Anderson  
West Shore Community College  
3000 N. Stiles Road  
Scottville, Michigan  49454

Dr. Rafael Cortada  
Wayne County Community College  
801 W. Fort Street  
Detroit, Michigan  48226
Appendix C

Transmittal Letter for Planning Survey Validation
Dear

I am a doctoral candidate at Western Michigan University pursuing a degree in higher education administration. I am conducting a dissertation study on the extent of strategic planning in community colleges.

As a result of the review of the literature and consultation with experts, you have been selected as a member of a validation panel. I have designed an instrument for measuring the extent of strategic planning. I would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to evaluate the enclosed questionnaire and then return it to me by __________. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your validation of the enclosed instrument is very important to the study. Your response will be treated with confidentiality. I have coded your questionnaire and no one else will be able to associate responses with names except me.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (616) 467-9945 (office) or (616) 651-9146 (residence). A copy of the developed questionnaire will be sent to you if you indicate this desire by checking the appropriate box on Figure 1 of the cover sheet.

Thank you for sharing your expertise and taking the time to respond.

Sincerely,

Dennis P. McCarthy

Enclosures: 2
Appendix D

Draft of Strategic Planning Survey
for Expert Validation
Please Note: The "Expert's Comments" section that corresponds to each item is not going to be part of the final instrument. The Comments section is there only for you to comment on the item, if you choose to do so.

If you wish to have more space for comments, feel free to write on the back of the page.

Each question also asks you to check if the question is "Clear" to you and if the question is "Appropriate" to the purpose of the study as described in the abstract.

FIGURE 1

Please send me a copy of the developed questionnaire.
PLANNING CHARACTERISTICS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify the extent of planning in Michigan community colleges. All responses will be kept confidential.

PART ONE

Please provide the following general information:

1. Does your college have an individual, other than the president who has the functional responsibility for planning? Yes ___ No ___
   Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___
   Expert's Comments __________________________________________

2. What is the title of this individual? _________________________
   Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___
   Expert's Comments __________________________________________

3. To whom does this individual report? _________________________
   Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___
   Expert's Comments __________________________________________

4. Check the response which best describes the responsibility of your planning officer:
   __ facilitating the work of a planning committee
   __ gathering data
   __ makes decisions about institutional direction
   __ institutional research
   __ other, please describe _________________________________
   Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___
   Expert's Comments __________________________________________
5. Has the planning process at your college been changed in the last three years?  Yes___ No____
   Clear: Yes____ No____  Appropriate: Yes____ No____
   Expert's Comments__________________________________________

6. Did an outside consultant with expertise in planning assist you in reviewing your planning procedures?  Yes___ No____
   Clear: Yes____ No____  Appropriate: Yes____ No____
   Expert's Comments__________________________________________

7. Are you considering changing the planning process at your college in the next three years?  Yes___ No____
   Clear: Yes____ No____  Appropriate: Yes____ No____
   Expert's Comments__________________________________________

8. If there are plans to change the planning process, please indicate the major changes being considered.
   ____________________________________________________________
   Clear: Yes____ No____  Appropriate: Yes____ No____
   Expert's Comments__________________________________________

9. What are the reasons for these changes?
   ____________________________________________________________
   Clear: Yes____ No____  Appropriate: Yes____ No____
   Expert's Comments__________________________________________

PART TWO

Please consider the functioning of the planning process at your college over the past three years. Circle the number below the column which best describes that your college's planning process.
(Code for the abbreviations at the top of the columns: SD=strongly disagree D=disagree NA/ND=neither agree nor disagree  A=agree SA=strongly agree)
### AS PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS:

1. A clear statement of the purpose of the planning effort was communicated prior to the process beginning: 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments

2. External trends, events, and constraints were closely monitored to determine their potential effect on the future of the college. 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments

3. Changes within the college were closely monitored to determine their effects on the future of the college. 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments

4. Top administrative support was readily available. 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments

5. Institutional strengths and weaknesses were carefully assessed. 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments

