LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SELF-STUDY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Lehigh University is a highly selective, comprehensive university located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The university offers more than 70 majors in four colleges. Lehigh has a Carnegie classification of a "Research II University." In the 1997 U.S. News ranking of national universities, we ranked 34th in terms of quality and price and 26th on the list of the top 50 "Best Values."

Lehigh combines the power of a large research university with the heart of a small liberal-arts college. Lehigh's 397 faculty members are active scholars and dedicated teachers. Ninety-nine percent of these faculty members hold terminal degrees in their fields. Our graduate programs are highly rated with five departments in the top 30 nationally and six more in the top 100. Lehigh's educational excellence is complemented by its wooded 1,600 acre campus, described in The Fiske Guide to Colleges as "stunning."

Lehigh's diversified and innovative academic offerings combined with its competitive financial aid package make it especially attractive to students. Lehigh enrolls 4,483 undergraduates, with 45 percent in the College of Arts and Sciences, 31 percent in the College of Engineering and Applied Science, and 24 percent in the College of Business and Economics. There are 1,833 graduate students enrolled at the university, with 27 percent in the College of Engineering and Applied Science, 25 percent in the College of Arts and Sciences, 25 percent in our graduate-only College of Education, and 22 percent in the College of Business and Economics.

Although many universities and colleges are struggling financially, Lehigh is doing well both in endowment growth and balancing its budget. Lehigh's endowment fund now exceeds $500 million. The university recently completed a $300 million fund raising campaign ahead of schedule and over $12 million above the original goal.

Successful fund-raising efforts supported substantial facilities growth including the Rauch Business Center, the Goodman Stadium, the $27-million Zoellner Arts Center, among others, including some major renovations in the last ten years.

The Self-Study

The self-study report describes the implementation of strategic planning, including the translation of the goals and missions of the university into everyday operations and the development of an annual Operating Plan. A 15-member steering committee, including faculty, students, and staff, collected data during the spring of 1997. Over seventy-five interviews and focus groups were conducted across all operating units of the university. Questions focused on three areas: a description of the strategic planning processes, how units evaluate and assess performance, and recommendations for change.
Recommendations for Change

Four general recommendations for change came out of our discussions across the university. Many specific suggestions for implementing these general recommendations are contained in the self-study reports on individual operating units.

The first and most often articulated recommendation is that more feedback needs to be provided to individuals writing departmental annual reports. Individuals wanted a better sense of how the annual reports were used in the overall planning processes at the university.

Correlated with the first recommendation was a call for more involvement of faculty and staff in the process of strategic planning and its implementation. Individuals wanted to know more about the roles played by planning groups and wanted more feedback about anticipated end results. Faculty and staff called for a more inclusive planning process at all levels of the university.

The third group of recommendations called for the development of more specific and realistic goals that are connected more tightly to the university budget. Faculty and staff had reservations about the university-wide planning documents, indicating that they were too broad and too vague. They wanted to see more realistic budgets with tighter links to the goals and objectives as well as holding people accountable for the goals they set.

Finally, it was suggested that the planning process be more proactive and less reactive. There was a concern that too many planning efforts were doomed when budget crises appeared and planning began anew.

Several changes in the administration at the upper levels occurred between June 1 and October 1, 1997, including an interim president and a new provost joining the university that summer. With these changes in leadership, several changes in the decision-making processes were made, beginning with the modification of the university's budget process in the fall of 1997. Thus, while the description of the decision making process in this self-study report no longer applies, the members of the steering committee who wrote this report are pleased that their efforts already have been used to effect change.
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PREFACE
January 1, 1998

The 15-member Middle States Steering Committee first met at Lehigh University in the spring of 1996. Over the course of the next year, members of the steering committee conducted over 75 interviews and focus groups across the campus to document the implementation of strategic planning at the university.

Since data collection for this report began, the campus has seen many changes, including substantial turnover in the university's leadership. These changes are recorded in this report. While the university is not the same place it was when data collection was initiated, we believe that the Middle States accreditation process presents us with an opportunity to understand our past -- both its successes and its shortcomings -- as we move toward the future.

In early October 1997, a draft of this self-study was made available to the campus. We sent copies of the report to all department heads on campus, created a web page with electronic access to the report, published sections of the report in a series of articles in the campus newspaper, placed an advertisement in the student newspaper, sent a flyer to all faculty and staff, and drawings were held for students, faculty, and staff who commented on the draft of the self-study. A draft of the self-study report was sent to anyone requesting it, and the web site, which contained a copy of the self-study, had 150 'hits.'

We asked members of the university community to read this report with two purposes in mind. First, we asked that any errors in our description of the processes of strategic planning and implementation be brought to our attention so that we could investigate them and change the report accordingly. Second, we asked the campus community to read the report with the sense of future possibilities including revisions or additions to the recommendations for strategic planning and implementation contained herein.

Thirty-four faculty, staff, and students responded to this self-study. The Middle States Steering Committee reviewed these suggestions for inclusion in our final report and recorded the comments in a separate log that will be given to the Evaluation Team for their review. These comments are interspersed throughout the document in abbreviated form, highlighted in italics. In general, these readers believed that this document reflects the process of strategic planning and implementation at Lehigh during the Spring of 1997. Some individuals felt that this document did not fully express
the magnitude of discontent with strategic planning at that time or the disconnection they, as individuals, felt. Their full responses are included in the log.

We updated and revised the earlier draft of this self-study to include the comments from the 34 readers. In addition, we have added a brief conclusion that summarizes the changes in the implementation of strategic planning on campus; these changes are already underway in response to this self-study. In summary, we are pleased with the results of our efforts. We have listened to individuals across campus and recorded their descriptions of the implementation of strategic planning as well as their concerns and recommendations for the future. We hope this document will be used to make Lehigh University stronger and more cohesive as it plans for its future.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Profile of Lehigh University

Lehigh is a highly selective, comprehensive university located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The university offers more than 70 majors in arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, business, education, and engineering; and has a Carnegie classification of a “Research II University.” Lehigh has risen from 51st in 1990 to 32nd in 1996 in the U.S. News ranking of national universities; its 1997 ranking is 34th. Since 1994, when U.S. News introduced its ranking of colleges in terms of quality and price, Lehigh University has risen from 31st to 26th on the list of the top 50 “Best Values.” In 1997, our retention and graduation rank was 26th, and Lehigh ranked second in alumni giving among national universities. Our graduate programs are highly rated, with five departments in the top 30 nationally and six more in the top 100.

The vision of Asa Packer remains as clear and true today as when he founded the university in 1865. Packer, an industrial pioneer, entrepreneur, and philanthropist, recognized the need for citizens who were broadly educated in the liberal arts and sciences -- young people who could combine practical skills with theory, judgment, reasoning, and self-discipline. In preparing students for their lives and careers in the 21st century, Lehigh emphasizes critical thinking, communications for life, global and cultural awareness, technological competence, full competence in a discipline, and lifelong learning.

From our faculty to our campus facilities, Lehigh combines the power of a large research university with the heart of a small liberal-arts college. Lehigh’s 397 faculty members are active scholars and dedicated teachers, 84 percent of whom are tenured. Fifty-one percent of these faculty hold the position of Professor, 34 percent are Associate Professors, 11 percent are Assistant Professors, and 3 percent are Instructors or Lecturers. Ninety-nine percent of these faculty members hold terminal degrees in their fields. Of these faculty, 53 percent are in the College of Arts and Sciences, 13 percent in the College of Business and Economics, 6 percent in the College of Education, and 28 percent in the College of Engineering and Applied Science. Twenty-one percent of Lehigh’s faculty are women. The majority of the faculty are Caucasian, with Asians (7.5%), African Americans (3%) and Hispanics (1.8%) representing 12.3%. Lehigh’s faculty hold degrees from a variety of universities. Eight percent of Lehigh’s faculty members graduated from Lehigh, with between 3 to 4 percent graduating from each of the following: University of Pennsylvania, Stanford
Lehigh enrolls 4,483 undergraduates, 45 percent of whom are in the College of Arts and Sciences, 31 percent in the College of Engineering and Applied Science, and 24 percent in the College of Business and Economics. Thirty-nine percent of these students are women. Caucasians are 77 percent of the undergraduate population, with 3 percent African American, 2 percent Hispanic, 5 percent Asian, and 8 percent of other or unknown ethnic origin. Ninety-eight percent of Lehigh's undergraduates are enrolled as full-time students. Almost all undergraduates at Lehigh are of traditional college age, from 18 to 22 years old (99% are 24 or younger). These undergraduate students come primarily from New York and New Jersey (38%) and Pennsylvania (30%), with just over 8 percent from other countries.

Lehigh's academic programs, strong faculty, and a student-faculty ratio of 11-to-1 combined with its competitive financial aid packages make it especially attractive to students. In 1997, the average SAT score for incoming students was 1224. Lehigh's students rely primarily on need-based financial aid, which is currently received by about 45 percent of the freshman class. An additional 10 percent of this year's first-year students received scholarships based solely on merit, including music, vocal and theater scholarships. In 1996-97, Lehigh provided more than $26 million in grants and scholarships.

Surveys of Lehigh's 1990 undergraduate graduating class, conducted in the fall of 1990 and the fall of 1995 by the Pennsylvania Independent College and University Research Center, found Lehigh graduates were overwhelmingly satisfied with their undergraduate experiences, with 46 percent saying they were very satisfied and another 47 percent indicating that they were satisfied. Seventy-six percent of the students surveyed had recommended Lehigh to someone else in the 1995 follow-up survey. Eighty-five percent of these 1990 graduates were employed, with a median income of $37,500. Of these graduates, 31 percent had completed an additional degree after graduating from Lehigh.

There are 1,833 graduate students enrolled at Lehigh, with 24.6 percent in the College of Arts and Sciences, 22 percent in the College of Business and Economics, 24.8 percent in our graduate-only College of Education, and 28.5 percent in the College of Engineering and Applied Science. These students are primarily Pennsylvania residents (80%), with 17 percent coming from other countries. Forty-three percent of Lehigh's graduate students are Caucasian, with 1 percent African American, 1 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Asian, and 35 percent other or unknown. Forty-one percent of our graduate students are women. Students range in age from 20 to over 65, with the majority of full-time graduate students between the ages of 20 to 29.

With half of Lehigh's faculty and 45 percent of the declared undergraduate majors, the College of Arts and Sciences is the university's largest college. The college
provides instruction in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences to all Lehigh undergraduates, and was 42 undergraduate majors and 60 minors for its own students. The new Zoeller Arts Center increases opportunities for students participating in theater and musical productions and provides a world-class facility that includes a stunning art exhibition and a professional music and theater venue for the campus and local community.

The College of Business and Economics, accredited since 1938, offers degree programs that develop entry-level skills plus broader intellectual capacities that enable graduates to thrive during lifetimes of dramatic change in the business environment. Its curriculum and research and educational centers offer many opportunities for experiential learning with both professors and business leaders. The 115,000 square-foot Rauch Business Center, which opened in 1990, provides a dynamic setting for learning for the College of Business and Economics. Graduates are especially prominent in the fields of finance and public accounting. The college also offers a predominately part-time MBA program that enrolls almost 400 students and a much smaller Ph.D. program in Economics.

The College of Education employs nationally recognized faculty who help educators make a difference. It includes nationally recognized programs in school psychology, special education, and counseling psychology, as well as more regionally recognized programs in leadership, educational technology, and teacher preparation. Associated with the college is the Centennial School, a state-approved private school for children with serious emotional disturbances and/or developmental disabilities. The College of Education houses a National Center for Partnership Development, a training collaboration of Lehigh's Iacocca Institute, and Communities in Schools, Inc., the nation's largest dropout-prevention program. The college also has a relationship with the Discovery Center, a hands-on museum designed to excite children about math and science.

A 130-year tradition of excellence continues in Lehigh's College of Engineering and Applied Science, which features accredited degree programs in eight engineering and science disciplines. Its 115 faculty members are engaged in both undergraduate teaching and cutting-edge research. The college provides an education designed to achieve technical proficiency along with an understanding of social values and the impact of technology on society. World-class facilities and programs include the NSF-funded ATLSS (Advanced Technology for Large Structural Systems) Center, the Electron Microscopy Laboratory, the Materials Research Center, the Manufacturing Logistics Institute, and other programs.

Lehigh's educational excellence is complemented by its wooded 1,600 acre campus, described in The Fiske Guide to Colleges as "stunning." The campus provides a wonderful combination of an idyllic late-1800s quad with modern state-of-the-art structures. Buildings range from the 1865 Christmas-Saucon Hall to our new Zoeller Arts Center, which officially opened in 1997.
In addition to an attractive campus, Lehigh provides a wealth of campus-based programming and student activities, including a strong athletic program. Lehigh belongs to the Patriot Athletic League and offers 23 intercollegiate varsity athletic programs for men and women. Lehigh provides athletic scholarships only in wrestling, which is a non-Patriot League sport. There are more than 120 student clubs and associations on campus, not including the 29 fraternities and seven sororities in residence on campus. Lehigh regularly hosts nationally known speakers including the following in the last year alone: Ellen Goodman, Lee Iacocca, James Earl Jones, Tom Kean, Jonathan Kozol, Andrei Kozyrev, Benoît Mandelbrot, George McGovern, Colin Powell, Marilyn and Dan Quayle, Adrienne Rich, and Alice Walker.
Assessing Accomplishments Since Last Accreditation

In the 10 years since Lehigh's last Middle States accreditation review, the university experienced many significant changes, including the strengthening of its financial base, improvements in the campus facilities, further solidification of the academic experiences for students, and many changes that lead to a better residential environment.

Although many universities and colleges are struggling financially, Lehigh is doing well both in endowment growth and balancing its budget. Over the past ten years, the market value of Lehigh's endowment fund has increased by more than $300 million and now exceeds $500 million. In addition, the university recently completed its $300 million Campaign for Preserving the Vision six months ahead of schedule and over $12 million over the original goal. The Campaign for Preserving the Vision provided support for undergraduate financial aid as well as building projects. Lehigh University maintains the discipline of always balancing its budget, a tradition that sometimes puts strains on the university to meet expenditures, but which ultimately means that the university is in solid financial health.

Successful fund-raising efforts supported substantial facilities growth in the last 10 years, including the Rauch Business Center, the Goodman Stadium, the opening of the $27-million Zoellner Arts Center, an indoor tennis center, the construction of the Ulrich Student Center, as well as major renovations to Taylor Gym, Drown Hall, and the University Center. The Zoellner Arts Center celebrated its opening in September 1997 with an inaugural event featuring a rare road appearance by the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. This inaugural event raised almost an additional $1 million, which will be used to support the program operations of the center for the inaugural year. These fund-raising efforts are especially significant because they follow the purchase of the Mountaintop Campus in 1986, which added 740 acres and five additional buildings to the Lehigh campus.

These new facilities are complimented by ongoing improvements to the campus. Major upgrades in classrooms have continued, including furniture replacement and the addition of new technological systems. Residential life on campus changed as fraternities on campus underwent major code upgrades to improve safety. The first permanent sorority was installed on "the Hill" (the area where fraternities are located on campus), and construction has begun on an apartment complex (three apartment buildings and a community recreation building) that will house 150 students in single bedrooms on the Hill. The beauty of existing campus structures has been highlighted by the addition of plazas, walkways, lighting, and outdoor seating areas where faculty and students can now sit, relax, and interact.
Lehigh also made significant changes to its academic curriculum, undergraduate experience, and academic support structures. Lehigh has diversified its academic offerings. Well before enrollments in engineering began to decline in the mid-1980s, Lehigh began to promote its Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Business and Economics. While enrollment in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences and College of Business and Economics remain strong, the College of Arts and Sciences now enrolls nearly half of Lehigh’s undergraduate students and one third of all students in the university.

Lehigh has expanded the opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in research and real-world experiences. A new program of Integrated Learning Experience (ILE) courses bring students and faculty together from across the university’s four colleges to solve real-world problems in consultation with corporations and other organizations. One example of such courses is the Integrated Product Development Program. In this program, students from engineering, business, and the fine arts work together in teams to develop technical and financial feasibility studies of new products. Students then design, build, fabricate, and test these new products. One example of these industry-sponsored projects is a new motorized adjustable table for the Knoll Group, a furniture manufacturer in Pennsburg, Pennsylvania. Other sponsors of Integrated Product Development projects include Lucent Technologies, Lutron, Exxon, Chrysler, and Black and Decker. Another ILE course to be taught next spring examines issues and strategies relating to online journalism. Students from design, computer science, marketing, journalism, and communication will work together to design web sites as they explore the broad social and cultural implications of online journalism.

In support of the university’s Mission Statement to prepare students to be future leaders in our global society, Lehigh has increased the opportunities for students to have international experiences. We now have in place an International Plan 2000. Over 200 students go abroad to study for Lehigh credit each year. In addition, an international ILE program will be in place by fall 1998. This interdisciplinary course is designed to study the tropical rain forest, including the environmental, political, economic, and engineering aspects of the dwindling rain forest. Faculty from the three undergraduate colleges are involved in planning this course, which will take place in Costa Rica.

In an effort to attract and retain the best undergraduate students, Lehigh now offers a President’s Scholars Program in which top undergraduate students can receive a fifth year of courses tuition-free and earn a second bachelor’s degree or a master’s degree. Almost 100 students have taken advantage of this opportunity since it was first introduced in January 1995.

Lehigh has made a concerted effort to control tuition increases and, at the same time, to provide access to all who are academically qualified. The 1997 tuition increase
of 4.1 percent was the lowest percentage tuition increase in 27 years. Today, more than half of Lehigh's students receive financial aid, with the average financial aid package covering two-thirds of a student's educational costs.

Information Resources at Lehigh University continues to apply the latest in innovative technology to improve the learning environment. Lehigh was one of the first universities in the nation to provide Ethernet connections to every student in every university-owned residence and to provide a high-quality personal assistance program to support this program. In 1997, Lehigh became a charter member of the national Internet 2 project, which will bring super-high speed capacity for data transmission necessary for today's research and tomorrow's instructional delivery programs.

Within the last year, Lehigh's libraries, which have long provided a very rich array of electronic information sources, vastly expanded this collection and made all information sources accessible through a unified, Web-based interface. Lehigh also played an essential role in the formation of a grassroots statewide library consortium, the Pennsylvania Academic Library Connection Initiative (PALCI). During the fall 1997 semester, Lehigh will serve as a test site for the new PALCI statewide system that will enable faculty and students to borrow library materials directly from any of the 38 members. This will be the most extensive installation in the country to merge multiple library systems into one using the library standard protocol.

In the realm of student life, Lehigh's Residential Environment Report examined living conditions on the Lehigh campus and included recommendations for creating a residential environment that focused more on academics and nonalcoholic social programs, including a recommendation to integrate the housing on the Hill with sororities and a dormitory. This report was the result of considerable collaboration across the campus community and included input from students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, trustees, and local residents. As suggested in the Residential Environment Report, plans are underway for a campus pub to provide a social alternative to fraternity parties.
Self-Study Goals and Procedures

Lehigh University chose to conduct a selected-topics approach to its self-study. In its last self-study in 1988, Lehigh presented its planning process to a group of attendees from other institutions, as well as to a Middle States evaluation team. In the ten years hence, Lehigh’s planning process has continued to evolve. Lehigh recognized that this planning process is not yet perfect, and saw the Middle States accreditation as an opportunity to improve strategic planning and its implementation. While any process can be improved, the growth and changes documented in the first chapter of this report testify to the relative success of Lehigh’s strategic planning. Lehigh is experiencing the end of an era with the departure of President Likins and the successful completion of a major $300 million development campaign. Thus, while identifying its successes, this document provides the campus community with an opportunity to reassess its processes and consider changes to improve strategic planning and implementation.

This report describes the implementation of strategic planning across all operating units of the university, including the translation of the goals and mission of the university into everyday operations and the processes for developing the annual Operating Plans. The history behind the development of the planning process is summarized in the next chapter of this report. Changes in this planning process as President Likins departs and Interim President William Hittinger and Provost Nelson Markley begin the 1997-98 academic year also are documented in later chapters.

In this section, we provide an overview of the procedures used to collect data for this report and the processes employed to communicate with the campus community. A more detailed description of data collection is included in the Design for Middle States Self-Study dated April 18, 1997.

Organizational structure of the self-study. A 15-member Steering Committee1 was responsible for collecting data for this study. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by Patti T. Ota, interim provost and vice provost for Academic Affairs at the time of data collection, and Joan Z. Spade, associate professor, Sociology. Joan Spade was on administrative release time during the spring 1997 semester and assisted with the data collection. Ron Yoshida, dean of the College of Education, assisted in the writing of this report but did not participate in data collection.

For the purpose of data collection, the operating units of the university were organized into eight categories. Steering Committee members were assigned to collect

---

1 Two persons left Lehigh University and the Steering Committee, one during the data collection and the other immediately after the data collection process was completed. Both individuals were replaced to maintain committee membership at 15.
data from these units and the Board of Trustees. Steering Committee assignments were as follows:

College of Arts & Sciences

College of Business & Economics
College of Engineering and Applied Sciences
College of Education, Information Resources
Academic Administration and
Enrollment Management
Athletics and Student Life
Development and University Relations,
Public Affairs, and Alumni Relations
Finance and Administration
Board of Trustees

Vincent Munley and Ruben Huerta-Ochoa
Henry Odi and Eunice Santos
Michael Nagel\(^2\) and Alexis Cohen
James Tiefenbrunn and Ali Richardson
Louis Martin-Vega and Patricia Newhart
George DuPaul
James Schmotter\(^3\)
Agnes Moroney and Joan Spade
Patti Ota and Joan Spade

The data collection process. This self-study examines the process by which Lehigh has implemented its strategic planning efforts across all aspects of the university's operations and all features of its services. As such, individuals across the campus were interviewed to describe the strategic planning process and its implementation in their particular operating units. As this process was viewed as an opportunity for growth and change, interviewees and, later, the campus community were asked for recommendations for improving the process of implementing strategic planning.

The interview questions focused on three areas. First, respondents were asked to describe strategic planning in their areas and their involvement in those planning activities. The reports of these interviewees are included throughout this document and describe planning from the perspectives of individuals across the university, including the president, members of the Board of Trustees, vice-presidents, vice-provosts, department chairs and supervisors, exempt staff, nonexempt staff, and students. The same individuals also were asked about the outcome measures used to evaluate and assess performance of operating units. Finally, interviewees were asked to suggest recommendations for change that would improve the process of strategic planning and its implementation, either in their operating units or within the university.

Steering Committee members followed similar patterns in collecting data from operating units across the campus. Most began by interviewing the top administrator in

\(^2\) Michael Nagel replaced Marilyn Mackes on the Steering Committee in April 1996.

\(^3\) Jim Schmotter left Lehigh University in June 1997 and was replaced on the Steering Committee by Roland Yoshida. Ali Richardson and Joan Spade rewrote the draft of this report for this document, recontacting persons in the operating units as needed.
the unit. Then interviews were conducted with other individuals in the operating unit or with focus groups of individuals from the operating unit. Interviewees were given ample opportunities to elaborate on any topics.

In addition to the use of interviews, Steering Committee members reviewed relevant documents that described and analyzed the planning process in the various operating units and used this information in writing the unit reports. For example, in early 1997, the College of Business and Economics was reviewed for accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (now The International Association for Management Education), which included a review of its planning process. These documents, as well as the planning documents used to compile the 1997 Operating Plan, will be available to members of the Middle States Evaluation Team when they visit Lehigh University in March 1998.

Additional data were gathered from a variety of sources to complete this report. Joan Spade and Patti Ota interviewed the chairs of Board of Trustees standing committees. Joan Spade interviewed President Likins, who described the development of the current model of strategic planning and the evolution of planning during the time he served as the university’s president. His comments are incorporated into the description of the overall planning process. Also included in this description of the planning process are comments from interviews Joan Spade conducted with student leaders as well as with faculty members who served on the University Council, a group that served to bring together faculty and administrators from across the university to advise the president. Joan Spade sat in on meetings of the Planning and Budgeting Working Group of the University Council that Patti Ota co-chaired during the time the Operating Plan for 1997 was developed, and her observations are also included. Patti Ota co-chaired the working group. Lastly, Joan Spade interviewed professional staff who developed budget and outcome measures for the 1997 Operating Plan.

All individuals within the university were given the opportunity to comment on the preliminary draft of this report during the fall semester of 1997. A preliminary draft of the report to the Middle States Evaluation Team was distributed to all department chairs in October 1997. The campus community was notified of its availability via electronic mail and campus publications, including the student newspaper. Comments were solicited from the entire campus community through several venues. First, over 14 meetings were held in all operating units of the university to allow individuals to discuss recommendations for change to the current planning process. Second, the description of the process and call for comments was published in eight articles in a campus publication, Lehigh Week, which is distributed weekly to all faculty and staff at the university. A World-Wide-Web site and a conference board on the campus electronic communications network also were established to inform the university community of the ongoing activities in relation to the self-study, including a copy of the full October 1997 draft of the self study, which received 150 “hits.”
We received comments from 34 faculty, staff, and students. Comments are interspersed throughout the document in abbreviated form, highlighted in italics. All comments to the draft of the self-study are recorded in full in a log that will be given to the members of the Middle States Evaluation Team. An abbreviated version of the comments will be available to the campus community. Comments unrelated to strategic planning and its implementation were directed to appropriate administrators.

The topic of this self-study was the implementation of strategic planning. This meant that students were not as involved in this report as faculty and staff because students are not typically involved in strategic planning in the university. Nor were students interested in reading or commenting on the report despite the opportunity to win a drawing. While we can make excuses for this lack of participation, we, too, would have liked to have more student participation in the preparation of this document.

No university is static. Therefore, the strategic planning process and implementation of that process presented here cannot represent the ongoing changes within Lehigh University. In an attempt to capture the changing environment that surrounds the implementation of strategic planning on Lehigh University’s campus, this document includes descriptions of the administrative changes on campus, changes in procedures concomitant with the transition to a new administration, and two developments that may affect the way strategic planning and its implementation are done at Lehigh: a project currently underway to redesign technology related to student services, financial and information systems, and human resources (SAFAHRIS) and a proposal for a Faculty Senate at the university.
CHAPTER 2
Overview of the Planning Process at Lehigh University

The development of a strategic plan — The Lehigh Plan and the Lehigh University Strategic Plan

On June 1, 1994, the Board of Trustees formally endorsed two planning documents that defined the agenda for the university: The Lehigh Plan and the Lehigh University Strategic Plan (hereafter referred to as the Strategic Plan). The Lehigh Plan developed out of task forces that involved hundreds of faculty, staff, and students; the Goals and Priorities Board; and open workshops dating back as far as the fall of 1990. The Strategic Plan was prepared for the Board of Trustees in order to provide a succinct summary of the operational implications of The Lehigh Plan, including specific strategies, goals, and time lines to implement the more general objectives in the larger document.

Until the 1997-98 year, the Operating Plan was compiled annually by the University Council⁴ and its Planning and Budgeting Working Group. The Operating Plan was the enabling document of the strategic planning process until the change in university leadership. The purpose of the Operating Plan was to substantiate progress made in implementing the strategies identified in The Lehigh Plan and to define future progress toward implementation of Lehigh’s Strategic Plan⁵. Each Operating Plan included Lehigh’s mission, vision, and values, because these statements guided the strategic planning process. The first Operating Plan was produced in 1993. The structure of the remainder of the Operating Plans evolved over the next three years. The process for the Operating Plan shifted around 1995. Originally the Operating Plan was produced for the October Board of Trustees meeting, while the university budget was presented to the Board at its June meeting. However, since any Operating Plan must be understood in conjunction with the institutional budget and future budget projection models, the university budget and annual Operating Plan were integrated and submitted to the Board of Trustees at the June meeting.

⁴ The University Council is no longer in operation; see Chapter 5, Changes in the University’s Decision Making Structure.

⁵ The format and process for developing the Operating Plan are being reassessed; see Chapter 6, Conclusion.
Dr. Peter Likins, president of Lehigh University from 1982 until October 1, 1997, discussed the events that led to the development of these two documents. In 1984, a plan was developed by faculty committees in consultation with Likins. The philosophy of this plan was that the administration would develop the context and mission and that the operating units could then advance their own plans within the larger framework. Some departments developed solid plans. Others did not. Most departments that developed plans received resources. Those that did not develop plans lost the opportunity for additional resources, although existing budgets were not jeopardized. This “bottom-up” type of planning process sufficed from 1984 until 1989, a time of adequate resources.

The climate changed in 1989-90 when resources became scarce, and the old way of planning no longer worked. Although changes were made in the administrative structure and the number of vice presidents had been reduced, additional cost cuts were needed across the university. In 1988, a Visiting Committee on University Resources was established to address the issue of how to develop and institute a resource reallocation plan. One half of the members were from Lehigh's Board of Trustees and the other half came from other academic institutions. This committee was chaired by Trustee Ron Hoffman. The committee spent 18 months developing a resource allocation plan, which was completed in 1990 and presented at a retreat for trustees and selected administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. A new Board of Trustees chair, William Hittinger, now interim president, took over as both Chairman of the Board of Trustees and leader of the planning effort at that retreat.

Thirteen vision workshops were held on campus during the academic years 1990-91 and 1991-92 with all members of the Lehigh community invited to participate in the development of a new plan for the university. The result of these vision workshops was a 100-page document authored by the new provost, Alan Pense, and the president. From this document, a mission statement was written that synthesized the discussions in the workshop while maintaining the fundamental dimensions of the 1984 plan (i.e., develop a College of Arts and Science that is as strong as the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences and build a graduate program on a solid foundation of undergraduate learning). While many people saw this exercise as unnecessary, both the president and the provost saw it as an important process in understanding the direction of the university at that time. The one-page mission statement essentially states that "Lehigh’s mission is advancing learning through the integration of teaching, research, and service to others."

In the fall of 1992, Lehigh began drafting what would become The Lehigh Plan. A Goals and Priorities Board (GAP) was established in late 1992, with 40 individuals, including trustees, administrators, faculty, and students. In addition, five task forces were formed involving approximately 20 people each. During the summer of 1993, Likins took all the materials that had been compiled by these various groups and wrote a draft plan. Although he tested his ideas with the deans of the colleges without
mandating their support for specific recommendations, he was looking for more dramatic change than could be produced by a committee. The resulting draft of The Lehigh Plan went out for discussion in September 1993. Many recommendations in this plan were perceived as radical; some were changed and others were abandoned, although many survived.

To facilitate the implementation of The Lehigh Plan during the spring of 1994, James Hobbs (a retired Management professor), former President Likins, former Provost Pense, and Vice Provost Ota used The Lehigh Plan to create the Strategic Plan. The Board of Trustees of Lehigh University formally endorsed both The Lehigh Plan and the Strategic Plan at its June 1994 meeting. The faculty never formally approved The Lehigh Plan, nor did they request the opportunity to do so.

The Strategic Plan includes nine key strategies to guide the university. These strategies are:

1) Focus on learning as the single all-encompassing purpose of the university.
2) Enhance the quality of the undergraduate learning experience as Lehigh’s highest priority.
3) Expand graduate enrollment, strengthen the quality of graduate programs, and eliminate those that do not or cannot achieve sufficiently high standards of quality and value to the university.
4) Reaffirm our commitment to offer competitive financial aid to undergraduate and graduate students.
5) Focus on three economic and social imperatives of our time: technology to enhance learning and advance society; globalization of curricula and attitudes; and harmonious diversity within the Lehigh community.
6) Identify and reinforce “world-class” characteristics of Lehigh University.
7) Apply principles of continuous quality improvement to enhance effectiveness, productivity, and “getting even better.”
8) Define expected performance and constraints, empower teams and individuals at the operating level to develop strategies and initiatives, and then acknowledge and reward group and individual performance.
9) Develop the Lehigh campus and continuously maintain the physical plant as a major asset of the university.

Part of the strategic planning process was a commitment to produce an annual Operating Plan that would introduce performance indicators and establish priorities, budget projections, and performance targets for a three-year period. The nine key strategies were reevaluated each year in the process of reassessing progress and rewriting goals in the annual Operating Plan.
The Governance Structure at Lehigh University

The planning process occurs within an organizational structure\(^6\) that includes the four academic colleges and a number of administrative operating units. This structure was used to organize the data collection process, and each operating unit's method of planning and assessing its strategic plans is included in Chapter 3, along with recommendations for change in the process of strategic planning. The organizational structure of the university at the time of our interviews also included a number of faculty standing committees and a University Council of both administrators and faculty. In this section, we describe the governance structure of the university at that time. The participation of students in the decision making processes of the university and a description of the Board of Trustees also are included in this section, as is a discussion of outcomes assessment. Lastly, we include a brief description of decision making in some of the affiliated organizations on campus.

**Faculty Standing Committees.** Faculty standing committees are composed of faculty elected by their colleges or by the university faculty as a whole. These committees function as policy-making, advisory, or appellate/advisory in university governance. All focus on matters of primary concern to the faculty and report directly to the faculty. Each of these governance committees is represented on the Faculty Steering Committee.

The Faculty Steering Committee channels issues from other standing committees in its interactions with the administration of the university. As stated in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty*, the Faculty Steering Committee will meet on a monthly basis to: (1) advise the president and provost on any proposed major structural changes within the university, (2) respond in a preliminary manner to ideas and initiatives emanating from the administration but with no formal powers of substantive review, (3) advise the president and provost of appropriate faculty committees for substantive review of administration initiatives, (4) share information about present and proposed committee activities, (5) channel faculty initiatives to the appropriate committees, (6) monitor the progress of faculty initiatives directed to the administration, (7) establish the agenda for university faculty meetings, and (8) report at least once a semester to the university faculty on issues relating to university governance.

(This) committee consists of 12 members: the president, the vice president and provost, the chairperson of the educational policy committee, the chairperson of the graduate and research committee, the chairperson of the faculty compensation committee, the chairperson of the

---

\(^6\) The most recent organization chart is appended to this document (see Appendix A) along with a copy of the organization chart at the time of the interviews (see Appendix B).
financial planning and operations committee, the senior (fifth) year member of the faculty personnel committee, the faculty chairperson or faculty co-chairperson of the Forum (all ex officio), and four faculty, one elected by each college faculty.

The four college representatives are elected to four-year staggered terms. (The above information was taken from Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.1.)

The Faculty Steering Committee includes a standing subcommittee on regulations and procedures that (1) conducts a continuing review of regulations and procedures within the university with the purpose of maintaining efficient and effective operations, (2) initiates proposals for changes in the university governance, (3) reviews the language and form of these faculty regulations revisions submitted to the steering committee, and (4) reports to the steering committee as it seems appropriate. (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.1.1)

The Educational Policy Committee “is responsible for the study of the university curriculum, long-range academic plans, and undergraduate academic rules and regulations” (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.2).

The Graduate and Research Committee “considers policies and regulations on graduate education and research,” including developing policies and regulations on graduate education, reviewing graduate programs and research activities, approving graduate course changes, interpreting and applying faculty rules governing graduate students and degrees, establishing policies for awarding fellowships and scholarships to graduate departments and programs, approving the formation or termination of research centers and institutes, and recommending policies and procedures for coordinating research-related activities of individual faculty members (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.3).

The Faculty Compensation Committee “investigates the level of faculty compensation and benefits relative to market conditions, peer institutions, university priorities, and faculty need” (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.4).

The Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee “represents the concerns of the faculty in advising the president, provost, and treasurer regarding financial planning” (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.5).

The Faculty Personnel Committee hears appeals from faculty and researchers at the university in matters of personnel policy and also monitors university appointments
to assure that policy is being followed in academic and research appointments (Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.6).

University Council. Former President Likins established the University Council in 1994 with an expanded group of campus representatives to give him advice on university-wide issues. Its creation resulted from his view that the effective implementation of strategic planning required a process whereby administrators and faculty could work together to appreciate a broader university-wide perspective and help stimulate the community to accept change. The purpose of the University Council was to advise the president. It was never a decision making body, although a common perception on campus was that it was.

The University Council consisted of administrators and five faculty members selected from five faculty committees presented in the previous section. (The Personnel Committee was not represented on the University Council.) Each member of the University Council served on one of five working groups (Planning and Budgeting, Undergraduate, Graduate and Research, Personnel, and Facilities and Infrastructure) that were responsible for studying specific issues and for making recommendations on particular courses of action to the president. For example, Planning and Budgeting guided the processes involved in compiling the annual Operating Plan and university budget. In addition to the above working groups, ad hoc committees associated with the University Council were formed from time to time on an as-needed basis. Examples include the Revenue Enhancement Task Force and the Restructuring and Re-engineering Task Force, both active in 1995-96.

The role of the faculty representatives on the University Council, according to one member, "is to participate in broad conversations on the affairs of the university in the council itself and in the working groups to get a clearer view as to how the major decisions are made at the university." Some faculty defined their roles in the University Council as those of raising questions of interest to faculty and the university community that are not being raised by administrators.

However, these faculty representatives had some concerns about the structure and process employed in the University Council. One comment was that, because the group served in an advisory capacity, sometimes decisions were made elsewhere and were only communicated to the University Council. They noted that communication with the faculty at large was minimal. While the faculty reported back to their standing committees and these committees reported to the university faculty meetings, few faculty attended these meetings. Another issue raised was that, as an advisory board, the council seldom voted on issues. This meant that there could be prolonged conversation around a single issue that did not get resolved or was not brought to closure. While faculty had a voice, they did not have a sense of how their input was used in the decision making process. It was also noted that there was a tendency by University Council to take action on matters that could be changed more easily, such as
buildings or administrative procedures, rather than dealing with issues related to teaching and research, which resulted in more time spent on operational details than on long-term goals and strategic planning. These faculty expressed concerns about disconnects between those making decisions and those who are affected by these decisions as well as between decisions made and the university budget.

_**Two Individuals, one faculty and one staff, who read a draft of this document reinforced these concerns about a disconnect citing a lack of both communication and agreement within the university on basic goals.**_

**Student participation in decision making.** Student leaders also were interviewed and asked about their involvement in planning activities relative to student activities. These students described things such as planning senior class activities, developing programs for residence halls, and coordinating programming for University Productions. All of the student leaders, in describing their activities, felt that they could go to the administration to ask for support for new initiatives. As they described their activities, it was clear that they worked closely with university administrators to do these activities. The students talked about working effectively with the Dean of Students Office as well as with other university services, such as transportation and food services. In these interviews, it was apparent that student groups work very hard and take a great deal of initiative in putting together events for the campus.

In the interview with student leaders, it was noted that students’ input was being solicited in the decision making processes involved in creating a new campus pub. The Student Senate conducted a survey asking students what they wanted in a campus pub. These student leaders were pleased that the results were being used in the plans for the pub.

It was clear that the student leaders interviewed were very active and involved in the campus and have a good working relationship with administration and staff at Lehigh. One student said that he had recently attended a conference of Greek presidents with another Lehigh student. They came away from this conference with a strong sense that the attention and support of the administration at Lehigh is far better than what students receive at other campuses. He was grateful for the ability to influence decisions at Lehigh.

When asked for recommendations for change, these student leaders asked that students continue to be involved in decisions related to structural change on campus. Some students currently meet with the Board of Trustees, and the number of students doing so will be expanded soon. The class officers of the Class of ‘97 also meet with the Alumni Association Executive Board, an event described as very successful by the Class of ‘97 president. He said the Alumni Association was pleased to have the students at its meeting and listened to students’ suggestions, making the students feel that they were making a contribution. It is clear that these students want to have
continued involvement and participation in the decision making processes on the Lehigh campus.

Two students who read copies of this report expressed concerns about the ways the views of students are represented in university planning. One student believed that students should have more say in academic decisions while another felt that faculty should have a say in such decisions because they are the closest link to the students and are likely to represent student views when student governing bodies cannot.

Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees at Lehigh University is comprised of four categories of active trustees: corporate trustees, appointed trustees, alumni trustees, and an ex-officio trustee, the president of the university. The corporate category consists of ten trustees whose successors are elected by the corporate trustees then in office whenever vacancies occur by death, resignation, or otherwise in accordance with charter provisions. Corporate trustees hold office for a term of five years and may serve for two successive terms. After vacating the office of corporate trustee for a period of at least one year, a former corporate trustee may be re-elected to such office. The appointed category consists of up to twenty-five trustees who are elected for terms of three years each upon recommendation by the corporate trustees. Appointed trustees may serve only three three-year terms. The alumni category is composed of up to six trustees elected by the members of the Lehigh University Alumni Association as prescribed by their by-laws. The alumni trustees are elected for terms of three years with two of the alumni trustees graduating not less than two years and not more than ten years prior to their election. The trustee body also includes emeriti trustees. Upon resignation of a trustee, the retired trustee may be designated the emeritus status and retain such distinction for life.