6. Faculty had little opportunity for input to the process. 1 2 3 4 5  
   - Clear: **Yes** No  
   - Appropriate: **Yes** No  
   - Expert's Comments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. All employees were given opportunity for input to the plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adequate financing was provided to support the cost of developing the plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information concerning potential student clientele was part of the planning process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A set of basic assumptions about the future were agreed to by the core committee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Realistic assessments were made about the availability of funds to finance the recommended changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The core planning group included both administrators and faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes____ No____ Appropriate: Yes____ No____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Institution values were identified and agreed to by the core committee.  
Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___

Expert's Comments ____________________________

14. Opportunities and threats in the external environment were carefully assessed.  
Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___

Expert's Comments ____________________________

15. Alternative strategies were considered for each major objective identified.  
Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___

Expert's Comments ____________________________

16. Desired levels of attainment were specified for each major objective.  
Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___

Expert's Comments ____________________________

17. The external environmental analysis, internal environmental analysis, and the institutional values were matched to provide:  
A. A mission statement .......... 1  2  3  4  5  
B. A description of clientele to be served ............... 1  2  3  4  5  
C. The program/service mix ...... 1  2  3  4  5  
D. The comparative advantages .. 1  2  3  4  5  
E. Strategic objectives ............ 1  2  3  4  5  

Clear: Yes ___ No ___  Appropriate: Yes ___ No ___

Expert's Comments ____________________________
## PART THREE

### AS A RESULT OF THE PLANNING PROCESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NA/ND</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. All units of the college received a copy of the plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. All employees have received a copy of the mission statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Issues critical to the future success and survival of the college are being carefully monitored.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The plan is reviewed on a regular basis (at least twice each year) and revised based on changing events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Priorities for action are identified each year based on the plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Adequate new resources or a reallocation of existing resources has provided funds to implement the plan in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. The following general plans have been developed to support the college's strategies for the future:
A. Facilities Plan ............... 1 2 3 4 5
B. Financial Plan .................. 1 2 3 4 5
C. Academic Plan .................. 1 2 3 4 5
D. Human Resource Plan .......... 1 2 3 4 5
E. Organization Plan outlining new policy and structure ...... 1 2 3 4 5
F. Enrollment Management Plan .... 1 2 3 4 5

Clear: Yes _No_ Appropriate: Yes _No_
Expert's Comments ____________________________________________

25. Units of the college have developed unit plans based on the plan. 1 2 3 4 5

Clear: Yes _No_ Appropriate: Yes _No_
Expert's Comments ____________________________________________

26. The best possible "strategic fit" between the college and its environment was accomplished. 1 2 3 4 5

Clear: Yes _No_ Appropriate: Yes _No_
Expert's Comments ____________________________________________

PART 4
IMPACT

The following illustrate areas which may have been affected by the planning at your institution over the past three years. Please circle the number which best describes the impact of the planning process on each area listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reallocation of existing resources.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear: Yes _No_ Appropriate: Yes _No_
Expert's Comments ____________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO IMPACT</th>
<th>LITTLE IMPACT</th>
<th>MODERATE IMPACT</th>
<th>GREAT IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Allocation of new resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Building programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Renovations of existing buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student recruitment strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student retention strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>GREAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program deletions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New academic program offerings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program revisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational policy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational procedure.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Clear: Yes _ No_</td>
<td>Appropriate: Yes _ No_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert's Comments</td>
<td>______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Personnel selection.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear: Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appropriate: Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Expert's Comments: __________________________________________

16. Overall effect of the college's plan on the college operations.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear: Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appropriate: Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Expert's Comments: __________________________________________

PART FIVE

A definition of Strategic Planning is given below. Please read this statement to determine if the definition fits the planning process at your college:

Strategic Planning is a process whereby the conditions in the external and the internal environment of the college are analyzed. The external environment is analyzed for the purpose of identifying opportunities, threats, and constraints to the college. The internal environment is analyzed to identify the strengths and weakness of the college. In addition to these analyses, organizational values are identified. These analyses are matched to develop a "strategic vision" of the future for the college which includes: The mission; the clientele to be served; the program and service mix; the comparative advantages of the college over the competition; and the strategic objectives for the college. This matching process is a creative effort where innovative and bold thinking are encouraged.