At the present time, there are 40 active members serving on Lehigh's Board of Trustees, 10 of whom are corporate trustees, 24 appointed trustees, and six appointed trustees. Of these 40 trustees, 31 are male and nine are female. Thirty-seven trustees are Caucasian, two are African-American, and one is Asian. Thirty-two trustees are employed in business or management, three trustees are employed in education or government, three are in the legal profession, and two are in other occupations.

The Board of Trustees elects its officers according to the by-laws of the University. Current officers of the Board of Trustees are: Ronald J. Ulrich, chairman; Eugene Mercy, Jr., vice chair; Denise M. Blew, secretary and treasurer; and Richard H. Sanders, assistant treasurer.

The Board of Trustees meets four times a year to review the general direction of the university and act upon significant matters affecting Lehigh. Trustees serve on 11 standing committees and two subcommittees of standing committees, responsible for specific administrative functions. These committees are: Executive, Academic Affs. (Graduate Studies and Research subcommittee), Physical Planning and Plant, Audit,
Finance (Investment subcommittee), Nominating, Student Affairs, Development, Cultural Affairs, Oversight Committee for Related Organizations, and Public Affairs. In terms of internal oversight, the Executive Committee oversees the overall activities of the Board. The Nominating Committee reviews current members and recommends new members for consideration by the Board.

Former President Likins described the changing role of the Board of Trustees as times have brought greater financial and legal pressures on all organizations, resulting in boards becoming less passive. While Lehigh's Board of Trustees has always been actively involved in the university, the current Board is more action-oriented, more interested in and involved in the financial and physical plant aspects of the university. A number of current trustees were interviewed for their report, and a summary of their views on strategic planning and its implementation is included in Chapter 3.

Outcomes Assessment

Lehigh has long adhered to some of the tenets of traditional assessment that emphasize examining the inputs (such as the characteristics of its students) and the outcomes (such as graduation rates, entrance into graduate schools and jobs, and standardized measures of academic achievement such as professional certification examinations or the Graduate Record Examination).

This comprehensive set of data are collected by the Office of Institutional Studies within Academic Administration. Data relevant to outcomes assess a broad base of university functions, including student outcomes. This subunit within the Academic Administration operating unit is staffed by two persons: Scott Knauss (director, Institutional Studies) and an administrative assistant. Institutional Studies functions within Lehigh University as a data gatherer and as the central storehouse for institutional data, including benchmarking statistics that are used in the annual Operating Plan. Many questions can be answered using the data in appendices of the Operating Plan. Deans and the president use the data in the Operating Plan frequently in their decision making processes, including for resource allocation decisions. This office also completes institutional surveys and monitors the data reported to external sources in order to maintain consistency and avoid duplication of effort.

Other forms of assessment also are used that look more directly at ways to improve the learning process. For example, Lehigh has long had a comprehensive and effective system of visiting committees to assess its academic programs, athletic programs, student affairs, libraries, and computing and communications services. Visiting committees are used across the university to "evaluate the quality of academic departments and other university programs by examining such issues as program quality, personnel, leadership, advancement strategies, and resource and space requirements to determine how well the program serves the requirements of the present, and will be able to meet the challenges of the future" (Visiting Committee
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Manual). These visiting committees, each chaired by a trustee, involve the trustees in the culture of the university, enable them to examine the impact of their decisions on the university community, and provide external assessment and guidance to departments and programs in the university. Visiting committees are composed of scholars or experts in the area being studied. Each committee typically spends two days on campus, visiting the department it is studying and presenting a final report to the president, provost, vice provost for academic administration, and appropriate dean or administrator.

Within the colleges, the College of Business and Economics is currently implementing an assessment process in conformance with AACSB guidelines. A similar process will be followed by the College of Engineering and Applied Science to comply with the new ABET accreditation standards. These assessment processes will include evaluations of teaching; surveys of undergraduates, graduate students, alumni, and employers; and establishment of course objectives as well as methods of measuring the attainment of these objectives. In addition, the College of Engineering and Applied Science is planning on having students build portfolios during their four years at Lehigh and creating a systematic method to use results of outcomes to improve their programs.

A variety of assessment measures are used in Student Affairs to provide an ongoing assessment of students’ responses to campus life and university services. For example, a quality of life survey is completed each year by all students living in residence halls, senior exit interviews and focus groups are used to gather students’ impressions of the university, and evaluation forms are completed by students using services in Student Affairs.

The effective use of measurement and analysis to support student learning and program improvement requires a strong focus on information system design. Lehigh is addressing this pressing need with its SAFAHRIS initiative. Among other things, this initiative will redesign the student information system, providing faculty, students, and administrators with increased accessibility to records that track students’ academic progress.

The continual evolution of Lehigh’s planning process will give added emphasis to assessment and improvement while generating a revised planning process that is even more participatory and responsive to the changing environment in which higher education finds itself today.

Affiliated organizations. Several centers and institutes are related to the university but operate as affiliated organizations or wholly-owned subsidiaries. These programs operate with their own funding, planning, and boards of directors under the umbrella of the Iacocca Institute, which is a Lehigh program. Examples of affiliated
organizations are the Ben Franklin Partnership, Discovery Center of Science and Technology, and Manufacturers Resource Center.

Joan Spade and Agnes Moroney interviewed Roger Nagel, the director of the Iacocca Institute, to learn more about planning within the institute. The Iacocca Institute sponsors numerous programs of its own, such as the Iacocca Scholars, Global Leadership Village, and executive leadership seminars. Nagel reports directly to the president of the university but interacts with the Oversight Committee of the Board of Trustees. All planning within the institute is done internally. However, the projects within the Iacocca Institute tend to develop in their own unique ways, typically beginning with a donor who has an idea and is willing to fund it. The Iacocca Institute and other affiliated organizations do not submit annual reports for the Operating Plan of the university.
Chapter 3
Strategic Planning and Implementation: 1996-1997

The 1997 Operating Plan

The 1997 Operating Plan was compiled by the Planning and Budgeting Working Group of the University Council. The format of the 1997 Operating Plan changed considerably from that of the previous year. The report was much shorter than previous Operating Plans and was strongly influenced by the format of the 1996 Executive Summary, produced by the president and the associate to the president for planning. In the 1997 Operating Plan, the focus is on the seven major goals of the university. For each goal, there is a set of objectives, quantitative and qualitative measures of progress toward meeting the goal, qualitative comparisons to a set of peer institutions, and projections of a number of intended outcomes for the next three years. The 1997 Operating Plan included the following seven goals:

1) Improve the student learning experience and the student profile, while achieving realistic goals for restoring growth in net undergraduate tuition revenue.
2) Strengthen graduate programs selectively, while achieving goals for net tuition revenue.
3) Reinforce research strengths and increase external support.
4) Increase gifts to Lehigh, and grow the endowment.
5) Strengthen community at Lehigh.
6) Improve information, technology and physical infrastructure.
7) Improve management and work processes.

Because the Operating Plan is intended to provide the context and framework for planning within the university’s departments, colleges, and administrative areas, the achievement of the goals and objectives of The Lehigh Plan requires the full participation of the Lehigh community. Therefore, the 1997 Operating Plan contains the objectives of 17 operating units of the university. Another section of the 1997 Operating Report contains measures of academic departments. The processes by which individual operating units came to define their objectives are described later in

---

7 There are more operating units in the 1997 Operating Plan than covered in this self-study because some operating units studied in this report were reported as more than one unit in the 1997 Operating Plan. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences was listed under Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences in the 1997 Operating Plan.
this chapter in the descriptions of the processes of strategic planning and implementation within operating units at the university.

An integral part of the *Operating Plan* is the use of data to assess outcomes for the goals listed in the plan. For example, on pages eight and nine of the 1997 *Operating Plan*, comparisons of Lehigh's tuition to that of other schools are graphically illustrated, which is relevant for assessing the goal of reducing the rate of tuition increases on page five of that report. Other data included in the *Operating Plan* are graduation rates; net tuition revenue and other sources of revenue such as endowments and research dollars; faculty compensation; capital expenditures; and student/faculty ratios. Each year, the Office of Institutional Studies compiles the data for the annual *Operating Plan*.

Some of the data in the tables on pages 37 to 41 were added to the 1997 *Operating Plan* for the first time. These tables, broken down by colleges and departments, summarize data collected through annual faculty activity reports, the Registrar's Office, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, and the Budget Office. These data include numbers of students by major, degrees awarded, credit hours taught, and the research activity of faculty.

The process of developing the *Lehigh University 1997-98 Budget* began in the fall of 1996. The budget was developed by the Planning and Budgeting Working Group of the University Council and shared with the University Council on a regular basis. During the fall 1996 semester, the process of developing the university budget took up the majority of the discussions at council meetings. One key factor in this process was that to achieve all the parameters and desired funding levels for budget growth, the vice presidents had to make reductions totaling over $1.5 million. In addition, a total of $565,000 of unrestricted expenditures (primarily salary and benefits) was transferred to restricted endowment accounts. This was made possible by a change in endowment spending policy approved by the Board of Trustees. The direct cuts of $1,580,000 and the shift to endowment of $565,000 produced total unrestricted savings of $2,145,000. This allowed for $1,620,000 to fund new or ongoing programs and for $525,000 to cover other percentage-driven items in the budget.

In January, the preliminary budget was reviewed by the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees and the full board approved the tuition increase and the percentage increase in salaries. The final budget was submitted along with the 1997 *Operating Plan* at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 6, 1997.

**Implementation of Long-Range Planning within Operating Units on Campus**

The following sections are the reports prepared by the members of the Mid-States Steering Committee, reflecting summaries of the interviews conducted with faculty and staff from across the university. These reports were edited to reflect a
similar voice; however, they represent the individual efforts and work of the members of the Middle States Steering Committee listed on the cover of this report. As noted earlier, these reports are the Steering Committee's interpretation of the information and data collected in this process and represent to the best of our ability the process of strategic planning and its implementation on campus at that time. These individual reports were used in developing the last section of this chapter specifying recommendations for change.

These reports present a varied picture of planning within Lehigh University, a finding that is not surprising given the number of distinctly different operating units on campus. Some operating units have very clear and well-articulated processes for the development of their strategic plans and their implementation. The units with clearly articulated planning processes tend to use these plans to guide the work of the operating unit and to assess progress on the goals set forth in the strategic planning process throughout the year. Other operating units use a process that is not as well articulated, with individuals feeling removed from planning, unsure what the strategic plans for their units are, and uncertain that contribution to the planning process would be worth their while.

Reasons for the differences in planning processes across operating units are numerous. Some of the most efficient planning processes were in administrative operating units, where individuals work in a hierarchal structure and planning is part of the job description. However, even within academic units, there were differences in the planning processes. Some of these differences can be attributed to transitions in leadership.

Size of operating unit seems to be another factor influencing the efficiency of planning across the university. Smaller operating units were able to include more individuals in the planning process and often sought the input of nonexempt staff in their deliberations. Larger units tended to use more hierarchical processes, with plans often being drafted by top administrators and commented on by others in the operating unit. Clearly, there are a variety of planning processes, including some top-down, some bottom-up, and some combinations of both.
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Introduction

The College of Arts and Sciences is the largest of Lehigh's four colleges. At the beginning of the fall 1996 semester, the college enrolled 1,945 undergraduates (including 92 Arts and Engineering students) or 45 percent of the student body and 446 graduate students or 25 percent of the post baccalaureate students at Lehigh. The 207 faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences account for slightly over one half of the university's tenure-track positions.

The College of Arts and Sciences is also the most organizationally complex of the four colleges. There are 18 academic departments in three informally structured divisions: humanities (Art and Architecture, English, Modern Foreign Languages, Music, Philosophy, Religion Studies, and Theatre), natural sciences (Chemistry, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Biological Sciences, Mathematics, and Physics), and social sciences (History, International Relations, Journalism and Communication, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology and Anthropology). Mathematics is the largest department in the college, with 23 faculty. Journalism/Communication and Music are the smallest departments, with four faculty each. There are 16 Interdisciplinary programs of study in the college, 12 of which have minors and four of which lead to undergraduate and graduate degrees. The college is also home to eight centers and institutes organized by research focus.

The college leadership includes Dean Bobb Carson (professor, Earth and Environmental Sciences) and two associate deans, Gary DeLeo (professor, Physics) and Kenneth Kodama (professor, Earth and Environmental Sciences). By tradition, the associate deans are members of the faculty who continue their teaching and research activities at a reduced level during a term that typically lasts between two and six years. Carson became dean of the college on July 1, 1997, succeeding Joan Straumanis (professor, Philosophy). Straumanis participated in the interviews for this report, which were conducted in the spring of 1997, prior to the appointment of Dean Carson.

Description of Data Collection

This section of the report is based on data collected during seven focus group sessions. These groups were: (1) former Dean Straumanis and one associate dean, (2) three of the five department chairs from the natural sciences division, (3) four of the six department chairs from the social sciences division, (4) five of the seven department chairs from the humanities division, (5) three of the research center and institute directors (all eight were invited), (6) four of the 16 directors of Interdisciplinary programs (some of whom were already interviewed as research center and institute directors), and (7) a group of seven faculty members (nine faculty were invited to participate, including one assistant, one associate, and one full professor from each of the three
divisions). In each of the first five cases the focus group comprised a majority of the total number of individuals included in the category. Additional interviews with faculty were not conducted because the pattern of responses was consistent across all interviews, and it was not expected that additional information would be gained from further interviews. Two members of the Middle States Steering Committee, Vincent G. Munley (professor and chair, Economics) and Ruben Huerta-Ochoa (graduate student, Mechanical Engineering) organized, conducted, and analyzed the discussions of these focus groups.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

This report focuses on strategic planning in the College of Arts and Sciences as it occurs within the context of the annual planning process at Lehigh. During the spring of each academic year, every subunit within the college completes a planning document -- a departmental annual report that describes its proposed initiatives for the upcoming year and how these initiatives fit in with the goals and priorities stated in the 1994 Strategic Plan.

One overriding consideration became obvious during the discussions of the seven focus groups in terms of the process of planning within the college. The College of Arts and Sciences has experienced an unusually high degree of turnover in leadership -- three deans (including an interim dean) since 1994 when James Gunton left the deanship. The continual change in leadership created an environment that was described by all interviewees as one that did not facilitate either effective planning or implementation of strategic planning within the college.

Within this context, last year the dean requested that department chairs turn in annual reports as requested by the provost's office. Department chairs approached this task differently. Some used the need to complete the annual report as an occasion to schedule an annual meeting or retreat. Others consulted with department faculty in meetings, while a few chairs completed the document themselves, consulting with departmental members on an informal basis.

Most respondents from this college, even those chairs who scheduled an annual retreat or meeting to formalize plans for their departments, felt that there is very little, if any, relationship between the actual planning that occurs within departments (leading to the departmental annual reports) and the formal annual planning process that results in the annual Operating Plans. Most interviewees felt that a planning process should occur because it provides an opportunity for departments to consider future directions, and in many departments this process would happen anyway. However, these interviewees did not see planning within the college as it is currently done as being connected to the larger university strategic planning process.
One concern of department chairs was that initiatives that are worth the effort and time required of formal planning within academic departments also require resources when the time comes to implement them. This disconnect between resource allocation decisions and planning efforts has led to frustration on the part of everyone involved in planning efforts within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because of tight budgets in recent years, it has been difficult for departments to obtain a commitment for new resources, even when their initiatives match up well to the goals and priorities listed in the Strategic Plan. Departments that plan major initiatives have little confidence that resources will actually be forthcoming from the university, even when their particular initiative is identified as merit ing support. In general, the current state of tight budgets has led to a general lack of faith in the utility of the planning process. There is a high degree of uncertainty concerning whether promised resources will be allocated. Moreover, even when an initiative is successful, the final outcome is often frustrating. This is because university resources, when they are allocated, are typically restricted to seeding initiatives. After start-up funds are exhausted, many worthwhile projects dry up because continuing monies are not guaranteed and are considered unlikely.

In general, it was felt that the planning process has very little impact on the distribution of resources within the university and that there is little cause and effect between faculty planning activities and what happens within the university administration. Instead, the perception of most interviewed was that the flow of resources is influenced to a much greater extent by external shocks (crises) than by the planning process. This leads to frustration on the part of those earnestly engaged in planning. Failure or delay in allocating resources often precludes the implementation and realization of plans. While it is impossible to completely eliminate the external factors that affect budgetary operations within the university, some interviewees want the planning process to be flexible enough to provide for contingencies when external circumstances change. Other interviewees noted that the most effective planning that occurs within departments involves preparing contingencies to deal with changes in university resource deployments brought about by annual crises. There exists a general perception that this uncertainty limits departments to playing a reactive role in the decision-making process. Faculty feel that it is futile to engage in long-term planning efforts without any certainty about whether needed resources will be forthcoming. Rather, departments most often spend their time forging out second-best solutions because the best ones have been made infeasible by prior decisions made at the university level and presented to the faculty as \textit{faits accomplis}. Examples of such decisions described in interviews were the closure of the microcomputer store, doing away with the graduate school office, the early retirement program, and the purchase of the Mountaintop campus.

On the other hand, planning generally does work fairly well within departments and committees in instances where additional resources are not required. An example is the recent initiative that expanded greatly the number of four credit-hour courses
offered within the College of Arts and Sciences. While it is not clear whether the idea originated in the Strategic Plan or was already under consideration by College of Arts and Sciences faculty, the modified version of this proposal that resulted clearly reflected a concerted planning effort. There are two reasons why this stands out as a planning success. First, implementation did not depend directly on the support of university resources but rather on a reallocation of faculty energies. Second, the governance structure within the college, especially the presence of an effective college Policy Committee, markedly facilitated this initiative. The planning and implementation of this initiative, however, were not connected to the annual planning process.

Some department chairs believed that preparing for visiting committees presented a better vehicle for departmental planning than the annual university-wide planning process. In the first place, the time horizon -- three years -- constitutes a more reasonable framework for planning within an academic environment. Second, visiting committees always provide direct feedback to departments about what they are doing and planning. Finally, there exists the perception that the university administration is more likely to act on the advice of a visiting committee than on that of the dean of a college. Thus, visiting committees actually help bridge the gap between the top-level university administration and departments.

Centers and institutes within the College of Arts and Sciences are typically small in terms of their resource bases. Except for the Zettlemyer Center for Surface Studies, these units tend to align closely with interdisciplinary academic programs. It is a common practice for a faculty member to head up both a center or institute and a related interdisciplinary program and to allow the two activities to meld together. Until June of 1996, centers and institutes were organizationally linked with the vice provost for research. With the elimination of the vice provost for research, administrative responsibilities were assigned to the dean of the college. Since the new alignment, centers and institutes have been involved in the annual planning process only on a sporadic basis. The directors find planning frustrating because they have difficulty generating more than cursory interest from the administration in the College of Arts and Sciences or from the development office, which they perceive as having other priorities.

Directors of interdisciplinary programs interviewed felt that they are completely out of the loop of planning within the College of Arts and Sciences. None of the respondents received an annual report form to fill out for the 1996-97 Operating Plan. They saw this as typical of how interdisciplinary programs are left out of all decision making at present. They reported that there exists no focal point to which they can direct questions or concerns, much less propose initiatives. Before the focus session for this report they had never met as a group either among themselves or with the dean of the college. A strong sentiment was expressed by those interviewed that the college's interdisciplinary programs work remarkably well given the environment within which they operate. The principal reason is the dedication of the associated faculty to their students and the courses upon which the programs are structured.
Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

There were few references to the use of outcome measures in these focus groups with members of the College of Arts and Sciences. Some people referred to student enrollment numbers in assessing the status of programs in the natural sciences. They used the increase in the number of graduate applications as a way of assessing how well programs were doing. Members of the social sciences faculty mentioned using enrollment figures to assess the need for additional faculty. The opening of the new Zoellner Arts Center also required more careful planning and assessment in the music and theatre departments. With the exception of these references, individuals did not discuss using outcomes measures systematically in their planning processes.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Several suggestions for improving the process of strategic planning and its implementation emerged from these interviews.

First, interviewees felt that the process should include feedback. Some felt that the annual planning process focuses more on gathering and updating data by departments than on reevaluating what they are actually doing. There is no systematic vehicle for feedback of any kind within the annual planning process. This causes department chairs to question not only whether the information that they include in their annual reports has any effect on what happens at Lehigh, but whether anyone even reads the documents that they prepare. The current structure requires departments to spend an inordinate amount of time filling out reports and supplying information without seeing any apparent utility. Some respondents even saw the completion of their own annual report in this way. This lack of feedback has led to the perception that planning at Lehigh is a top-down exercise. Departments are required to assemble and compile data but are not encouraged to submit ideas. Respondents suggested the following changes to include more feedback and involve more levels in the planning process: college deans should be required to provide a formal and timely response to departmental plans, deans should make available to interested faculty the annual reports that they forward to the provost, and, finally, the provost should respond formally and openly to the annual reports submitted by the four colleges.

A second concern is that the goals and priorities set forth in the Strategic Plan are so general that almost any potential initiative is consistent with one or more of them. Persons interviewed felt that the principal goals and priorities of the university should be specific so that they provide focus for planning efforts. The vague directives provided to academic departments do not challenge them to explore their capacity for change. The lack of specific focus invites a variety of uneven responses from departments. In light of the current environment of tight resources within which the university operates, respondents felt that it is important that the university establish clear and specific
priorities, as opposed to the vague and general ones presented in the 1994 Strategic Plan. They also felt that it is important for the administration to communicate openly and honestly with all academic units about how locally proposed initiatives rank within the university's priorities, as well as to tell them what can be reasonably expected in terms of the support level and resources that each initiative is likely to receive.

Third, frequent changes in leadership in the College of Arts and Sciences in a relatively short time period have had a demonstratively negative impact on the planning process. Respondents felt that it is important to avoid additional changes in the dean's position.

Fourth, respondents felt that an environment should be created in which the faculty can participate in a proactive, and not a reactive, way. For example, if at all possible the administration should refrain during the summer months from making and then quickly implementing changes that have a direct (and perhaps negative) impact on faculty activities.

**Update (January 1, 1998):**

In response to the above concerns, Dean Carson has made changes in the college planning process. These changes are in progress and will be evaluated to assess their effectiveness. First, Carson is working on strengthening the college planning process, particularly as it relates to the next capital campaign. Department heads will meet by division (humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences) to develop plans for the college based upon the annual plans produced by departments. While these department plans will be used to build college plans, departments also will have to reevaluate their plans based upon the plans the college establishes. In addition, Carson has appointed a committee to establish criteria to evaluate departments and interdisciplinary programs. These criteria will be communicated to all departments and programs in the college. Carson intends to build upon centers of excellence within the college. Thus, when resources become available, these criteria will be used to make resource allocations.
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

Introduction

The College of Business and Economics is an academic unit consisting of two departments and eight research institutes and centers. Undergraduate education is the primary focus of the college, followed by the MBA and graduate programs. Degree programs offered in the college consist of B.S., M.S., M.B.A., and Ph.D. programs. In the fall of 1996, the college enrolled 961 undergraduate students, 22 percent of the total undergraduate population, and 417 graduate students or 23 percent of the graduate population of the university.

The dean oversees all aspects of the college and reports to the provost. On July 1, 1997, Patti T. Ota became dean of the College of Business and Economics, replacing James Schmotter, who left the university. Dr. Ota also serves as vice provost for academic administration. In addition to the dean, the college has an associate dean and director of undergraduate programs, an associate dean and director of the MBA program, and a director of graduate and professional education, who handles special and certification programs for the college.

The structure of operation within the College of Business and Economics prior to the 1994 writing of the university's Strategic Plan included six individual departments: accounting, economics, finance, law, management, and marketing. The Strategic Plan called for the consolidation of these six academic departments into two, business and economics, each with its own chair. The research and center directors have more autonomy in the operations of their subunits than the department chairs. There are eight research institutes and centers, each with its own center director:

- Diamond Center for Economic Education
- Goodman Center for Real Estate Studies
- Martindale Center for the Study of Private Enterprise
- Philip Rauch Center for Business Communication
- Center for Innovation Management Studies
- Institute for the Study of Commodities
- Musser Center for Entrepreneurship
- Small Business Development Center

The college has 54 tenure-track faculty members and two instructors, as well as six exempt staff and 15 nonexempt staff. Faculty in the college are assigned to departments and can be members of various centers. Each department and center has its own group of secretarial staff. The central college offices also have a group of secretarial staff assigned to them.
Chapter 3: Strategic Planning and Implementation

During the spring of 1997, both the college and the accounting program underwent evaluations for accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). In addition, the college is required by the university to have a visiting committee evaluate its programs, last done in 1993. Beginning in 1997, two visiting committees will evaluate the two departments separately. Both the AACSB and the visiting committee reports were not entirely favorable. Changes suggested in these two reports are included in later sections of this review of the college. Although the college received renewal of its accreditation from the AACSB only through the year 2000, it has and continues to enjoy success in several key areas such as:

1. maintaining a stable student enrollment;
2. a strong following among many employers, as indicated by hiring the college’s graduates across degree levels;
3. developing and implementing innovative academic activities for students; and
4. attracting talented and productive faculty dedicated to teaching and research.

Description of Data Collection

The two members of the steering committee assigned to the College of Business and Economics, Eunice Santos (assistant professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science) and Henry Odi (assistant provost), interviewed key people in the college and held two focus groups with faculty and staff. These interviews and focus groups included individuals from all groups in the college, including: James Schmotter, dean of the College of Business and Economics at that time; Therese Maskulka, associate dean and director of undergraduate programs; Kathy Trexler, associate dean and director of the MBA program; Michael Kolchin, graduate coordinator of special and certificate programs; Vincent Munley, chair of the Department of Economics; Stephen Buell, chair of the Department of Business at the time; and Larry Strain, director of the Small Business Development Center.

One focus group consisted of five faculty members (six were invited) representing individuals from both departments at the ranks of full, associate, and assistant professors. The second focus group included three nonexempt staff (four were invited) from throughout the college’s departments, research institutes, and centers.

In addition to the interviews and focus groups, information from the AACSB accreditation report and the report of the 1993 visiting committee were reviewed and information from them is included in this report.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

According to former Dean Schmotter, the dean is responsible for all aspects of the college, including supervision of faculty and staff. Through consultation with the university president, provost, department chairs, faculty, and staff, the dean shapes the
strategic plan for the College of Business and Economics in the form of its annual report. This process of consultation helped to prioritize the goals and objectives to further the mission of the college and the university.

During the 1995-96 academic year, Dean Schmotter began a program of planning and evaluation designed to improve faculty development and utilization. He met with teaching faculty after each had provided a professional development plan, indicating if or her goals for teaching, research and service. Changes were made in teaching load in response to this process, but there was no evaluation of progress on the proposed outcomes in the original faculty professional development reports, and professional development plans were not completed in 1996-97. Two faculty members who read this report expressed concerns over how these professional development plans were implemented and followed up.

Dean Schmotter delegated some planning responsibilities to the two associate deans, department chairs, director of graduate and professional education, research institute and center directors, and College Policy and the Graduate and Professional Education Committees. The roles of the associate deans and director of graduate and professional education include assisting the dean in shaping and strengthening the overall academic matters within the college. Each individual focuses on a particular academic program or group in the College of Business and Economics. The associate dean and director of undergraduate programs focuses on the strategic planning and implementation process that deals with undergraduate recruitment, retention, advising new curriculum development, long-term program evaluation and assessment, and placement. The associate dean and director of the MBA program, along with the director of the graduate and professional programs, focus on the issues that affect the graduate students and programs. Responsibilities of these two individuals include: developing aggressive strategies for marketing the MBA program to part-time students; developing an articulated agreement with other colleges as part of the College’s recruitment effort, retention, long-term program evaluation, assessment, and placement. The latter two individuals work closely with the College Policy and the Graduate and Professional Education Committees on curriculum development.

The College Policy and the Graduate and Professional Education Committees play critical roles in the approval of new curricula, course sequencing, and serving as an oversight committee for the MBA distance learning and graduate programs. Their findings and recommendations are forwarded to college and university faculty for approval and inclusion in the overall university curriculum. The identification of the appropriate funding support for these activities is under the leadership of the dean will assistance from the Development and Institutional Advancement Office.

Dean Schmotter periodically solicited advice and input from the college’s Business Advisory Council regarding the strategic planning and implementation process. This is an external group which meets at least twice a year and consists of alumni and
corporate friends of the college. For example, this advisory body helped to institute a program to increase awareness of diversity by providing speakers (executives in residence) to speak to students in their areas of expertise.

The participation of department chairs and research institute and center directors in strategic planning and implementation follows from their positions as administrators whose responsibilities include the oversight of both academic matters and the faculty in their subunits. Moreover, these individuals, typically senior faculty members, work together to provide an enriching environment for research between faculty and students, and to create connections for students to the external world. Their specific roles include oversight of the following key areas:

1. faculty composition and development, including: appropriate faculty planning, faculty recruitment, selection and orientation, faculty development, promotion, retention and renewal, and faculty size.
2. instructional resources and responsibilities, including: physical facilities, library and computer resources available for support to academic programs, collective faculty instructional responsibilities, and individual faculty instructional responsibilities.
3. curriculum development and evaluation for undergraduate, MBA, specialized master’s and doctoral programs, including developing curricula that provide not only an overall understanding of basic subjects in a particular degree program, but that also include depth of understanding along with topics containing current advances in the field, in preparation for visiting committee and accreditation activities.
4. academic student issues including student selection and career planning and placement supported by an organized process designed and implemented by the Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid and the Office of Career Services, respectively.
5. intellectual contributions by faculty in research and educational activities.

The restructuring that occurred in 1995, along with the nationwide trend toward fewer available resources, makes the jobs of the department chairs more challenging. Each department chair has found creative ways to achieve the mission of the college and university, such as: soliciting faculty involvement, shaping the curriculum to address future needs, shaping faculty composition to reflect current and future research and academic needs, and identifying achievable goals that can be managed and evaluated.

While there is a flow of information moving up the hierarchy in the College of Business and Economics, most faculty felt there was little feedback going down. Former Dean Schmotter, however, indicated that he solicited advice from the two associate deans and the director of graduate and professional education as well as the two department chairs. The dean is required to formally state the short-term and long-
term goals of College of Business and Economics in its annual report. He then discussed these goals and how they fit with the university goals with others in the college.

Chairs and research institute and center directors are required to submit to the dean short-term and long-term goals of their subunits along with information about how these goals will be implemented in their annual reports. Moreover, these annual reports must discuss how these goals fit into the goals of the college and university. These chairs and directors, in turn, noted that they solicit advice from the faculty for potential objectives and goals through working together on ongoing projects such as curriculum development. One chair indicated that he meets with the faculty in his department to prepare their department’s annual report, giving faculty members in the department an opportunity to comment on the final draft as well as to provide input along the way. The other chair followed a more limited process in which he produced the annual report and sent a copy to faculty at the time it was passed on to the dean. The primary means by which faculty state that they participate in strategic planning at the university level is as members of university committees.

Several concerns were raised in the interviews and focus groups in terms of the level of involvement in the strategic planning and implementation process in the college. First, there was a feeling that the planning process was so loose in the college that the faculty and staff did not know how it was being done. Many people felt that if they were invited to be involved, they would have something to contribute to the mission of the college and university. Some suggested that the current organizational structure should be modified in order for successful strategic planning and implementation to occur. The current process is described by some as ad hoc, and the feeling that participation may not be worthwhile was consistently stressed by the faculty focus group. The perception of most faculty and staff on the issue of establishing goals is mainly that any input they provide will not be taken into account. This is due in part to the fact that they feel that there is no sense of feedback on any ideas they have suggested. In fact, there is no sense of communication either to or from higher administration.

Second, individuals noted that internal disagreements within one of the departments have severely impacted some aspects of the strategic planning and implementation process within the college. While some members of the college work well together and form a productive team, there are a few individuals who are not supportive of the goals and mission of the college, which results in internal disagreements.

Third, there was a feeling of constraints from the university administration that limit full participation in the strategic planning and implementation process. Many of the interviewees felt that they were unwelcome in the planning process and that there was no role for them or opportunity to voice their opinions in the planning process.
Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

One of the key findings in the AACSB’s accreditation report was the lack of any means for measuring outcomes of stated goals and objectives. This is an area the college is addressing.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Recommendations to improve the strategic planning process within the College of Business and Economics come from three sources: the individual interviews, the focus group meetings, and the AACSB accreditation team report. Because the recommendations of the 1993 report of the College of Business and Economics visiting committee are essentially those articulated in the AACSB report, they are not discussed separately.

The majority of the faculty and staff who participated in the individual and focus group meetings were disappointed with the current structure of the strategic planning and its implementation. As a result, they called for changes that they hope will improve the process and the college.

Several recommendations were made to ensure that faculty and staff have the opportunity to play a key role in the strategic planning process. Feedback was an important consideration in these interviews. Some suggested that the university must create a structure that will facilitate ongoing feedback from the university administration and dean to department chairs, research institute and center directors, faculty, and staff regarding their contributions to the strategic planning process. Staff would like to see clear evaluation, with one-on-one feedback. Another recommendation was to develop a clear and concise structure for planning and implementation, including well-defined expectations for the faculty and staff in the college.

A second concern of faculty and staff was the assessment of outcomes. One suggestion was that the goals and objectives be both achievable and manageable and that enough information be provided for assessment of outcomes. For example, it was suggested that the college develop placement assessments and surveys of students to track both current students and graduates. Another example given was to systematically collect teaching evaluations.

A third category of recommendations dealt with improving communications. One suggestion was to open the line of communication for faculty and staff to voice ideas and concerns to the university administration. Developing a top-down and bottom-up strategic planning process was suggested to provide more opportunities for the flow of influence and ideas up from the faculty and staff to the university administration and back down from the university administration to faculty and staff. Another suggestion was to bridge the communication gap between the departments and the research
institutes and centers. It was noted that students working in the research institutes and centers are currently the primary means of bridging this gap. Additional resources are needed for implementation in the form of financial and staff support. Some suggested that an incentive plan be established to encourage more faculty involvement in the strategic planning process and with students outside the classroom.

Two recommendations in the AACSB report pertain to or could affect the process of developing and implementing strategic planning in the College of Business and Economics. The AACSB report calls for greater program integration in the college. In addition, the AACSB report also recommends the implementation of an assessment program to measure outcomes, including a systematic assessment of teaching effectiveness with appropriate feedback mechanisms.

Other recommendations of the AACSB report related to planning and implementation process are to develop a mechanism to determine faculty consensus about continuous improvement; a curriculum planning process to align practice with the university’s mission in a timely fashion; and an aggressive plan for diversity within faculty, staff and student ranks. These recommendations, if implemented, would provide a more open and diverse planning process.

Update (August 31, 1997):

Since the interviews were conducted, a number of initiatives were put in place to address problem areas. The response of the faculty to these changes has been positive as of August 31, 1997. Following the resignation of Dean Schmotter, Interim Provost Patti Ota consulted with every faculty and staff member in the college to identify strategies to begin to address the leadership issues (the Business chair also resigned effective May 1, 1997) and the concerns raised by AACSB. After this consultation, Ota appointed a new chair for the Department of Business. The new chair quickly enlisted six faculty to serve as vice chairs and program directors and an additional faculty to serve as vice chair for administration. A vice chair and undergraduate program director also was identified for the Department of Economics. On July 1, 1997, President Likins appointed Ota to the position of vice provost and dean of the College of Business and Economics.

Ota has established a Dean’s Council that includes the two department chairs, the two associate deans, and six additional faculty that she will look to for guidance on external and curricular initiatives. She also announced her intent to involve the college’s stakeholders in as many initiatives as possible, both for enrichment of connection to the business world and as a source of pressure to move from analysis and debate to action. As an initial step, she invited members of the Business Advisory Council and six undergraduate students to join faculty from the college in a two-day retreat held before the beginning of the fall semester to jump-start the process of undergraduate curricular examination and reform. This reform effort will continue by
the vice chairs and program directors under the leadership of the Department of Business chair.

As of August 31, 1997, task forces charged with addressing teaching effectiveness, program assessment, and program integration produced interim reports ahead of schedule. Two faculty members have taken responsibility for the necessary diversity initiatives and will enlist support from faculty both within and outside of the college. The Accounting Report submitted to AACSB at the end of July 1997 told how the program and the college are responding to the accreditation team report. Finally, an MBA Core Design Team has been working on developing an integrated core for a revised MBA curriculum, and the faculty were asked to adopt the new curriculum in the fall of 1997.
THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Introduction

The College of Education is the smallest academic unit at Lehigh. The college concentrates on graduate education, with a small but growing undergraduate enrollment in an education minor. This college, which recently merged its two departments into one, has 27 faculty members. The college offers the M.A. in Education, the M.Ed., the M.S., the Education Specialist, the Ed.D., and the Ph.D. In the fall of 1996, the college enrolled 445 graduate students, or 24 percent of the post baccalaureate students in the university as well as 60 undergraduate minors. From speaking with the faculty and administrators in the college, one perceives a very upbeat attitude built on the base of a process of internal planning in the college. Individuals in this operating unit were aware of the fact that external market forces can have a more powerful effect on their college than on other areas of the university. This fact has heightened their efforts in planning for the college.

Ron Yoshida, the dean of this college, joined Lehigh University in August 1996. Even though Dean Yoshida was not part of the planning process that created the college’s goals listed in the Operating Plan for 1996, he worked on those goals as well as others that were not included in the university’s 1996 Operating Plan.

Description of Data Collection

James Tiefenbrunn (assistant vice president, Resource Management) and Ali Richardson (undergraduate student, English) conducted four interviews and focus groups to gather information from the College of Education. They first interviewed the dean of the college, followed by a meeting with the department chair. They then conducted three focus groups: program coordinators, college faculty, and all six nonexempt staff in the college. They invited a total of 20 people to participate in these interviews, representing 53 percent of the college’s faculty and staff. Centennial School staff were not included in the focus groups.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

When he arrived, Dean Yoshida found that most of the planning in the college was reactive rather than proactive. For example, budgetary cuts made in August 1996 meant that new strategies for the continuation of programs needed to be developed. However, the college began a more proactive planning process by setting agreed-upon goals. This refocusing process began in the fall of 1996 and will be fully operational by the fall of 1997. The program coordinators echoed the dean’s concern about reactive planning and also noted that they are currently moving toward a more proactive planning process.
Chapter 3: Strategic Planning and Implementation

Some interviewees perceived the planning process at the university level as bureaucratic. There was a general feeling that strategic planning is forced into a position of secondary importance. Because of the bureaucratic nature of university planning, some faculty and administrators did not feel that there was a very close relationship between the college's planning efforts and the university's planning efforts. The two are in agreement with basic goals, but formal integration is not emphasized. Some faculty attribute this perception to the language used in the university's Strategic Plan and yearly Operating Plans, which they think is more corporate than academic.

Goal setting was a recurring theme in speaking with the faculty and the college's leadership. The dean and faculty indicated that most, if not all, goals and initiatives come from within the college. The dean sends these initiatives to the university's administration in the college's annual report, and they are evaluated based upon the priorities listed in the university's Strategic Plan. The initiatives that survive become part of the college's operating goals.

Independent of the above process, goals are set and changes are implemented in areas of direct concern throughout the college. For instance, student surveys track the effectiveness of the faculty's teaching methods every year. Faculty document this process in their individual annual reports and then send them to the department chair, who forwards these data to the dean.

The college has a written planning process that is broken down into three strategic planning areas. One area in which all the academic units must engage is the recruitment of students. Faculty are currently planning new recruitment strategies to boost the college's enrollment. In addition to recruitment, the college is focusing on admission and retention. Because the College of Education does not have any undergraduate major programs, its planning activities are not as coordinated with the university's activities as those of the other three colleges. The department chair noted that the college's strategic planning is in sync with, but independent of, the university's because the university's planning priorities as listed in the Strategic Plan are geared toward undergraduate education. Program coordinators felt that the university's planning process addresses issues of budgeting and not academics.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Everyone we spoke with in the college understood the metrics the college was using to assess its ability to meet established goals. The number of applications, offers, and acceptances are important forms of feedback. Within the college, they also monitor and track students' performance and use student evaluations to assess faculty. One of the key metrics they use is job placement, because both program coordinators and faculty actively work to place students in jobs. In addition, the college engages in self-studies using surveys and statistical data and also uses feedback from accreditation agencies. In the spring of 1997, the college successfully completed an
accreditation evaluation of its Counseling Psychology Program with the American Psychological Association as well as its certification programs with the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Another metric employed to assess faculty performance incorporates quotas set by the college. The dean and the department chair monitor the number of scholarly publications produced within the college. They use a "floor measurement," which is a number based on the publications produced by the college’s faculty in past years. The entire college makes a conscious effort to maintain a high level of academic activity. This practice ensures that the college faculty continue to balance their energies into the areas of service, teaching, and research.