If you think your college's approach to planning fits this definition, please answer the following questions 1-10. If your college's approach to planning does not fit this definition, please describe your planning process in the space provided in #12.
1. How long has your college been doing strategic planning? ____ years

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments

2. Has strategic planning greatly enhanced the accomplishments of college goals? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments

3. Is your college better off financially now than before strategic planning was implemented? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments

4. Do you believe that your college had adequate information about the external environment to make good planning decisions? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments

5. Do you believe that your college had adequate information about the internal environment to make good planning decisions? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments

6. Do you believe that your strategic plan resulted in a better "strategic fit" between the college and the external environment? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments
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7. Has the process of strategic planning been more or less beneficial to your college than the actual plan?
   More  Less

   Please explain: ________________________________

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments ____________________________

8. Would you say that your strategic planning was more "bottom-up" or more "top-down"?

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments ____________________________

9. Considering the past three years, briefly describe the major benefit(s) which have resulted from the strategic planning at your college.

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments ____________________________

10. What have been the major problem(s) you have experienced with the strategic planning process?

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments ____________________________

11. Please describe the role the President of the college played in the strategic planning process.

   Clear: Yes  No  Appropriate: Yes  No
   Expert's Comments ____________________________
Note: Respond to #12 only if you did not respond to #1-11

12. Describe the planning process at your college. Feel free to write on the back or attach additional page(s) as necessary.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Clear: Yes__ No__  Appropriate: Yes__ No__
Expert's Comments_______________________________________________________


........... ENDOF THE EVALUATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE...........


NOTE TO EXPERT EVALUATOR:
Please provide any additional commentary that you feel would be helpful in making this an improved questionnaire on the following page. You may also attach any form of commentary you desire.
THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THIS SURVEY.
PLEASE PLACE YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED,
STAMPED ENVELOPE AND RETURN TO:

Dennis P. McCarthy
204 Michigan Ave.
Sturgis, Michigan 49091

Phone: (616) 651-9146 HOME
467-9945 OFFICE

NOTE: This survey was based on an instrument developed by
John C. Ray (1987) for a doctoral dissertation at the
University of Houston.
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Appendix E

Permission Letters for Use of Strategic Planning Instruments
Mr. Dennis McCarthy
204 Michigan Avenue
Sturgis, MI 49091

Dear Dennis:

I am pleased that you will be doing your dissertation on strategic planning as it relates to institutional climate. The recent interest in outcomes and effectiveness has made strategic planning a very important topic for research. If I can assist you with any information as you begin your work, please do not hesitate to contact me.

As we discussed by telephone, you have permission to use the survey instrument which I developed for my dissertation. It is my understanding that you intend to modify some of the items and that is certainly permissible. I ask that you do note that the survey which you use is modified from mine. Beyond that, feel free to use the survey as you see fit in your work.

Best wishes as you begin research for your dissertation.

Sincerely,

John C. Ray
Vice President
dd

500 College Drive / Lake Jackson, Texas 77566 / (409) 265-6131
March 26, 1991

Dr. Mark Meredith
Management Information Exchange and Analysis
University of Colorado
Campus Box 15
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Dear Dr. Meredith,

When you responded to my request for evaluation of the draft of my Strategic Planning Questionnaire, you also sent me a copy of the questionnaire that you, Dr. Cope and Dr. Lenning developed for a study in 1987. I plan to use several questions from this questionnaire as part of my revised questionnaire. I have included with this mailing the revised version of my initial questionnaire which includes the questions I adopted from your study.