**Recommendations for Changes in Strategic Planning and Implementation**

The following recommendations tended to come unanimously from all groups interviewed. There were several requests for more feedback from the university administration regarding the request and initiatives included in the college’s annual reports. Another concern in the area of communication was with the perceived target audience of the university’s Strategic Plan. Some faculty had trouble connecting the university’s Strategic Plan to their work in a precise manner because they feel the plan lacks specificity regarding goals. Also, there is the perception that the Strategic Plan, because of its language, seems more appropriate for a corporate than an academic audience.
Introduction

The College of Engineering and Applied Science offers the Bachelor of Science degree in 13 programs, combining a strong background in sciences and mathematics with required course work in humanities and social sciences. The college offers seven engineering programs accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and one program, Computer Science, accredited by the Computer Science Accreditation Board (CSAB). Leadership to the college is provided by Harvey Stenger, dean; Richard Weisman, associate dean for undergraduate studies; and Carol Smith-Nichols, assistant dean for graduate studies. Six departments are affiliated with the college: Chemical Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics. Several centers are also affiliated with the college, most notably the Engineering Research Center for Advanced Technology for Large Structural Systems (ATLSS). The college's laboratories and facilities are spread between the Asa Packer Campus and the Mountaintop Campus. College enrollments in the fall of 1996 were 1,419 undergraduates or 33 percent of the university's undergraduates and 531 graduate students or 29 percent of the university's graduate students.

As part of the process of securing ongoing accreditation from ABET, self-study reviews were completed in June 1995 for the Departments of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering and Electrical Engineering.

Description of the Data Collection

Data were collected via five interviews conducted as follows: 1) the college dean, 2) the associate and assistant deans, 3) the dean's council composed of the department chairs, 4) the college's institute and research center directors, and 5) the college's Academic Policy Committee. Approximately 19 people, nearly all of them faculty, were interviewed in this process. The interviews were conducted by Alexis Cohen (undergraduate student, Computer Engineering) and Marilyn Mackes (director, Corporate Relations and Career Services at the time). Michael Nagel (campaign director and senior development officer), who replaced Marilyn Mackes three quarters of the way through the data collection process, participated in one interview and worked on this report.

Documents used in the college for evaluation and planning were reviewed for this report. Those documents include the college plans as well as accreditation reviews. All college planning documents, accreditation reports, and individual departmental self-study accreditation reviews are available to the visiting committee, with the exception of the ABET Committee Report, which is not a public document.
Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

Planning is clearly a valued activity in the college; it takes many forms and occurs on many levels. Like all of the colleges, the College of Engineering and Applied Science participates in the annual strategic planning processes that result in the university's Operating Plan, and various iterations of the model used in the university-wide process are visible throughout the college. In addition, the faculty, staff, and students of the college engage in a considerable number of other planning and assessment processes resulting in, among other documents, the development of an Academic Plan for the college in 1993, a College Plan in 1994, a State of the College report in December 1996, and the Graduate Program Plan in March 1997. In addition, the college also undergoes accreditation reviews on a regular basis, as noted above. Each review requires that the department develop objectives and assess progress toward those objectives while considering issues of curriculum, facilities, and finances. In summary, strategic planning is integral to the college and is carried to levels exceeding university expectations on a regular basis.

At the college level, the Office of the Dean normally acts as the catalyst to the planning process. Issues addressed by college-level planning range from the development of planning elements for inclusion in the university's Strategic Plan to issues specific to the college or to selected departments or centers within the college. A typical planning flow begins with the dean or the dean's representative identifying the outcome(s) desired from the particular planning process. Most often, this person will sketch out a preliminary outline of the proposed plan. The outline is then circulated to the affected group within the college (i.e., the department chairs) for comments and revisions. Some number of formal and informal meetings normally accompany this process with the result that a plan representing the consensus of the group. It is clear that great care is taken to solicit and consider opinions from everyone affected by the issue at hand, and, in some cases, input is even sought from those who are not direct stakeholders.

The model described above is used, in some variation, as the planning process throughout the college from the departmental level down through centers and individual faculty members. Planning is objective-oriented, and every effort is made to gather widespread input. The faculty and staff interviewed also felt that they have turned the corner in planning and have moved from simply responding to crises to more deliberate planning activities in recent years. There is a strong sense that problems and issues are now more sharply defined.

In a follow-up interview, Dean Stenger described the process used by the college to develop its portion of the university's Operating Plan. He begins the process by asking the department chairs and center heads to complete their own departmental annual report by March or April of each year. He then summarizes the input that he receives
into a college annual report which is then given to the provost. Dean Stenger noted that each step is not done in perfect order and that some of the contributors spend more time on this project than others. Some chairs and heads of centers or institutes use an inclusive style in producing their report while others produce their annual reports with little or no intra-organizational consultation. Formats vary, but most favor the SWOT (Strength – Weakness – Opportunities – Threats) approach. The college annual report that is submitted to the provost becomes the college plan and is typically used as a reference point in allocating resources and in keeping college activities focused. This document is a planning document as opposed to a report. Individual faculty annual reports, typically submitted in January, serve as input for the college’s annual report.

It should be noted that nearly everyone interviewed mentioned in some way the disconnect that occurs in planning throughout the university. The disconnect takes two forms. First, colleges and departments are asked to engage in strategic planning exercises that serve the university but not the participants. Put another way, many people speak of sending plans up to the Alumni Memorial Building that have no impact on or importance to their lives back in the classroom or laboratory. Faculty especially were frank in noting that they might be inclined to regard the process more seriously if they thought their input was being seriously considered. There was a strong sense that university administrators are more interested in planning than in tactics or in translating plans into action. Some individuals put it another way, saying that planning often seems to be the end rather than a means.

Second, most faculty and administrators engage in some level of strategic planning to address issues that arise within the department and the college. However, they view this planning as unrelated to the university’s overall planning process. A common observation was that these issues, while important to the faculty and the college, would never find a place in the university’s Operating Plan because they are too specific and action-oriented for inclusion. The university planning process requires that departmental plans be linked in some way to the overall Strategic Plan. This linkage is easy, according to some, because the objectives in the Strategic Plan are so overly broad that linkage is difficult to avoid. Yet, this perception of the university’s planning priorities, as stated in the Strategic Plan, as nebulous was one of the most commonly expressed concerns about our strategic planning process.

Any misgiving that interviewees have about the strategic planning process are all born of a sincere interest to make the process more beneficial. Faculty and staff in the college recognize the importance of strategic planning and they collectively engage themselves where possible. However, there is a strong perception that there is too much of a void between college planning and university planning. The challenge is to make the university planning process more applicable at the college level.
Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Typical measures used to evaluate college goals and objectives include enrollment by college, department and curriculum, research expenditures, ranking, academic standing, and job and graduate school placement. For example, writing in the State of the College report in December 1996, Dean Stenger noted that Lehigh ranks eighth in Ph.D.'s per faculty member but third in research expenditures per Ph.D. with the same peer group. Since the number of Ph.D.'s issued per faculty is a major factor in graduate ranking, Dean Stenger suggests that the ability to supervise, fund and graduate Ph.D. students must be a high priority when evaluating current faculty for promotion and tenure. Similar objectives are set at various levels throughout the college, and there is a keen awareness among the faculty that they have to deal very aggressively with unfavorable demographics, a stagnant interest in engineering as a career, and, perhaps most significantly, the challenge of expanding enrollment at the graduate level. Goal setting appears in very general terms in most cases, and there is a sense that planning attempts to influence outcomes on a global instead of an incremental basis.

The faculty are also very concerned with more intangible measures of student success and satisfaction, and they spend considerable time in the classroom and on one-on-one assessments of students' responses to instruction, understanding, and capability when applying the materials to identify and correct classroom problems.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Five categories of recommendations were made during these interviews. First, individuals wanted to have clear goals at every level of the university, with indisputable measures to assess progress toward those goals. Interviewees felt that Lehigh's planning must focus on results that are measurable without equivocation. Along with this, there was a call for better distribution of statistics and information, which does not currently trickle down to the faculty. Information, such as placement of graduate students, could be easily available on the Web and would help faculty in their daily activities. Also, they suggested that the College of Engineering and Applied Science redirect some of the energy expended in gauging itself against other schools and focus more on creating means of self-evaluation. In addition to the above, it was suggested that the college and university planning process have more continuity, building on successes as the college works on its weaknesses rather than starting planning activities from scratch every year.

Another recommendation was to connect planning to a plan of action, focusing more on tactics and less on planning itself. A commonly heard observation is that we plan, set objectives, and then put the plan away until next year. When next year comes, we dust off the plan, try to relate the previous year's work to our objectives, and then start the process all over again. This observation was also referred to as a
disconnect, meaning that we plan because we have an objective to do so. Once the planning is done, we resume trying to teach and manage. The planning that we do was sometimes referred to as “dead” vs. the “live” things we do on a day-to-day basis.

Another concern was that input should be welcome. University and college administrators need to make it clear that all opinions merit consideration and are valued. The single most significant concern about the strategic planning process at Lehigh is that the opinions of most people (those at the grassroots) do not matter. Many of those interviewed feel that the president and provost solicit their opinions simply to say that they did so without any real intention of altering the university’s course based on those opinions.

Another recommendation was that the administration of the university address problems strategically. The concern was voiced in the form of two questions: for all of our strategic planning, why does the university seem to be surprised year after year by budget shortfalls, and why haven’t we been able to develop a more innovative response than cutting expenses and salaries?

There also were recommendations for a more unified College of Engineering and Applied Science. One suggestion made by faculty was to integrate departmental planning and center planning and to have these plans connect with the college’s plans. Another suggestion was to involve alumni and students more extensively in the planning and assessment process. Alumni are a resource that can give feedback as to what has worked in the college in the past, and can give the faculty a better understanding of what students will face in the job market.
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

This operating unit is headed by Vice Provost for Academic Administration Patti Ota, who also served until July 1, 1997 as the associate to the president for planning and was Interim Provost from January 1, 1997 to July 30, 1997. Academic Administration encompassed a variety of areas that Vice-Provost Ota characterized as somewhat unrelated until July 1, 1996, when the Offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, and the Registrar were moved into this operating unit. However, she now believes that the operating unit has an enrollment-management focus. The following offices or subunits report to the vice provost: Admissions, Child Care Center, Faculty Development and Learning Innovation Center, English as a Second Language, Financial Aid, Institutional Studies, International Education, Learning Center (referred to as 110 Drown -- its address), Military Science, Registrar, Special Academic Programs, and the Women's Center.

Admissions: Oversees and coordinates the recruiting, admission, and matriculation of all undergraduate students.

Child Care Center: Provides child care to dependents of Lehigh faculty, staff, and students.

Faculty Development and Learning Innovation Center: Coordinates services to help faculty expand and improve their pedagogical approaches to assist student learning.

English as a Second Language: Provides credit and non-credit English courses to students for whom English is not a first language and tests and certifies English fluency for teaching faculty.

Financial Aid: Oversees the awarding of need-based and merit-based undergraduate financial aid. The role of the Financial Aid Office has changed in recent years from primarily evaluating families' ability to pay to helping families strategically plan how they are going to finance the college education of children.

Institutional Studies: Oversees collection and distribution of institutional data for all purposes, including planning activities. Lehigh supports nine direct exchanges with universities abroad, seven faculty-led programs abroad, and sends students to over 40 other abroad sites.

International Education: Coordinates all of Lehigh's international activities, including study abroad, undergraduate and graduate student recruiting, development, visas, and other services.
110 Drown: Provides tutoring in writing, math, and study skills to Lehigh students.

Military Service: Operates Lehigh's Army R.O.T.C. program.

Registrar: Oversees and coordinates course scheduling, student registration, and student records.

Special Academic Programs: Operates Lehigh's distance education and summer session programs.

Women's Center: Sponsors and organizes programs for women and programs that improve gender understanding and relationships.

Description of Data Collection

Louis Martin-Vega (professor and chair, Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering) and Pat Newhart (academic coordinator, Materials Science and Engineering) were responsible for conducting the interviews and collecting data for the Academic Administration operating unit. In addition, they interviewed the assistant provost and the secretary to the president. Data were gathered in seven different interviews with a total of 17 people. The first interview was conducted with the vice provost for Academic Administration. Following that, interviews were conducted with: (1) the director of special programs; (2) the director and other representatives from International Education, including International Advancement and the director of English as a Second Language; (3) the directors and other individuals from the offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, and Registrar; (4) the assistant provost, the director of Institutional Studies, the Faculty Development coordinator, and the secretary to the president; and (5) the director of the Child Care Center and Women's Center (same individual), the director of 110 Drown, and the head of Military Service. After these interviews were completed, a second interview was held with the vice provost for Academic Administration.

Most of the individuals interviewed were managers or heads of their subunits. No staff were involved in the interviews. The interviewers asked one question and elicited a response from each subunit representative participating in the interview before proceeding to the next question. Notes taken during the interviews were recorded on a cassette tape immediately after each interview. The tapes were transcribed, and the transcriptions served as the input for this summary.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

At the time of the interviews, the vice provost for Academic Administration spent part of her time as associate to the president for planning. This function, by definition, is totally engaged with strategic planning at the highest level in the university. Ota was
one of the primary contributors to Lehigh's Strategic Plan. Also, as co-chair of the Planning and Budgeting Working Group of the University Council, Ota continued to be involved in formulating the annual Operating Plans and university budgets.

As vice provost for Academic Administration, her role includes facilitating planning efforts for the subunits in this operating unit. A key forum used to facilitate this process is the monthly enrollment management meetings with subunit directors, any staff members that care to attend, the associate dean of students for academic support, the assistant dean of students for academic support, the assistant provost, the director of the Iacocca Institute, the director of Career Services, and a representative from Information Resources. The vice provost also meets monthly with her direct reports and with the associate dean of students for academic support. In addition, Ota meets individually (normally monthly) with most of her direct reports.

In the fall of 1996, Ota initiated three major planning efforts to provide appropriate information for the Board of Trustees, the University Council, and the 1997 Operating Plan. Three planning task forces were created and charged with producing an Undergraduate Enrollment Management Plan (headed by Lorna Hunter, dean of Admissions and Financial Aid), an Undergraduate Retention Plan (headed by Sharon Basso, associate dean of Students for Academic Support and Dr. Raymond Bell, professor of Education), and an international plan, called International Plan 2000 (headed by Anne Thomas, director of International Education) by the end of the semester. Specifically, the task forces were asked to look at and evaluate relevant projections in the 1996 Operating Plan; to benchmark the operations of other institutions; to establish appropriate targets for admission, retention, and international initiatives; and to establish metrics for measuring the success of these operations. The task forces involved approximately 30 faculty and staff. The Undergraduate Enrollment Management Plan was presented by Ota and Hunter to the Board of Trustees in January 1997.

In addition, each subunit prepares a department annual report. These reports are synthesized into the annual report of the operating unit. This function was performed by Ota until 1997. During this year, that responsibility was given to the registrar, the dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, and the director of Special Academic Programs acting in concert.

Most of the planning effort within Admissions focused on developing the Undergraduate Enrollment Management Plan and then on its execution. Development of this document was driven by current mission statements and goals of the university as reflected in its Strategic Plan.

Individuals in Financial Aid did not consider themselves directly involved in strategic planning. This subunit reacts or responds to financial aid budget decisions and
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attempts to find the most effective way to respond to objectives of the Undergraduate Enrollment Management Plan and the Strategic Plan.

The Registrar's Office is involved in planning to the extent that it is involved with meeting legal guidelines and regulations as well as with implementation of the faculty policy included in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty. The subunit's major input to strategic planning is its role in developing the five-year enrollment model upon which the university budget is based.

Institutional Studies is heavily responsible for developing the strategic planning documents described earlier in this document. Because of this responsibility, this subunit plays a direct role in many of the issues and discussions that take place at different levels of the university (for example, the Planning and Budgeting Working Group of the University Council), which eventually becomes part of the Operating Plan.

Faculty Development does not provide direct input to strategic planning but reacts to and implements those aspects of the Operating Plan related to teaching and faculty development at Lehigh.

Special Academic Programs has not provided direct input to the strategic planning process in the past, but feels that this role is changing as a result of a greater emphasis on the revenue-generating activities in which it is engaged. Subunit goals and objectives are developed internally for the department annual report and targeted to items in the Strategic Plan. The director of special academic programs has routinely provided input into the annual budget preparation process with respect to summer-session and distance-education income.

Individuals in both International Education and English as a Second Language view strategic planning as a major activity in their areas. The main vehicle for planning in International Education is an International Planning Group with representatives from many different offices at the university. Many members of this group were part of the task force that developed the International Plan 2000.

Individuals from Military Service, 110 Drown, the Women's Center, and the Child Care Center noted that they do not have direct involvement in strategic planning. These individuals, however, do provide input through the vice provost for Academic Administration related to the relationship of the goals and objectives of their subunits to those in the university's Strategic Plan. People from all of these areas feel that their work supports Strategic Plan objectives related to recruitment and retention of students and enhancement of the quality of the undergraduate and graduate experiences at Lehigh.

The assistant provost provides direct input with respect to the diversity of faculty, staff and students. In addition, the assistant provost works with the director of
institutional studies and with the Diversity Commission to produce Lehigh's Affirmative Action Plans.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Most of the subunits under Academic Administration have clear outcome measures. These measures are summarized in the following subunit descriptions and are consistent with the measures described by the vice provost for Academic Administration. One additional objective for this operating unit is to achieve more integration between people and functions reporting to the vice provost for Academic Administration.

Outcomes in Admissions are very quantitatively driven and easier to measure than those of other subunits of the university. Admissions maintains data on inquiries, applications, ratio of admitted students to applications, yield, and quality of incoming students for the university as a whole and for each undergraduate college. These measures are commonly used by most admissions offices.

In Financial Aid, outcome measurements are driven by compliance with federal regulations: how financial funding can be spent, federal and state guidelines for funding, etc. Outcomes measures include how well Lehigh meets these guidelines and Lehigh's expectations for net undergraduate tuition revenue.

Outcomes for the Registrar are based on the goal of providing timely, responsive service to customers and ensuring that Lehigh is in compliance with federal regulations and university policies. One measure of outcomes is the number of complaints that they receive.

For Institutional Studies, the main objective is to get the Operating Plan produced and distributed on time. This subunit provides much of the data in the plan, and so accuracy of data is another important objective. The outcomes for this subunit are straightforward: did the Operating Plan get produced on time and with accurate information?

Outcomes for Faculty Development involve the number of faculty and teaching assistants that participate in faculty development activities along with the evaluations of these programs.

The outcomes for Special Academic Programs also are quantitative; they are distance education and summer session net tuition revenues. Other objectives are: growing the programs at a rate that allows the maintenance of academic and customer service quality; having the programs provide a financial return to the university departments; helping increase the national visibility of the university, especially to industry; and creating greater awareness of the need for professional master's degree
programs or for more programs that are in tune to professional degree-type programs, not as a substitute for the regular graduate programs but as a parallel effort.

Individuals in both International Education and English as a Second Language view strategic planning as a major activity in their areas. An International Administrators’ Team with members from several departments across campus meets regularly to plan and coordinate a variety of international activities. The International Plan 2000 benchmarks Lehigh’s programs with peer institutions and sets specific strategic goals. Several team members served with faculty on the committee which wrote the plan, and are actively engaged in fulfilling those goals.

The Child Care and Women's Centers do not use specific outcome measures. However, these operations pay close attention to meeting the perceived needs of their constituents. The waiting list of families wanting to use the Child Care Center is one measure of success. Moreover, other universities frequently call Lehigh’s Child Care Center and Women’s Center to benchmark their activities.

Military Service, or R.O.T.C., is evaluated by the US Army through the Office of the General of Cadet Commands. The R.O.T.C. program went from a "very poor" rating (almost closed) two and a half years ago to the most recent "commendable" rating, which is the highest rating a detachment can receive. President Likins received notification from the Army that Lehigh's R.O.T.C. program is in the top 5 percent in the nation. Lehigh's R.O.T.C. cadets also attend an annual ranger challenge competition where they compete with 24 other schools in the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York areas. Our team has been rated first or second in this competition every year.

For Drown 110, one outcome measure has to do with the number of students served by the Center. The Center is growing, and that is probably a reflection on its effectiveness. The Center also solicits evaluations from the students to evaluate the quality of its services, and this feedback is generally positive.

There are very specific outcome measures for the assistant provost, who administers a number of precollege programs. Part of this responsibility is raising financial support for these activities, so dollars raised in a given year to support these activities is an outcome measure. The assistant provost also serves as the Affirmative Action Officer for the faculty and actively recruits minority graduate students. Some other outcomes measures are the number of minority and women faculty and number of minority graduate students recruited. This subunit also is responsible for administration of the university visiting committee system, which the assistant provost must make sure operates effectively. A mechanism to measure this outcome has yet to be developed.
Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

One set of concerns voiced in these interviews related to the structure and workings of the University Council. The administrative staff interviewed felt that the role of the University Council needs to be clarified on campus. While its role is to serve as an advisory board to the president, they thought that the perception of many faculty and staff is that the University Council serves as the “planning decision maker.” Concerns about the University Council’s role in planning are highlighted when faculty and staff are required to make presentations before the council and no feedback is forthcoming. At best, staff feel that the University Council is an unnecessary body to which to report. At worst, the University Council is perceived as a policy making body without any accountability to the campus.

Another concern is that there is a lack of coordination between the University Council and the Education Policy and Graduate and Research committees of the faculty. Individuals interviewed saw this as a real impediment to strategic planning as well as to the way in which individual operating units implement planning in their areas. It was felt that there was an overly complex procedure for major decision making in the university that retards the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Even though there are overlaps in individuals serving in positions within the university’s organizational structure, the faculty committees, and the university committees and working groups, many we have interviewed perceived that these groups did not really talk to each other about planning.

Another common concern related to the role of information systems in the planning process. One concern voiced had to do with the number of information and data bases on different platforms. A more integrated information system would have a major effect on enhancing the planning process in many subunits within this operating unit. Better historical records and a more efficient way to store and recall data would significantly improve the planning capability of subunits such as Admissions and Financial Aid. For example, there have been three Admissions computing systems at Lehigh in the past nine years. The SAFAHRIS project (described in Chapter 5) is expected to provide better data-harvesting capabilities and a good relational data base to enhance planning and decision-support capabilities in these subunits.

Finally, it was mentioned that institutional planning was not nearly as big an issue ten years ago when Lehigh was doing very well. It was acknowledged that the demands on the system and the financial realities and constraints of today make planning much more critical. No one is shirking this responsibility. A comment that summarizes part of the frustration was, “we are being asked to do things that we didn’t have to do in the past, but we now are also saying that we need better tools in order to do these things.”
ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

Introduction

The Lehigh University Alumni Association is different from the other operating units described in this report because it is a separate organization from the university. The Alumni Association receives funding from the university; however, it does not submit annual reports for the university’s Operating Plan. The primary function of this operating unit is to maintain alumni connections with the university. The association reports to the president of the university and to the Board of Trustees.

The leadership in the association includes Executive Director Barbara Turanchik, whose responsibilities include the Lehigh University Alumni Association management, Lehigh University Alumni Association Executive Board, internal relations with administration and faculty, the publication of the Alumni Bulletin, Lehigh alumni tours, Lehigh University Alumni Association Awards Committee, President’s Council of Lehigh Women, a liaison to the Global Advancement Council, alumni clubs, personnel issues, the physical plant of the Alumni Association, and professional development. Associate Director Janet Tucker works with alumni clubs, international alumni, graduate alumni, and is the advisor to the Graduate Student Council. In addition, Tucker is responsible for resource management, alumni education, and reunion planning. Tucker and Turanchik also work with the deans of the colleges and the academic departments to support their programs. Associate Director Thad Turner is responsible for Senior Alumni Council, class reunions, and alumni clubs. An assistant director, Amy Costello, is alumni club coordinator, liaison to alumni admissions outreach program, serves as liaison to the Parents Committee, and is special events coordinator. Another assistant director, Todd West, is responsible for the Greek Alumni Council, Metro Alumni Clubs, young alumni activities, undergraduate relations, undergraduate class advisor, and special interest groups. In addition to the directors, there are seven support staff members. For more information on the responsibilities of the Alumni Association, please refer to the Lehigh University Alumni Association Long Range Plan (Action Plans).

Description of Data Collection

Joan Spade (associate professor, Sociology) and Ali Richardson (undergraduate student, English) collected data in two focus group meetings. One focus group included the executive director, both associate directors and two members of the Lehigh University Alumni Association Executive Board. The other focus groups included four (of seven) members of the support staff, or all of the individuals who were working on the day of the interviews. In addition to the focus groups, the following documents were reviewed: the Lehigh University Alumni Association Long Range Plan (Volumes I and II) and the Lehigh University Alumni Association Action Plans (July 1996 to June 1997).
Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

This operating unit lists its long-range plans in the Lehigh University Alumni Association Long Range Plan (Volumes I and II). Beginning in October 1984 and extending over the next 20 months, a specially appointed Long Range Planning Committee developed a document to serve as a planning guide for the activities of the association. The project began under the guidance of Chair James B. Swenson '59, and was completed with the assistance of Chair A. A. "Gus" Riemondy '41 (now deceased). The report was the result of many hours of committee members' volunteer time.

The structure of the plan, as presented in Volume I, was patterned after The Lehigh Plan. The Alumni Association Long Range Plan establishes the mission statement, the guiding principles, and the prescribed goals that comprise the philosophy of the association. In Volume II, a set of standing action plans outlines the activities of the association, and describes the actions needed to accomplish its objectives in harmony with the stated goals.

The Alumni Association Board of Directors meets quarterly. At these meetings, the programs and goals of the association are reviewed and revised as necessary. These meetings coincide with the Board of Trustees meetings. Six alumni trustees are elected to serve on both boards for three-year terms. The president of the Alumni Association reports on the state of the Alumni Association's programs and its progress toward the goals of the association at each Board of Trustees meeting. In addition, the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association meets annually with the president, provost, chairman of the Board of Trustees and, in recent meetings, the vice president of Development to update them on the association's progress in their programs and goals.

The professional staff work closely with alumni volunteers to develop operating plans for the alumni clubs, host alumni events, and perform all of the other responsibilities (as listed in the action plans) of the association. Each year a meeting of all staff is held at which nonexempt staff give feedback and input into the planning of association events and activities. In their interviews, support staff said they feel very comfortable with their working relationships in the association. They talked about an "open-door-policy," which allows them to voice suggestions and concerns at any time to the directors. In addition to giving input into the association's planning process, the support staff members felt that they are able to set office goals. They meet together regularly to determine what they feel is the best and most efficient means of operation for the office. All of the interviewees felt that the Alumni Association office operated in a manner that allowed some freedom in personal goal setting along with a comfortable degree of self-accountability.
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The Alumni Association also engages in a number of across-unit projects and programs within the university. These are usually programs in which alumni interact with undergraduate students. The Residential Environment Report of 1995-96 is one example of where the Alumni Association used its ongoing contact with alumni to solicit input that was included in the report.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

The association, because of the nature of its function, primarily uses absolute numbers and percentages to measure the effectiveness of its plans. For instance, the staff measures the percentage of alumni attending alumni reunions each year and develops tactics to increase that percentage. They also measure attendance at all alumni club activities and suggest goals for clubs to strive for in their planning stages. If clubs do not meet these expectations, the association staff works with the clubs to make changes that may increase attendance.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Individuals in this unit who participated in these interviews were very satisfied with their current planning and implementation process. They noted that when problems arise, they deal with them as they occur. Everyone was very satisfied with this system and no one had recommendations for changes in their processes for planning and implementation.
DEPARTMENT OF ATHLETICS

Introduction

The Department of Athletics is directed by Joseph Sterrett, who is assisted by Senior Associate Director Karen Adams (see Appendix C). This department is responsible for a variety of university activities, most notably intercollegiate and intramural athletics. In addition to head and assistant coaches in 18 varsity sports, a number of other individuals report to the director of athletics. These individuals include the equipment manager, assistant to the athletic director for academic support, director of athletic facilities, director of communications and marketing, director of athletics partnership, and an assistant athletic director for compliance. The following individuals report to the senior associate director of athletics: the director of intramurals/club sports, director of fitness/recreation, director of sports medicine, director of tickets/budgets, and a number of support staff.

Description of Data Collection

Data were collected through a series of individual and group interviews conducted by George DuPaul (associate professor, College of Education). The director of athletics and senior associate director were interviewed individually. A total of 12 of the 18 head coaches participated in a one-hour focus group. Also, six student-athletes who compete at the intercollegiate level participated in a one-hour focus group. Finally, a variety of written materials were reviewed, including the Department of Athletics' Mission Statement and Strategic Priorities, program reviews for the various subunits of the department (e.g., intercollegiate sports, fitness/recreation, support staff), and the department budget summary for 1996-97.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

Strategic planning occurs at a variety of levels in the Department of Athletics. According to most of the interviewees, this process is tied to the fundamental mission of the university (i.e., to promote the learning experience of our students). Also, the planning process is tied explicitly to evaluation of outcomes (described later). Each subunit of the operating unit develops an annual report that includes program goals and objectives, as well as strategies and priorities for meeting these goals. Each subunit also provides a performance appraisal report (including outcome data) on an annual basis to either the director of athletics or the senior associate director. These annual reports and performance appraisal reports are written by the heads of each subunit (e.g., head coaches) with input from staff and students. Reports include recommendations from each subunit as to changes, resources, and/or strategies that are needed to meet stated goals.
As part of the above planning process, the director and/or senior associate director undertakes a comprehensive review of each intercollegiate program at the conclusion of the pertinent season. An example is the football program, which is reviewed every year at the end of the fall season. This review includes both oral and written input from the program director (in the case of varsity sports that person would be the head coach), other program staff, and student-athletes. The degree to which the program has met stated goals and objectives is examined at a variety of levels; some examples are the performance of personnel, quality of team process, and academic and competitive outcomes. Administrative programs undergo a similar review at the conclusion of each academic year. Program evaluations and an executive summary, prepared by the director, are distributed on an annual basis to the entire staff in the Department of Athletics, to other interested parties, and to president, the person to whom the department reports. These annual reports are then used in developing program and departmental plans for the following year with the overriding objective being to tie these plans into the overall mission of the department.

The planning process of the department also is aided by the input of several committees, including the Student-Athlete Council, the Imaging Committee, and the Faculty Athletics Council. These committees primarily provide input to the director and meet with him on a regular basis; the Student-Athlete Council meets monthly.

The department also has developed plans that involve collaboration with other components of the university or local community. For example, the department is involved in a Community Outreach Program that involves participation in youth athletic programs in the community. Each of these collaborative programs has its own planning process and outcomes evaluation with broad participation across the department.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

The planning process in this operating unit is strongly tied to outcome data. In addition to competitive results (wins and losses), program planning is tied to academic performance of student-athletes, reduction and prevention of injuries, and involvement of students in extracurricular activities beyond athletics. Student input is solicited in a variety of ways, including a written survey completed at the end of each competitive season as well as an exit interview with graduating seniors. The focus of these oral and written evaluations is on the quality of the student-athletes’ experiences at Lehigh as well as the students’ perceptions of the degree to which each program is meeting its objectives. The goals and objectives of the athletic program are shared with the students they enlist, so students know what will be expected of them and what they should expect from the Department of Athletics.
Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Participants provided a number of recommendations for change in the planning process within the Department of Athletics, two of which follow.

The staff in the Department of Athletics and student-athletes would like to have greater involvement from the faculty in planning and evaluation processes. For example, faculty could participate in exit interviews with graduating seniors. Another area where the department would like more faculty participation is on the Faculty Athletic Council.

A second recommendation is to improve instrumentation to measure outcomes and employ greater use of technology to increase efficiency of the evaluation process. This means the implementation of a more efficient data base to improve information retrieval and facilitate quicker, more accurate evaluation of student and departmental statistics.

Other recommendations were made from within the subunits. One was that the director and/or senior associate director should meet more frequently with student team representatives (once or twice a season). In addition, students felt that these meetings with the directors should be open to all student-athletes who volunteer, not just those who are chosen by coaches or teammates. Although coaches and student-athletes feel that their input is used in making planning decisions, both groups voiced a need to have their input taken more seriously (e.g., student-athletes would like to be more involved in coach selection). Coaches would like to see more of their input sought by and attended to by university faculty, particularly in areas such as the students' completion of academic requirements and the scheduling of courses.
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Introduction

The Board of Trustees of Lehigh University consists of 40 trustees who sit on 11 standing committees and two subcommittees of standing committees. Each trustee serves on at least one of these committees, with most serving on two or more. These committees and associated subcommittees are described in detail earlier in Chapter 2.

Description of Data Collection

Patti Ota (vice provost for Academic Administration) and Joan Spade (associate professor, Sociology) interviewed five chairs of standing committees (executive, physical plant and planning, finance, student affairs, and advancement committees) and one person who serves as both vice chair of the academic affairs committee and the chair of the graduate studies and research subcommittee. These persons chair committees most closely associated with the strategic planning process.

All interviews took place over the telephone and lasted approximately 30 minutes each. Questions asked of these trustees differed from those used in the other interviews because the nature of trustee involvement in decision making is considerably different from that of other units in the university. Questions asked were:

What is your role in the planning process at Lehigh University, both as an individual and as a trustee standing committee chairperson?

What do you know about the university planning processes, and how useful do you find the annual Operating Plans and their Executive Summaries?

Do you have any recommendations for additions or changes to the planning processes that would facilitate decisions of the Board of Trustees?

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

When asked how they viewed their role in the planning process, these trustees saw it as a global one. The chair of the Board of Trustees felt that the trustees should have a broad concept of what the university should be and that the role of the chair of a committee is to project that vision.

Many of the trustees we interviewed saw their role as one of oversight. They believe that they should be able to assure that processes are in place and that
strategies and plans will happen. Specific references were made to oversight of fiduciary affairs and governance. Others, however, said that they saw their role as that of setting broad goals and objectives for the university. The roles of goal setting and oversight often became entangled, even within individual interviews. One trustee, while emphasizing the board's role as one of oversight, noted that board recommendations shaped planning decisions.

Trustees saw their role as being distinct from that of management. One trustee explained that the trustees set the general goals and that management develops the strategies and plans for implementing these goals. While most trustees agreed with this orientation, another trustee said that it was management's responsibility to set goals. This person believed that trustees could not provide follow-through or governance, only advice, consulting, resources, and a supporting mechanism for change. Another trustee used the words “consultative” as well as “monitoring the implementation of goals” as he defined his role on the board. One trustee talked about strategic planning as a critical part of the process he oversees and spoke of planning documents within the operating unit as a "living document." Another trustee said that his role as chair of a standing committee did not carry any formal authority, but rather provided an avenue for committee members to express their views and provide a link between the university and the trustees on the committee.

In terms of their relationship to the university's planning process, trustees varied in how they use the university's planning documents. Most said they were more likely to use the Executive Summaries rather than the more detailed Operating Plans. They tended to use the figures and data in the Operating Plans only if they saw "red flags" in the Executive Summaries or needed more data to answer questions they had. These documents were described as providing a "context" should the board disagree on an issue.

One trustee said that he reviewed the annual Operating Plan but did not use it as a tool or formally in his role as a trustee standing committee chair or as a trustee. This trustee saw these planning documents as tools used by management that were drawn up to achieve the broader objectives set by the Board of Trustees. Another trustee said that the process of creating the planning documents may be as important as the reports themselves because it gives the persons writing the report an opportunity to assess their goals and priorities. Yet another trustee noted that individual members of the Board of Trustees can affect the implementation of plans and priorities by "stepping up to the plate" and funding something that he or she believes is important to the university, regardless of its ranking in the priorities.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

In terms of recommendations for changes in the planning process, most trustees indicated that they did not see the need for further documentation, and some suggested...
that the planning documents be reduced. One trustee felt the reports needed to be simplified, that they were much too complex and too verbose. Another trustee asked for less detail and more focus on the core issues. (Note: the Operating Plan and Executive Summary were simplified and combined into one document in 1997.)

Another suggestion was that the board be given benchmarks for key issues so that things can be flagged earlier in the year to assure that the university is meeting targets.

Someone suggested that the standing committees become more involved in setting goals, with the committees perhaps meeting with appropriate university operating units prior to the presentation of the Operating Plan to the full board in June. While this trustee felt that the committees were getting good information, he felt that there was not enough time to question the directions being set and to revise the goals accordingly. Another trustee expressed the need for the development of academic goals for the university.

One trustee cautioned that long-term planning, even for five years ahead, may be unrealistic given the changing nature of higher education today. Planning must incorporate and be sensitive to the impact of external forces, particularly technological change.
DEVELOPMENT AND UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Introduction

This operating unit underwent considerable changes in administrative structure since the initial interviews were conducted in the early spring of 1997. At the time of the initial interviews, there was one unit, University Advancement, which was under Michael G. Bolton, vice president for advancement. The following areas reported to the vice president for advancement: development, including alumni fundraising, development relations, development services, and planned giving and leadership gifts; corporate relations, including career services; foundation relations; university relations, including external communications, internal communications, design resources, and design; and community and government relations, including university events.

Effective July 1, 1997, this operating unit was reorganized into two separate operating units. Bolton became vice president for public affairs, with community and government relations reporting to him. Jill Sherman became vice president for development and university relations, with development, corporate relations, foundation relations, career services, and university relations reporting to her. In addition, John Van Ness will join Lehigh University in September as assistant vice president for corporate and foundation relations, reporting to Sherman. Bolton left the university on August 31, 1997, and Ken Smith replaced him on October 1, 1997.

Description of Data Collection

Initial interviews were conducted by Jim Schmotter (dean of the College of Business and Economics), who left the steering committee and the university on June 30, 1997. Schmotter interviewed Bolton on January 21, 1997, when Bolton was vice president for advancement. Schmotter also conducted two focus groups. The first group meeting on April 2, 1997 included Bolton and colleagues Sherman, then assistant vice president of development; Ron Ticho, then assistant vice president of university relations; and Marilyn Mackes, then director of corporate relations. A second focus group was conducted with a group of seven staff members on May 7, 1997. Joan Spade (associate professor, Sociology, and co-chair of the Middle States Steering Committee) followed up these interviews with an interview with Sherman, now vice president for development and university relations on August 13, 1997.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

For the past five years, the primary focus of the development functions of this operating unit have been driven by the priorities established in the “Preserving The Vision” capital campaign. The goal to “Advance successfully the $300 million dollar campaign for Preserving The Vision” was listed in the 1994 version of The Lehigh Plan.
Staff members noted a definite “top-down” emphasis in planning in the development subunit. Some even suggested that no planning was underway in any sort of systematic way. Many also commented that numerous recent personnel and leadership changes in this area have distracted most staff members from focusing on any one priority.

University relations holds a retreat twice a year in which all staff members work to develop a set of priorities for the subunit. The current priorities focus on aiding admissions and development in accomplishing their goals. Informally, interviewees admitted that the ranking surveys in the public press and informal opinions of trustees also occasionally play a driving role in establishing priorities. Changing university priorities also can deflect planned priorities into new directions as new initiatives are begun in midyear.

Corporate relations holds biannual retreats addressing goals and objectives in The Lehigh Plan. All members of the staff participate by completing written tasks in advance of the retreats. This format was developed when corporate relations reported to student affairs. It now faces broader and more complex challenges with its placement in university advancement.

Corporate relations establishes its goals and priorities based upon consistent interaction with key corporate constituents. They hold focus groups and conduct surveys on a regular basis to assess needs.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

In 1996-97, the Office of Development asked academic units across the university to identify needs in their areas. Also that year, cash goals for the year were established within the development subunits by taking a list of the contributions for the last five years, throwing out the high and low years and averaging the remaining three years. Development consistently establishes goals in conjunction with Budget Office projections for the annual fund drive.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Those interviewed in development, university relations, and corporate relations voiced considerable frustration with the planning process in 1996-97 and previous years. First, there was a concern that there is a lack of understanding of a meaningful mission. There is a need for a clearer and more direct statement of university goals and priorities. Interviewees expressed the sentiment that The Lehigh Plan is too long and complex to provide a meaningful context for planning and that the process for developing the current Operating Plan for the unit is ineffective. They felt that there needs to be “one vision for Lehigh.” The linkage between overall university priorities and operating unit objectives is not understandable; therefore, most of the focus
remains at the operating unit level. This practice leads to occasional duplication of effort and inconsistency of purpose across operating units. Individuals felt that this practice discourages the generation of effective metrics to measure outcomes and progress.

Second, there was a concern, particularly among managers, that there is a disconnect between faculty and administrators with regard to university priorities. While more faculty are becoming involved in the activities of this operating unit, it is frustrating to staff and administrators that a lack of a common purpose or even an understanding of that purpose presents obstacles to the accomplishment of goals. Someone made the observation that any individual faculty member who wishes to resist consensus may do so, thus detracting from serious, focused planning. Some staff members also commented on the hierarchical contexts of their organizations, which lead to similar results, depending on the leadership style of the manager.