Would you please review my use of these questions and indicate your approval of my using these questions by signing below? As we discussed on the phone today, I will only need your approval and not that of Dr. Cope and Dr. Lenning.

Thank you for all your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dennis P. McCarthy

204 Michigan Avenue
Sturgis, Michigan 49091

I give Dennis P. McCarthy permission to use questions from the questionnaire developed by myself, Dr. Cope, and Dr. Lenning.

Signature Date
Appendix F

Strategic Planning at Michigan Community Colleges Survey
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

STRATEGIC PLANNING
AT
MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

About this project:

This instrument is part of a state-wide study on planning in Michigan community colleges. This study is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation on the extent of strategic planning and its effect on organizational climate. You are asked to help by completing this survey. I am seeking information about your perceptions of the overall planning process at your college rather than information about one particular department or division.

YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL!

Please complete the instrument at your earliest convenience. If possible, I would like to have it returned within ten days of when you receive it. It requires about 15 minutes to complete and should be both interesting and thought-provoking. If you have questions or comments, please contact me, Dennis McCarthy, at (616) 467-9945.

When completed, please return the survey instrument in the addressed, stamped envelope. If there is no envelope, please mail to:

Dennis McCarthy,
204 Michigan Avenue
Sturgis, MI 49091.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP!
THE PURPOSE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO IDENTIFY THE EXTENT OF COLLEGE-WIDE STRATEGIC PLANNING IN MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES. PLEASE READ THE PARAGRAPHS BELOW AND THEN ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW:

Strategic planning is a process of planning that impacts the overall organization. Conditions in the external environments are analyzed to identify opportunities, threats, and constraints to the college. The internal environment is analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the college. In addition to these analyses, organizational values are identified.

These conditions are matched to develop a "strategic vision" for the future which includes: the mission; clientele to be served; program and service mix; comparative advantages of the college over its competition; and the strategic goals for the college.

Alternative courses of action are formulated for achieving the strategic goals. The proper balance between encouraging individual entrepreneurship and consideration of institution-wide implications for actions is sought. Courses of action are selected. Resources are directed to help assure successful performance.

Results are evaluated to monitor the appropriateness of the courses of action chosen. Modifications to the strategies are made based on the success of the actions and based on changes that may have occurred since the plan was last adopted.

SECTION ONE: Planning at Your College

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Does your college currently, or has it recently, engage(d) in some form of strategic planning that would approximate the description given above?
   (Check one):  Yes  No  Not Sure
   If your answer is Yes or Not Sure, please go on to Section Two at the bottom of page 3.
   If your answer is No, please answer 2-5 below.

2. If your answer to #1 is No, please check the appropriate box below:
   To the best of my knowledge, this college (Please check one box only).
   ☐ does not feel the necessity to engage in strategic planning.
   ☐ has not considered the possibility of using strategic planning.
   ☐ considered engaging in strategic planning, but rejected actual implementation.
   ☐ engaged in strategic planning some time ago, but no longer does it.
   ☐ other (please specify):_____________________________________________

Continued on the next page...
Strategic Planning at Your College (continued)

3. If your answer to #1 is No, please give the general reasons for your college not engaging in strategic planning...
   (Please check all that apply)
   - previous efforts of this kind were not successful or beneficial.
   - it was too costly and time-consuming, versus the possible benefits.
   - the tools and techniques are available, but seem too ambiguous.
   - the college does not possess the necessary tools and techniques.
   - the college has such a specialized mission that strategic planning is not required.
   - other (please specify): ____________________________________________

4. If your answer to #1 is No, identify which of the following college-wide planning processes you now have:
   - our focus is on annual, year-to-year, incremental planning.
   - our planning is done within the context of a traditional long-range plan (a blueprint or map of the future looking say, 3 to 10 years out).
   - the college has no formal planning process
   - other (please specify): ____________________________________________

5. If your answer to #1 is No, please provide the name and address of the responsible/knowledgeable individual to whom further queries (or follow-up) on this topic may be directed.
   Name: ___________________________ Title: ____________________________
   Address: _________________________________________________________
   Telephone: _________________________________________________________

IF YOU RESPONDED NO TO ITEM 1, YOU NEED NOT GO FURTHER WITH YOUR RESPONSES. PLEASE RETURN IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

***************************

IF YOU RESPONDED YES OR NOT SURE TO ITEM 1, PLEASE GO ON WITH SECTION TWO......

SECTION TWO: Strategic Planning Process Characteristics

Please respond to items 1-25 by circling the number to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the statements about college-wide strategic planning pertain to your college.

If you would like to clarify your responses, please do so immediately below the item statement or on a separate sheet.

Continued on the next page...
### Strategic Planning Process Characteristics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At our college...</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A clear statement of the purpose of our planning effort was communicated in writing prior to the beginning of the process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. External trends and events were forecast to estimate their potential effect on the future of the college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. External opportunities and threats to the college were identified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strengths and weaknesses within the college were systematically assessed to estimate their effects on the future of the college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional values were identified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The culture of the organization was analyzed to determine its appropriateness to the future needs of the college.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The college's mission was reviewed and clarified in terms of “What business we are in.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The various clientele (or target audiences) of the college were clearly identified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The “comparative advantages” of the college over its competition were identified (Comparative advantages are examples of where your college is perceived by your clientele to be the better alternative for programs and services than other competing organizations).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Goals were identified to take the college from its present situation to a desired future state.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Alternative courses of action for reaching the goals were considered before actions were decided upon.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Our planning process had the right balance for our institution between stimulating individual entrepreneurship and consideration of institution-wide concerns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Central to our plan was a clear and compelling vision of what the college is to become.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At our college...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Academic programs and services were assessed based on such factors as cost, quality, and demand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Decisions were made as to which new programs and services would be added based on the needs of the students and the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Decisions were made as to which programs and services would be reduced or eliminated based on the needs of the students and the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Both departmental and campus-wide strategic plans were developed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Adequate resources were provided to implement the strategic decisions in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. During the strategic planning process, concern for &quot;doing the right thing&quot; in the future was more important than &quot;doing things right.&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The achievement of our college goals was greatly enhanced through strategic planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The college is better off financially now than when it began strategic planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A better &quot;strategic fit&quot; has resulted between the college and the external environment (&quot;strategic fit&quot; occurs when the programs and services of the college match the wants and needs of the college's constituency).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Following implementation of strategic decisions, reviews and evaluations were carried out to ensure that decisions and goals were met and were appropriate, with modifications as necessary.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The community has a better understanding of the purposes of the college as a result of strategic planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Environmental scanning is done regularly to assess trends and changes in the social, demographic, technological, economic, and political influences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION THREE: EXEMPLARY COLLEGES

From your knowledge of Michigan community colleges, please list five that you believe plan effectively. The five should be listed in descending order where #1=most effective, #2=second most effective, etc. You may include your own college.

#1 ___________________________________________________________

#2 ___________________________________________________________

#3 ___________________________________________________________

#4 ___________________________________________________________

#5 ___________________________________________________________

SECTION FOUR: General Information

1. Does your college have an individual, other than your chief executive officer, who has college-wide strategic planning as a major functional responsibility?   Yes  No

   If Yes, answer #2 and #3; if No, please go on to #4.

2. What is the individual's title? ____________________________________________________

3. To whom does this individual report? (give title):____________________________________

WITH REGARDS TO COLLEGE-WIDE STRATEGIC PLANNING....