Third, measurement of goals and outcomes is unclear in many areas. Even in development, number of dollars raised does not fully reflect the long-term process that includes years of donor cultivation. There was concern that the full impact of planned giving is not widely understood or appreciated on campus. There was a sense of frustration about a “what have you done for me lately” attitude toward development and university relations, especially among the trustees. The metrics used to compare Lehigh with other universities and colleges were also mentioned. Some interviewees perceived an unhealthy obsession with national rankings among some constituents, as well as unrealistic benchmarking with Ivy League institutions by alumni and trustees.

Fourth, inconsistency in the planning process was mentioned repeatedly. The announcement of the “Advancement Plan” was noted as an example. This initiative, while linked to and broadly consistent with The Lehigh Plan, occurred outside the normal campus planning process and was driven by individual members of the Board of Trustees. These changes distract the planning process and create inconsistencies in outcomes. Frustration also was expressed over the hands-on management by a few members of the Board of Trustees.

Fifth, a concern was voiced over the frequent and rapid changes in personnel and direction in this operating unit. Staff members believe this makes them largely reactive and not engaged in any sort of meaningful planning. One interviewee commented that she has reported to five different supervisors during the past 16 months and suggested that such an environment makes planning and implementing any plan extremely difficult. The changes in personnel in this operating unit at the time of the interviews created a general sense of anxiety and unease among staff members in these interviews.

Sixth, there was a strong sense of disconnect between the formal university planning process and the activities of staff members. Formal Operating Plans
guide the work of most people interviewed and are seen as largely irrelevant to the actual work of the subunits in this area.

Update (August 31, 1997):

While this report reflects the feelings of people in this operating unit in the spring of 1997, several changes have been made since the July 1, 1997 reorganization. This update provides an overview of these changes as of August 31, 1997.

First, there has been a carefully orchestrated effort to develop goals in both university relations and development which includes the participation of everyone in the operating unit. Two retreats were held with a total of 20 managers. One included all managers from university relations and the other included all managers from development. Individual managers were to work with their staff to develop goals and objectives for each of their subunits. These individual goals were compiled into one annual plan for development and university relations, including mission statements for development and university relations. These goals are connected to The Lehigh Plan. Each “team plan” incorporates objectives, strategies necessary to meet those objectives, and the metrics by which the team will measure success. The entire staff in this operating unit will meet in September to review and finalize these plans and to create an overall work plan and strategic outlook for 1998.

Second, the committees of the Board of Trustees have been revised and there are now two committees, development and university relations, which replace the previous advancement committee. The role of these committees is clearly defined and should coordinate more effectively with the planning activities within development and university relations.

Third, this unit has begun work on the “quiet phase” of the next development campaign. This involves an extensive needs assessment of faculty through an interview process and a call for faculty ideas and input. This needs assessment was reviewed by development staff with the deans and center directors, and they will continue to work with the provost as the plan progresses. Development has devised an interim plan for the next two years based on these assessments and hopes to present it to the Board of Trustees at the October 1997 meeting. The next two years will include assessments of their donor base and support for the future campaign, benchmarking, reviewing resources and evaluating staff in the subunit. They will also be looking for lead donors prior to going public with the campaign.

Fourth, university relations is working more closely with development in conjunction with goals for the operating unit. They are working toward “speaking with one voice” across the university. Their 1997-98 annual plan includes strategies in five different goal areas with metrics to assess each strategy.
Update (January 1, 1998):

University Relations changed its report to the Public Affairs stem with the hiring of the Vice President for Public Affairs Kenneth Smith on October 1, 1997. Jill Sherman, as Vice President for Advancement, now oversees a stem entirely focused on donor cultivation and fundraising. This, along with the hiring of new staff, has resulted in a redistribution of responsibilities focused around the areas of Planned Giving; Leadership, Major and Planned Gifts; Advancement Relations; and Corporate and Foundation Relations and Career Services.

One staff member who read the draft of the self-study said that the section "does not begin to convey the crucial connection between a sound strategic planning process and successful university advancement (fund raising)." Another staff member expressed concerns that "few of the employees in our stem are consulted in regards to the short- or long-term planning in University Relations."
Chapter 3: Strategic Planning and Implementation

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

Finance and Administration is composed of Vice President for Finance and Administration Rhonda Gross with four assistant vice presidents, a controller, a secretary/treasurer, and an internal auditor (see Appendix D). Finance and Administration has close links with the Board of Trustees, staffing six board committees: Oversight, Finance, Investment Subcommittee, Physical Plant and Planning, Audit, and Community Affairs.

In describing the stem, the vice president for Finance and Administration said that although this operating unit has many individual subunits with separate functions, the overriding goals of these subunits are to: 1) be cost effective and operate efficiently, 2) increase customer service, and 3) increase revenue. The seven subunits within this operating unit are described as follows:

The Facilities Services & Campus Planning area is responsible for maintaining and operating all campus facilities as well as for providing planning and prioritizing all changes, renovations, and enhancements to the campus facilities.

The Resource Management area covers both human relations and budget responsibilities. All human resource activities, including benefits and compensation, and employee relations and training as well as preparing and monitoring the annual budget is done within this subunit.

The Business Services area is responsible for providing tangible and intangible services to all areas of the university, including overseeing the performance of contracted services. Areas covered by this subunit include: purchasing, travel, mailing and printing services, Stabler Center, transportation services, food services, residential services, conference services, and the bookstore. Some of these units are cost centers, which means they must raise their own budgets and return additional monies to the university. Two of the ten services in this area -- travel and food services -- are contracted to outside companies.

The Controller is responsible for all financial information, including payroll, accounts payable and miscellaneous receivables. Property management also falls under the controller's office. This office is responsible for conducting the physical inventory of the university's land, buildings, and equipment.

The Secretary/Treasurer receives and distributes funds. In addition, the corporate secretary is the chief liaison with the Board of Trustees. Risk management oversight, the bursar function, and real estate also are handled by this subunit.
The **Internal Auditor** assures the integrity of all financial functions and also includes an information systems auditor, including operational, financial, compliance, and information systems audits through all areas of the university and its related organizations.

The **Office of Research and Sponsored Programs** is responsible for the administration of research and other sponsored activities. This includes the review and negotiation of proposals, financial/compliance management of any sponsored project awards, maintenance of an information data base for internal and external reporting purposes, and development of various indirect cost rates.

**Description of Data Collection**

The collection of data consisted of eight individual interviews and three focus groups with individuals from the Finance and Administration operating units depicted on the attached organizational chart. Agnes Moroney (administrative clerk, Development Office) and Joan Spade (associate professor, Sociology) began by interviewing the vice president for finance and administration, who provided an overview of how the operating unit is organized. Then, individual interviews were scheduled with five heads of subunits to gain a sense of what and how their respective areas implement the strategic planning process. Interviews at this level also included a focus group with four senior-level managers, the controller, treasurer, assistant vice president for Research and Sponsored Programs, and director of the Internal Audit Office. In addition, a separate interview was conducted with an individual in the operating unit who worked on developing a system of outcomes evaluation. These interviews were followed by two focus groups, one with middle-level managers (nine persons were invited, six participated or sent a substitute) and the other with nonexempt staff (eight were invited, three participated or sent a substitute). A final interview with the vice president for Finance and Administration reviewed and clarified findings. Each focus group, other than the senior-level managers, consisted of individuals randomly selected from all areas of the Finance and Administration operating unit.

Both Agnes Moroney and Joan Spade participated in all interviews in Finance and Administration. These interviews followed the format described earlier in this document. Interviews were conducted "confidentially," and everyone participated in a free and open manner, stating successes and failures of implementing strategic planning as well as suggestions or recommendations for change. All focus groups were taped, and these tapes were reviewed in writing this document. Immediately after all interviews and focus groups, both interviewers dictated notes and impressions from the interviews.
Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

In general, most planning in this operating unit follows the strategic planning process involved in producing annual Operating Plans as established by the university. For the most part, this process works very well within this operating unit and in the subunits in Finance and Administration. People in this operating unit rely upon the framework of strategic planning to order their work. Individuals interviewed felt the planning process is more focused now than it was ten or 15 years ago, requiring more individuals to reflect on their plans for the future. These goals then bring order and focus to the work they do for most people in the operating unit. The operating unit itself contains many diverse subunits, as described earlier, but the department heads within these subunits all describe a similar process of planning. In fact, some of the key elements of this process were developed within Finance and Administration. The process, as described by the vice president and echoed by others within the stem, begins with the identification of institutional priorities, and subunits then identify where these priorities fit into the overall goals of the university and set their plans accordingly. The vice president for Finance and Administration identified this planning process as a bottom-up approach.

The planning process typically, but not always, begins with the writing of annual reports by individuals. The goals set forth in these individuals’ annual reports sometimes become incorporated into the goals and priorities of the subunits. In some subunits, however, the development of goals for a subunit is not associated with those included in individuals’ annual reports. In general, the higher a person’s level in an organization, the more likely it is that his or her goals will be goals for their subunit, whereas individuals lower in the organization are more likely to identify goals related to personal growth (i.e., learn new skills) in their annual reports.

Each subunit also develops an annual report, which is linked to the university’s priorities, strategies, and outcomes. These annual reports become part of the annual Operating Plan for the university in a process that merges lower-level subunits’ annual reports into higher-level subunits’ annual reports. Most planning is confined to this formal cycle associated with the university planning, although some subunits occasionally step back and reassess their planning at other times during the year.

Although all subunits within this operating unit utilize the planning process, some subunits are exceptional in that the top-level managers are more ‘in touch’ with the process of planning within their subunits. These exceptions appear to be related to either the style of the manager or the size of the subunit, with smaller subunits having a more inclusive form of planning that involves more of the staff in a more proactive way.

Each of the subunits in Finance and Administration hold regular departmental meetings, although meetings are not typically devoted to planning except around the time when annual reports are produced. The basis for planning varies across subunits
within Finance and Administration. While real and continued needs are considered in all subunits, other factors can affect priorities within subunits. In some subunits, planning is sometimes donor-driven, whereas in others it can be driven by changes in law or reporting criteria, so flexibility in some subunits is necessarily greater than in others. In some cases, decisions are made either within or outside of the university, and subunits have to plan to accommodate them in midyear. This process was referred to by one interviewee as "backward planning" as opposed to "forward planning." In other cases, it may be the "squeaky wheel," an emergency situation, or a donor that influences how priorities are set. The variations in the planning process are described within each of these subunits.

At the level of the operating unit, the seven people who directly report to the vice president meet regularly. The vice president meets periodically with department heads within Finance and Administration and twice a year with everyone in the operating unit. The topic of these meetings is not directed at planning, although sometimes planning is the key agenda. This past year, at midyear, the vice president published a status report for all goals in Finance and Administration.

Managers in most subunits meet together with supervisors under them to develop annual reports for the subunit. These meetings did not take up a great deal of time for those subunits reviewed. The process was described as a natural outcome of other activities such as annual appraisals and developing budgets. One person gave an estimate of the time devoted to planning activities alone as a couple of meetings of approximately one hour each.

Within the subunits, there is considerable variation in terms of involvement of staff in planning activities. In most cases, nonexempt staff members have little input into the planning process, with the majority of planning done by mid- and upper-level managers. There were exceptions, however, with one subunit opening up the planning process to everyone in the subunit. In this subunit, the planning of new projects typically begins with a discussion of the problem and its possible solutions. For example, when a change is planned in this subunit, everyone affected by this change is given an opportunity to offer suggestions and to plan the new process. This led to considerable satisfaction in this subunit, with even the lowest persons in the hierarchy giving input into changes that would affect them.

The development of goals in most of the subunits typically begins with the priorities and strategies listed in The Lehigh Plan. An individual in Facilities Services and Campus Planning developed a one-page sheet which lists priorities, strategies, and outcomes in three colors. This one-page sheet is now used by most people within Finance and Administration. However, individuals within the operating unit noted that these priorities and strategies are vague and that it is easy to fit existing projects within the overall university plan.
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Not all of the goals that are developed within subunits end up in the annual reports or the Operating Plans. Managers and supervisors spoke of including in their annual reports either their “most important” goals or those goals most related to the priorities. Subunit-specific goals or less important goals are left to be worked on within the subunits. As such, there is a two-tiered level of goals in most subunits: those related to the university Operating Plan and those related to the subunit, not all of which are related to Lehigh’s goals and priorities (i.e., changing an operating procedure or process within an office).

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Development of goals and priorities within Finance and Administration is primarily done within the subunits, although some subunits go outside to assess needs from customers and to coordinate activities with others in the university and the community. Coordination with others is related to the type of activity being planned. For example, planning of new facilities on campus involves an assessment of and knowledge of the Bethlehem neighborhood and community development plans. As such, individuals within Finance and Administration, including the vice president of Finance and Administration, are involved in a variety of community development projects. Other managers described putting together committees or focus groups to assess needs in the development of new priorities or major planning initiatives: These groups are typically formed on an ad hoc basis, including individuals who might be affected by the change. One example of this is the focus group of students formed to provide input for the plans for a new pub on campus.

Although a midyear status report was published in 1997 for all goals in Finance and Administration, some individuals complained that there is little assessment of goals from year to year.

While individual units collect outcomes measures, formal outcomes assessment across all subunits of Finance and Administration has not occurred. Outcomes assessment has been discussed and an individual was assigned to look into the development of benchmark indicators to measure performance more systematically, but this initiative has not progressed very far. Don Knowles from Facilities Services conducted a rather thorough investigation of benchmarking performance indicators in the year preceding our interviews, including an extensive report from the National Association of College and University Business Officers. This initiative was not pursued because a university-wide outcomes project is pending. Other concerns about a more formal process of benchmarking were expressed in other interviews as well. First, there was the concern that any finite measures of benchmarking could be manipulated. For example, if measures of the number of gross square feet used for renovation or the number of requests answered in a particular office were used, individuals in those units could inflate their numbers by splitting a request in two, for example, or counting a renovation twice by counting painting and floor covering separately. Another concern
with extensive benchmarking procedures would be the time it would take to collect and assess the benchmarking metrics. A third concern is that some items are particularly difficult to measure, such as staff quality.

SAFAHRIS (described in Chapter 4) will have a considerable effect on most operations in Finance and Administration when it is fully implemented, but the implications of that effect are yet unclear because the planning is in early stages. Eventually, SAFAHRIS will affect information gathering in all of the financial units.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Six general recommendations for change were voiced in these interviews. For the most part, these recommendations came up in two or more interviews, in slightly different ways. They are presented here in no particular order, and we hope they capture the essence of what the individuals interviewed had in mind.

First, there was a call for more time for the planning process. Individuals felt it was too rushed, with not enough time for input and feedback, particularly during the last couple weeks as the Operating Plans are finalized.

Second, and relatedly, people wanted to have more feedback. They felt they did not know what happened to their reports, how their suggestions were incorporated into the general planning of the university, how changes might affect their operations, or if they were meeting the needs or vision of what is expected.

Third, in terms of setting goals, individuals felt they did not always have enough input. A special concern was that more coordination was needed both within operating units and across operating units, particularly in coordinating administrative units with academic units. Interviewees felt that the needs of those in academic stems of the university were not clearly articulated, and this hindered people in planning activities within their subunits. Also, more data would be helpful when setting goals. Another area in which coordination was felt to be needed was with the Development Office. Setting long-term goals (including maintenance and replacement costs) with specific priorities was recommended as a way to better coordinate both within and across operating units on campus.

Fourth, and another concern in terms of setting goals, is that the priorities listed in the annual reports and Operating Plans are really goals or objectives. Priorities would need to be more specific and have a tighter plan for implementation. If people could see that their priority would be implemented in one or two years, they might be satisfied to wait. However, seeing a list of vague goals or objectives does not satisfy people.
Fifth, nonexempt staff interviewed expressed the desire to have more input into the planning activities. While they recognized the limitations involved when too many people plan something, they also felt that they have valuable insights that can prevent serious mistakes when implementing plans. There was particular concern among nonexempt staff about university-wide decisions that affected them, such as the holiday schedule. While they see many potential opportunities afforded by ERAC, they feel that ERAC needs to have a broader agenda, provide more information to university employees, and open opportunities for anonymous suggestions from across the university community. Two specific recommendations were that anonymous suggestion boxes be placed across the university and that ERAC representatives meet with individual departments around campus to discuss problems. Whatever the process, their goal for more open communication, where all voices are heard.

Sixth, there was an underlying concern in Finance and Administration about developing better measures of outcomes. This concern was expressed both in the need for outcome measures and in a thoughtful assessment of the problems associated with such procedures. These issues are discussed in the previous section of this report in describing the progress thus far on benchmarking and outcomes assessment.
INFORMATION RESOURCES

Introduction

Information Resources is a service organization that provides library, computing, and administrative systems support, as well as telecommunications services to academic and administrative areas of the university. The university's Strategic Plan called for the merger of the previously separate university libraries with the computing and communications operations. The actual merger began in October 1995 when Vice Provost Arnold Hirshon assumed his duties.

Beginning in December 1995, this operating unit began an intensive period of planning that resulted in major reorganization of functions and individual job realignments. The integrated unit is now organized into three main service delivery groups: Client Services (including Collection Management), Information Management Services, and Technology Management Services, along with two internal support operations: Administration and Planning Services and the Advanced Technology Group (see Appendix E).

The new organizational structure represents a major change from the past. The reorganization involved both the merging of previously separate units and a restructuring within those units. This represented a major undertaking as administrators, managers, and staff restructured the operating unit while maintaining ongoing operations. When the data for this report were collected, Information Resources was still operating within the specter of these major changes, which were effective July 1, 1996. As these interviews occurred within one year of the major changes in the operating unit, many individuals were not fully adjusted to the organizational changes and/or specific job changes. Furthermore, many of the staff in this operating unit had doubts about the strategic planning effort, implementation of planning, and eventual reorganization. Thus, it was difficult to focus interviews strictly on the strategic planning aspects rather than on the fallout from the structural reorganization. This report attempts to capture that strategic planning process while also focusing on concerns of the interviewees related to strategic planning.

Description of Data Collection

The individuals interviewed included Vice Provost for Information Resources Arnold Hirshon, all the group leaders (see title explanation and Appendix E), all of the team leaders, and random samples of both exempt and nonexempt staff from the unit. Five focus groups were held with 40 individuals invited, representing approximately 32 percent of Information Resources personnel. Two Middle States Steering Committee representatives, Jim Tiefenbrunn (assistant vice president, Resource Management) and Ali Richardson (undergraduate student, English), met with each focus group.
separately. One representative asked questions and focused the discussion while both attempted to record the responses. To preserve the content of these discussions, both representatives immediately reviewed the notes taken and highlighted ideas presented by the interviewees. In addition, the Information Resources Strategic Plan and subsequent annual reports were reviewed.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

In December 1995, the vice provost issued a document that described in detail the strategic planning and restructuring process for Information Resources. This document outlined both the case for strategic planning and restructuring as well as the actual process that would be followed. The process commenced in January of 1996. At least 25 percent of the staff (both exempt and nonexempt) had direct involvement in this planning process. Four working groups were created to develop strategic plans (client services, information infrastructure, technology infrastructure, and facilities and resources) with a fifth “Lead Team” assigned to coordinate and consolidate the work of the four other groups. In addition, an all-day retreat was held in which all staff were invited to develop the new mission, vision, and values statements. About half of the staff attended that retreat.

In addition to the input from the staff, Information Resources facilitated eight focus groups with the user community (e.g., students, faculty, and staff) and administered a series of student surveys. The results of the above processes have been documented and made available on the university's Network Server. Throughout the reorganization processes there was ongoing communication over E-mail as well as brown bag lunches where staff would work on the operating unit's plan. The changes made within this operating unit's infrastructure are considered to be direct responses to clients' needs articulated in the focus groups as well as to the mission and vision statement (see Information Resources 1996-2002 Strategic Plan under subheading Focus Group: Summary).

Vice Provost Hirshon noted that the strategic planning that occurs within Information Resources reflects the Strategic Plan and that the Information Resources Strategic Plan is either a response to or an extension of university priorities. He meets at least once a month with the provost of the university to report on the operating units' plans and activities. He also tests ideas and gathers support for Information Resources activities at Provost's Council meetings and University Council meetings.

According to Vice Provost Hirshon, a number of mechanisms have been put in place to ensure continuous alignment of current operations with the annual Operating Plan, both within Information Resources and between this operating unit and the university at large. Information Resources has a number of advisory committees that meet to provide guidance and advice, including: Library Users Committee, Advanced Technology Advisory Committee, Learning Innovations Committee, Library Materials
and Information Access Advisory Council, Networked Information Council, Software Advisory Committee, and the Computer Store Transition Advisory Group. In addition, the university visiting committee will review operations and provide advice on their next scheduled visit in 1998.