4. What is the title of the person who has the primary responsibility for:
   A. Initiating the planning _________________________________________________
   B. Developing the plan __________________________________________________
   C. Implementing the plan ________________________________________________
   D. Evaluating the plan _________________________________________________

5. Did an outside consultant with expertise in planning help in developing your planning process?   Yes  No  Not Sure

6. How long has your college engaged in strategic planning?  Year(s)  Not Sure

7. Did your planning raise "false hopes" about gaining the resources and support necessary for implementing new programs and ideas?   Yes  No  Not Sure

Continued on the next page....
8. Does (did) your college have a "core planning committee?" (By this is meant, is there a designated group of people whose responsibility it is (was) to finalize and recommend strategy to the President and/or Board of Trustees?)
   ____Yes  ____No

9. If #8 is Yes, does (did) this committee include representatives from:
   (Check all that apply) (estimate what percent of the committee)
   ____Faculty.................................................................................................... %
   ____Administration........................................................................................ %
   ____Support staff.......................................................................................... %
   ____Students................................................................................................. %
   ____Board of Trustees................................................................................... %
   ____Community at-large................................................................................ %
   ____Other ..................................................................................................... %
   TOTAL 100%

10. Were there opportunities for community groups or individuals to be involved in developing the strategic plan?
    ____Yes  ____No  ____Not Sure

11. Were there opportunities for the Board of Trustees to be involved in developing the plan (prior to formal adoption)?
    ____Yes  ____No  ____Not Sure

12. Would you say that your strategic planning is more "bottom-up" or more "top-down"?
    ("Bottom-up" means that information flows primarily from the lower levels of the college hierarchy to the top levels and helps serve as the guide for decision-making. "Top-down" means that decisions are made at the top of the hierarchy, with little or no input from the lower levels and are passed down through successive layers as a guide for action).
    ____More of the "top-down" process.
    ____More of the "bottom-up" process.
    ____A fairly equal balance of "top-down" and "bottom-up" processes.

13. Did your college most recently engage in strategic planning...
    ____to avoid an impending crisis  ____to improve an already good situation
    ____to correct an existing crisis  ____other
    ____to maintain the status quo

14. Please briefly describe the major benefits of strategic planning at your college.

    Continued on the last page...
15. Please briefly describe the major problems with strategic planning at your college.

16. What role did (does) your college President play in college-wide strategic planning?

OPTIONAL:
Please provide any additional commentary that you believe would be helpful to me in understanding your college's strategic planning efforts (Note: You may prefer to make your comments on a separate sheet and return with the survey):

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. ALL RESPONSES AND MATERIALS PROVIDED WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL!

PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

Name of Person completing this survey: ________________________________
Title: ________________________________ Phone: ________________________________

IF THERE IS NO ENVELOPE, PLEASE MAIL TO:
DENNIS P. MC CARTHY
204 MICHIGAN AVE
STURGIS, MI 49091

Note: The model of strategic planning used in this study is based on the model of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems - (NCHEMS). Portions of this instrument were based on the questionnaire developed to identify bona fide strategic planning in a 1987 study by Mark Meredith, Oscar Lenning, and Robert Cope. The results of the study were reported at the Association for Institutional Research Forum's May 15-18, 1988, meeting in Phoenix, AZ. Portions were also based on a questionnaire developed for a doctoral dissertation by John C. Ray at the University of Houston in 1987.
Appendix G

The Work Environment Scale (WES) Questionnaire: Sample Items
SAMPLE ITEMS FOR THE
WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE
REAL FORM

by Paul M. Insel and Rudolf H. Moos

Directions: These statements are about the place in which you work. The statements are intended to apply to all work environments. However, some words may not be quite suitable for your work environment. For example, the terms "supervisor" is meant to refer to the boss, manager, department head, or the person or persons to whom an employee reports. You are to decide which statements are true of your work environment and which are false.

Involvement Scale
1. The work is really challenging.

Peer Cohesion
2. People go out of their way to help a new employee feel comfortable.

Task Orientation
5. People pay a lot of attention to getting work done.

Work Pressure
6. There is constant pressure to keep working.

Control
8. There's a strict emphasis on following policies and regulations.

Innovation
9. Doing things in a different way is valued.

Supervisor Support
13. Supervisors usually compliment an employee who does something well.

Autonomy
14. Employees have a great deal of freedom to do as they like.

Clarity
17. Activities are well-planned.

Physical Comfort
20. The lighting is extremely good.

From Work Environment Scale by Paul M. Insel and Rudolf H. Moos. Copyright 1974 by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. Further reproduction is prohibited without the Publisher's written consent.

You may change the format of these items to fit your needs, but the wording may not be altered. Please do not present these items to your readers as any kind of "mini-test," but rather as an illustrative sample of items from this instrument. We have provided these items as samples so that we may maintain control over which items appear in published media. This avoids an entire instrument appearing at once or in segments which may be pieced together to form a working instrument, protecting the validity and reliability of the test.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Appendix H

Transmittal Letter to Michigan College Presidents
and Next-in-Charge When it Comes to
Strategic Planning
Dear

I am a doctoral candidate at Western Michigan University in Educational Leadership. I am conducting a study designed to measure the extent of strategic planning in Michigan community colleges and its impact on organizational climate.

The purpose of the enclosed questionnaire is to gather data on strategic planning. The questionnaire is an important part of my dissertation and I would appreciate it if you would respond. It has taken about 12 to 15 minutes for a pilot study group to complete the survey.

Your response will be kept strictly confidential. Neither individual respondents nor colleges will be identifiable in the report on the results of the study. Your questionnaire is coded to insure for confidentiality. Only I will know the identity of each respondent.

If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact me at (616) 467-9945 (office) or (616) 651-9146 (residence).

I appreciate your assistance in providing me with this important information.

Sincerely,

Dennis P. McCarthy

Enclosure: Strategic Planning Survey
Return Envelope
Appendix I

Names for Expert Validation of Strategic Planning Survey
NAMES FOR EXPERT VALIDATION

of

STRATEGIC PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. Gunder A. Myran, President
Washtenaw Community College
4800 E. Huron River Dr.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
Ph: (313) 973-3300

Author, editor, and practitioner.
President of a community college that has a long history of strategic planning.

Dr. Robert G. Cope
Miller Hall
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195
(Ph: (313) 232-6287

Author, researcher, and theorist.
Strategic planning in colleges. Associate Professor.

Dr. Robert C. Shirley
Univ. of Southern Colorado
2200 Bonforte Blvd.
Pueblo, Colorado 81001-4901
Ph: (303) 549-2306

Author, consultant, and practitioner. President of a college. A long background as a planner.

Dr. George Keller
Univ. of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216

Author and theorist. Strategic planning in colleges. Senior Fellow.

Dr. Robert Lisensky
NCHEMS Mgmt. Services, Inc.
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder Colorado 80302
Ph: (303) 497-0345

Author and practitioner.
Strategic planning in colleges. President of NCHEMS.

Dr. Raymond M. Haas
University of Virginia
The Rotunda
Charlottesville, VA 22903
Ph: (804) 497-0345

Author, consultant, and practitioner well grounded in theory.

Dr. Patrick Terenzini
Center for the Study of Higher Ed.
Pennsylvania State Univ.
403 S. Allen St.
University Park, PA 16801-5202

Author, former professor.
Director of institutional research. Won award for excellence in the theory and practice of planning from the Society for College and University Planning.
Dr. Mark Meredith  
Management Info. Exchange and Analysis  
University of Colorado  
Campus Box 15  
Boulder, Colorado 80309  
Ph: (303) 492-8632

Author, researcher, and practitioner. Strategic planning in colleges. Director of management, exchange & analysis.

Dr. David Dill  
University of North Carolina  
02 S. Bldg.  
CB 9100  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9100  
Ph: (919) 962-1365

Author and practitioner. Associate editor of Planning for Higher Education. Assistant to the Chancellor for Planning.

Dr. Adelbert Purga  
Brevard Community College  
1519 Clear Lake Road  
Cocoa, FL 32922  
Ph: (407) 632-1111

Author and practitioner. Former president of the National Council for Research and Planning, an AACJC affiliate.

Dr. Gregory Lozier  
Pennsylvania State University  
405 Old Main  
University Park, PA 16802  
Ph: (814) 865-0405

Executive director of planning and analysis. Author and practitioner.

Dr. James L. Morrison  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9100  
Ph: (919) 962-1365

Author and theorist. Strategic planning in colleges. Professor of education.

Dr. Toby Milton  
Essex Community College  
7201 Rossville Rd.  
Baltimore, MD 21237  
Ph: (301) 682-6000

Author, researcher and practitioner; Strategic planning in community colleges. Director of institutional studies and analysis.

Tom Mecca  
Piedmont Technical College  
Emerald Rd., P.O. Drawer 1467  
Greenwood, SC 29648-1467  
Ph: (803) 223-9351

Author and researcher; Strategic planning in community colleges. Vice-president for planning and development.

Dr. Marvin W. Peterson  
Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259  
Ph: (313) 764-5520

Author and theorist; Strategic planning in colleges. Director of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education.
Appendix J

Doctoral Dissertation Proposal Abstract Sent to Experts on Strategic Planning
The purpose of the dissertation is to determine the extent of strategic planning in the Michigan community colleges are perceived by Michigan community college presidents. Additionally, the impact of strategic planning on the work climate of the colleges will be determined.

An instrument will be developed to determine which elements of strategic planning are present. The strategic planning model of the National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems (NCHEMS) will serve as the guide for the questionnaire construction. The work climate will be measured using the Work Environment Scale (WES) developed by Rudolf Moos and Paul Insel of the Social Ecology Laboratory of Stanford University.

The population for the strategic planning survey will be all Michigan community colleges. Each president of the 29 community colleges will receive the strategic planning survey. Colleges will then be ranked on the extent of strategic planning. Ranking will be determined by the summation of scores for each college of Part Two, Part Three, and Part Four of the questionnaire. Two colleges from the top third of the rankings and two colleges from the bottom third will then be selected in order to compare the climates of high and low
ranking colleges. Administrators of the selected colleges will be surveyed on their perceptions of the work climate of the organization using the WES as the instrument. The differences in selected psychometric climate measures that relate to strategic planning will then be compared to determine if there are differences in the climates of the colleges in the top third compared to those in the bottom third.
1. **Mission** is "the basic purpose of an organization, that is, what it is trying to accomplish" (Kotler & Murphy, 1981, p. 478).

2. **Organizational Climate** is the "relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants (b) influences their behavior (c) can be explained in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the environment" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 25). Climate can be measured through the perceptions of those who experience the climate or who observe it.

3. **Organizational Culture** is the "norms that inform people what is acceptable and what is not, the dominant values that the organization cherishes above others, the basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of the organization, the rules of the game that must be observed if one is to get along and be accepted as a member, the philosophy that guides the organization in dealing with its employees and its clients" (Owens, 1987, pp. 29-30).

4. **Strategic Fit** occurs when the programs and services of the college match the wants and needs of the college's constituency.

5. **Strategic Issues** are "fundamental policy choices facing the organization concerning its mandates, mission, and product or service level mix; clients; customers or users; cost; financing; organization; or management" (Bryson, 1989, pp. 161-162).

6. **Strategic Planning** is a highly participatory process where the conditions in the external and the internal environment of the organization are analyzed. The external environment is analyzed for the purpose of identifying opportunities, threats, and constraints to the organization. The internal environment is analyzed to identify the strengths and weakness of the organization. In addition to these analyses, the values of the organization are identified. These analyses are matched to develop a strategic vision of the future of the organization which includes: The mission, the clientele to be served, the program and service mix, the comparative advantages, and the strategic objectives for the organization. This matching process is a creative effort where innovative and bold thinking are encouraged (Shirley, 1990).

7. A **Value** is "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5).
8. Vision is a "mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization . . . (which) articulates a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than that what now exists. . . . a target that beckons" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 89).
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