Within Information Resources, senior administrators (group leaders and the vice provost) usually meet weekly to monitor and discuss the status of ongoing projects as well as to plan for new initiatives. In addition, each group leader is scheduled to meet weekly with the vice provost for Information Resources to discuss the status of plans relevant to that group. The managerial leadership group (group and team leaders and the vice provost) are scheduled to meet biweekly. Group leaders meet with their team leaders throughout the year, usually no less frequently than every two weeks. Team leaders also typically conduct meetings with their teams on a schedule that varies from once per week to once per month, depending upon need.

To implement the Information Resources Strategic Plan, the vice provost develops and distributes to all staff an annual report. The process for preparing the annual report begins with the team leaders. Each team leader submits a list of priorities for the academic year to his or her group leader. Group leaders then consolidate and edit those lists and add group-wide priorities as appropriate. The vice provost then consolidates and edits the group lists and organizes the items into broad priorities, adds organization-wide priorities, and submits the annual report to the Provost's Office to be incorporated into the university's Operating Plan. In addition to this annual report, a shorter set of priorities of overarching importance within Information Resources is shared with the entire Information Resources organization and the campus.

Staff within Information Resources tended to feel that there is a disconnect between the planning and implementation done within their operating unit and that done at the university level. The perception is that plans are sent to the university administration in the form of annual reports and that often that is the last stage in the process. Some staff in the operating unit believe that the university administration does not take the time to review and respond to what is sent to their offices. Another concern voiced by many administrators is that the budgeting and the planning processes are separate at the university level, and that this hinders the implementation process.

Members of the Information Resources staff with leadership positions were more aware of the university's Strategic Plan than other staff interviewed. These individuals were more likely to have been involved in Information Resources' strategic planning process; therefore, they were more likely to indicate that their planning is in tune with the priorities listed in the Strategic Plan. Some staff not in leadership positions were aware that the Strategic Plan existed, but they were less likely than managers to make a connection between this plan and their daily work.
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In the focus groups, major concerns and issues were brought up regarding the unit's plan for reorganization. Some of the Team Leaders were initially excited about the reorganization and felt that they worked extensively to contribute to the Information Resources Strategic Plan: 1996-2002. However, when the final plan was issued, some felt that the extensive amount of work and input of numerous teams had been boiled down or left unused, and so they perceived that only "trace elements" of their inputs had come through in the final plan (Information Resources Strategic Plan).

Most of the staff generally felt that the process for developing the Information Resources Strategic Plan: 1996-2002 was fair. Now, however, after the reorganization, they feel they are less empowered to make decisions that they were comfortable making prior to the reorganization. For example, in order to conduct a survey that deals with a very specific service provided by the unit, someone noted that a request needed to be sent "up the chain of command." Another concern was that instructions from the top Information Resources administrators were not always clear. More specifically, the perception is that some of the objectives in the Information Resources Strategic Plan have a vagueness, which makes it difficult for some Team Leaders to know exactly how they should focus their team's energies.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Vice Provost Hirshon feels the need for more statistical data to get a better sense of the services needed. The group leaders said that no specific benchmarks have been implemented as of the time of the data collection. At that time, the only measurement of outcomes was whether or not they have accomplished the goals they have set for themselves. The team leaders and staff all agreed that there were currently no metric tools in place to measure the progress of the organization.

Information Resources is developing an IR Services Plan to meet their need to measure outcomes. The work for this plan is being done by the Strategic Planning and Restructuring Client Services Team and the IR Services Plan is scheduled to begin in the fall 1997 semester. All team and group leaders are engaged in preparing service metrics and objectives for their areas. The objective of the plan is to provide specific descriptions of each significant client-apparent service, and, whenever possible, a metric against which to measure the quality of service delivery.

Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation

Some staff felt that there needs to be more discussion about organizational development. This feeling seemed to be driven by the difficulties in restructuring the organization in response to the Information Resources Strategic Plan. Many felt that less attention had been given to the implementation than to the development of that plan. Staff noted the need to be more aware of the direction of the operating unit.
They also wanted to have their input given more weight on issues that fall under their areas of expertise.

Some other recommendations that are geared toward the university at large are as follows. First, a recurring theme expressed by higher and middle-level management staff was that there was a need for more across-the-university planning. The staff felt that if the organization engaged in more planning exercises with colleges and departments, they would be able to provide more effective service to the campus.

Another recommendation refers specifically to the writing of strategic plans. The suggestions are that strategic plans be written in a more straightforward and concise language. One concern was that planning documents contain grandiose language that may not be written with the proper audience in mind. In addition to the use of more precise language, the staff felt that planning documents and activities should, with greater frequency, address issues of student life and academic achievement.

**Update (January 1, 1998):**

Recognizing that there were some difficulties in the process of implementing the new organization, steps were taken during the spring and summer 1997 to address staff concerns and to stabilize the organization. Changes to the organization chart were made to clarify areas of operational overlap between teams and groups. The development of the IR Services Plan (discussed previously) also will establish areas of responsibility. An all-day leadership workshop was held in March that ultimately resulted in the adoption of four recommendations to improve internal process. In addition, an organizational development and improvement plan was put into place. To address staff concerns related to the IR budget process, Vice Provost Hirshon reports steps taken since the interviews included development of a new budget structure in Information Resources that: (1) provided a mechanism for team and group leaders to make budget requests and receive responses in a timely manner, (2) provided for regular life-cycle and special initiative funding for new equipment, and (3) decentralized most of the budget authority and placed it into the hands of the group leaders.

During the 1997 fall semester, additional steps were taken to further refine the planning and implementation processes. A budget seminar was held for all IR staff to provide a full explanation of the current IR revenue, expenditure categories, and budget authority. The IR Services Plan (renamed IR Service Standards) was finalized, an overview session was provided for all IR staff concerning implementation, and the Standards were published and issued to the campus. These Standards also were the first step in implementing service metrics, and during Spring 1998, IR will develop mechanisms to collect performance data about the delivery of the specific services listed. In addition, two new technology infrastructure planning processes began, one concerning networking and telecommunications, and the other to ready the campus for
the year 2000. For the former, the services of an external consultant were engaged to provide a needs assessment and a series of recommendations.

Six persons responded to this section of the draft report. Although one reader believed this description of Strategic Planning and Implementation in Information resources, indicating it was "a good overview," even this person had concerns about the process of strategic planning in this unit. In general the concerns expressed by these readers were that communication was a top-down process and that the time and energy put into strategic planning by members of the operating unit were often overlooked or ignored. These readers expressed strong dissatisfaction with the planning processes because individuals' recommendations are not taken into account. They note that low morale continues to be a problem within Information Resources.
STUDENT AFFAIRS

Introduction

Student Affairs, under the direction of John Smeaton, vice provost for Student Affairs, is responsible for most of the non-academic aspects of student life at Lehigh. These aspects include residential life, student conduct, student activities, service learning opportunities, multicultural affairs, academic support services, peer education and leadership development, campus safety, and crisis management, as well as the provision of counseling, health, and religious/spiritual services. There are five subunits in this operating unit: Dean of Students, Counseling Center, Health Center, Chaplain’s Office, and University Police (see Appendix F). The directors of each of these subunits report to the vice provost for Student Affairs. Each of these subunits has additional staff reporting to the subunit director.

Description of Data Collection

Data were collected through a series of individual and group interviews conducted by George DuPaul (associate professor, College of Education) and Joan Spade (associate professor, Sociology). The vice provost for Student Affairs, dean of students, chaplain, director of Counseling Services, director of the Student Health Services and the chief of the University Police were all interviewed individually. Also, separate one-hour focus group meetings were held with staff of the counseling center and the Dean of Students’ Office. Finally, a variety of written materials were reviewed, including Student Affairs’ vision statement and strategic priorities, program reviews for the various subunits of the department, and measures used for evaluation of services.

Description of Strategic Planning and Implementation

Planning activities are conducted at both the department and the subunit level. The planning process for the department is described first, followed by descriptions of planning within each of the five subunits.

Overall planning within Student Affairs is guided by a vision statement that was generated at a retreat for the operating unit held in 1992. The primary focus of this vision is to enhance the college experience for all students. Much of the planning in the department occurs in biweekly meetings that include the vice provost and each of the subunit directors. Additional planning is conducted during regular (weekly or biweekly) meetings between the vice provost and the subunit directors. Goals, priorities, and strategies for the department are discussed and updated at these meetings. Planning is also aided by reports that are submitted each semester by each of the subunit directors and in focused, end-of-the-year discussions involving the vice provost and the subunit directors as a group.
Chapter 3: Strategic Planning and Implementation

Significant planning activities also center around various project initiatives conducted within the realm of Student Affairs. In recent years, these activities included projects centering around enhancing residential environments, promoting community service by students, and addressing student problems related to alcohol. (Many of these issues were addressed in the Residential Environment Report 1995-96.) Planning of these projects typically involves members of the university community beyond this operating unit.

Although most interviewees stated that the planning process within Student Affairs was effective, two concerns emerged during the interviews. First, there is a general consensus that the planning process should be more inclusive beyond the subunit directors and the vice provost. Recommendations regarding increased inclusiveness are listed later in this section. Second, some staff members believed that there should be greater collaboration across subunits on programs and initiatives that are applicable to more than one subunit. For example, initiatives related to alcohol have implications for all five subunits, and planning related to this issue should have broader participation.

Planning for the University Police is primarily carried out by the director. The planning process is impacted by university budget issues and various external factors (e.g., officer training regulations, district attorney input). Because officers are licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are activities required by the state as this subunit must report to the district attorney. There are no reported group-planning activities that occur at the subunit level.

The Chaplain’s Office has only one primary staff person (the chaplain); therefore, planning is done on an individual basis. The chaplain also meets on a regular basis with other religious leaders on campus (Hillel, Newman Center) to conduct planning. Planning activities focus on the organization of various programs and events designed to address spiritual facets of student life on campus.

In the Counseling Center, various strategies/activities are used in the planning process. Staff have a full-day retreat each year in August to discuss outcomes of the previous year and to outline goals, objectives, and strategies for the coming year. This planning is primarily conducted by senior staff, but interns and newer staff members participate in some portions of the planning. There is an attempt to tie the planning process to the overall goals of The Lehigh Plan -- in particular, its focus on responding to the needs of students and its emphasis on student learning from a broad perspective. In addition to their annual retreat, senior staff meet on a regular basis to discuss a variety of issues, including planning efforts. When drafting the annual report he director of the counseling center solicits input from staff members that is then submitted to the vice provost for Student Affairs. It appears that members of this subunit are comfortable with a "bottom-up" circulation of ideas that will flow through the director on up to the vice provost.
Planning activities within the Dean of Students Office are overseen by the dean of students. He meets on a weekly basis with the three associate deans for planning purposes. In addition, planning for the overall office is conducted at meetings with the seven associate and assistant deans held on alternate weeks. A retreat for all exempt staff in the subunit is held for two days each summer to set priorities (in the form of broad goals) for the year ahead. Follow-up meetings are then conducted to refine and delegate activities related to subunit priorities. The staff meetings described above are used throughout the year to update progress on plans made during the summer retreat. A more formal planning meeting is held in January and includes participation of associate and assistant deans. Although The Lehigh Plan is not explicitly considered during the planning process, there are some connections as the focus of planning efforts typically is on the enhancement of student residential life. There also is an attempt to increase the integration of nonacademic and academic components of student life. Members of this subunit see the planning process as incorporating both "bottom-up" and "top-down" approaches with a broad degree of participation across the staff. This planning process is seen as productive, and many goals are met. However, crises inevitably occur that impact time demands and thereby circumvent consistent follow-through in achieving some goals.

Planning in Student Health Services is primarily conducted by the director in consultation with health services staff and the vice provost. The director meets with the staff every other week, with the focus being on short-term planning. The meetings were necessitated by changes in administration within this subunit and by budgetary pressures to restructure the organization and personnel in health services. The director meets with the vice provost every other week to apprise him of health services activities and to receive consultation on further planning efforts. It is apparent that at the present time, the director's efforts are focused largely on restructuring and budgetary issues, but it is assumed that, in the future, long-term planning will be initiated to promote health education and wellness programs.

Use of Data to Establish Goals and Measure Outcomes

Data are collected in a variety of ways by each of the subunits within Student Affairs. The dean of students utilizes a number of questionnaires designed to assess student perceptions of various facets of the Lehigh experience. For example, a quality of life survey is completed by all students who live in residence halls on an annual basis in order to obtain ratings of various services (e.g., study facilities, room furnishings, quality of meals). A senior exit survey is requested of all graduating seniors along with small focus group meetings in order to obtain impressions of all facets of university life from graduates. A Dean of Students Evaluation Form is completed by all students who meet with a member of the dean of students office in order to evaluate services provided. Various other forms are utilized to assess student perception of the judicial process, reasons for withdrawing from the university, and quality of various workshops or other programs conducted for students.
In a similar fashion, Student Health Services and Counseling Services assess student satisfaction with services using confidential written questionnaires. Typically, completion of these questionnaires is requested of all students receiving services in these centers during a specified time period (e.g., one month) during the academic year. Less extensive data are collected for planning purposes by the chaplain and the university police.

**Recommendations for Change in Strategic Planning and Implementation**

Recommendations for the departmental planning process are primarily centered around activities designed to increase inclusiveness in planning and to promote more collaboration across subunits.

One staff member suggested that there be a more predictable planning routine and an implementation of mechanisms that would consistently include staff. The majority of staff recommended that directors share the minutes of the meetings they attend with their subunits. This would facilitate more efficient planning at their own meetings. For example, if the minutes were distributed ahead of time, the meeting agenda could be set in advance and more of the actual meeting time could be used for planning.

Another recommendation from the focus groups was that more communication occur across subunits within Student Affairs. Periodic meetings could apprise all staff of what is being worked on, especially regarding campus community outreach efforts. One suggestion was to form a committee to focus on Health Education and outreach which would plan for guest speakers well in advance so that efforts are not duplicated, and so that different offices within Student Affairs do not ultimately compete for students’ time and interest. This practice would reduce redundancy in programing while promoting collaboration of subunits.

Some of the other recommendations that were made for the operating unit were that there be a periodic in-depth analysis of the unit (and each subunit) using a confidential report going back to office/division rather than to the president of the university. The recommendation is that the operating unit employ a process that will allow it to conduct and benefit from a critical analysis of its functioning, with the primary purpose being one of self analysis and change rather than bureaucratic reporting. Also, in order to facilitate self assessment, there was a request that instruments be developed, possibly employing on-line technology.

There were also suggestions about how to improve planning at the university level. The most ubiquitous recommendation was to involve others besides administration and faculty in the university planning process. There is a perceived need for greater inclusion of personnel who represent different facets/levels of the university,
especially those dealing with students on a day-to-day basis. Also, announcements of planning or project initiatives should be made to everyone in the university community (via the network server) with an invitation for comment and/or participation.

Another area where suggestions were made was that of planning across the operating units. One suggestion was that there should be more opportunities and time for planning between Academic and Student Affairs. Another was to explore areas where academic affairs and student affairs can be integrated.
Chapter 4
Recommendations for Change

This section summarizes the comments of individuals we interviewed on campus. The recommendations made in Chapter 3 were reviewed and discussed by the Middle States Steering Committee. The committee focused on those recommendations that could move the university into a process of strategic planning and implementation that would meet future challenges.

The first and clearly most often-articulated recommendation is that more feedback needs to be provided to individuals writing departmental annual reports. Individuals wanted a better sense of how the annual reports were used in the overall planning process at the university level. It was recommended that administrators comment and provide feedback on the operating units' annual reports after they are submitted. This recommendation was directed to all levels of managers, including the university administration. Another suggestion was that the annual reports should be reviewed periodically throughout the year and at year's end to see if we have accomplished what we set out to do. It also was suggested that the previous year's annual reports be used to establish goals and outcomes for the following year. By using the annual reports in this way, individuals felt that they would take more seriously the need for careful planning.

Correlated with the first recommendation was a call for more involvement of faculty and staff in the process of strategic planning and its implementation. Individuals were concerned about the role of the University Council, the lack of feedback in the process, and the need for a more inclusive planning process. These concerns are detailed in the previous chapter. Many concerns were expressed about the workings of the University Council and the role of planning groups. It was recommended that the process of planning be more clearly articulated and specified. Individuals want to know what role planning groups play in the process and what the anticipated end result is. Individual staff members, especially nonexempt staff, want more information about planning from supervisors in their departments. While nonexempt staff do not necessarily want to be included at the top levels of the planning process, they want to know that their opinions are valued, particularly in regard to planning relating to their work. They also want to know what is going on in their departments and operating units. The process of providing feedback would make individuals feel more connected to the overall Operating Plan and would help them to understand how their input is being used.
Faculty called for a more inclusive planning process. Sometimes this call was for faculty inclusion in planning at the college level, but often it is related to planning at the university level, as described above in relation to the University Council. Another suggestion was to improve connections between academic colleges and administrative units that work closely with students in developing and implementing strategic plans. Individuals involved in facilities planning also felt they would be better able to plan for the needs of the campus if they had input from faculty. Finally, there was a call for better planning processes across the four colleges. One reader of the draft of the self study indicated that all plans are based upon information technology, “but Lehigh has no strategic initiative for supporting and funding technology growth and use.” This person recommended that we develop a strategy to upgrade and maintain technological systems.

One reader of the draft of this self-study made two suggestions to improve communications and feedback. First, it was suggested that we make minutes related to planning available on-line and use the technology available to (1) instantly respond to such documents without leaving the document and (2) collect and collate ideas using the computer. Second, it was recommended that faculty, students, and staff be allowed to vote on key issues within the university to produce a “ballot of action items.” This reader also suggested that annual reports be compiled in comparative form so that individual units can compare themselves against others.

The third set of recommendations deals with the development of more specific and realistic goals that are connected more tightly to the budget. Many individuals expressed the concern that The Lehigh Plan was too broad and too vague, that anything anyone wanted to do could fit into it. Some individuals expressed the same reservations about the annual Operating Plans. They wanted to see more realistic budgets and tighter links to the goals and objectives. Aligned with this recommendation is another stating that units should have measures to which they are held accountable. However, one reader of the draft of this report noted that it is misleading to try to measure the ultimate goal of the university: “learning.”

Finally, it is recommended that the planning process be more proactive and less reactive. There is a concern that too many planning efforts are doomed when budget crises appear and that planning then begins anew, this time reacting to monetary crises rather than adhering to the plans produced earlier. It was recommended that contingency planning be included as the budget and Operating Plan are being developed. If planners account for worst-case scenarios, there is less chance that the planning process will be reactive. Financial uncertainty and an ever-changing environment call for more flexible planning and budgeting processes. Also, given the need to be responsive to changes in the university’s situation, evaluating the goals and progress toward those goals more often than once a year was recommended.
Chapter 5
Changes on the University Campus that May Affect the Implementation of Strategic Planning

Changes in administration

Several changes in the administration at upper levels occurred between June 1, 1997 and October 1, 1997. Most notably, effective October 1, 1997, President Likins left to take the position of president of the University of Arizona. William Hittinger will serve as interim president until a new president is appointed. Nelson Markley became the new provost on July 28, 1997.

In addition, two new deans were appointed during the summer of 1997. Bobb Carson became dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on July 1, 1997, replacing Joan Straumanis. Patti Ota assumed the position of vice provost and dean of the College of Business and Economics on July 1, 1997, replacing Jim Schmotter.

Other changes in upper-level leadership occurred in the areas of Development, University Relations, and Public Affairs. On July 1, 1997, Jill Sherman became vice president for Development and University Relations replacing Michael Bolton, who became vice president for Public Affairs with Community Relations and Government Relations reporting to him. Michael Bolton left Lehigh University on September 1, 1997 and was replaced as vice president of Public Affairs by Ken Smith on October 1, 1997. Jill Sherman's title was changed to vice president for Advancement because University Relations was reassigned to Public Affairs. At the same time, University Events was reassigned to report to the vice president for Development.

Changes in the university's decision making structure

As a result of these changes in leadership, several changes were made in the decision making structure of the university, beginning with the modification of the university's budget process in the fall of 1997. The new system incorporates the important roles played last year by the University Council's Planning and Budget Working Group, and Interim President William Hittinger's desire to obtain broader campus input before a preliminary budget is presented to the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees in January.

This new process grew out of discussions with faculty leaders and key campus administrators, particularly the Faculty Steering Committee. It followed much
discussion last year by the University Council about its future role in university governance. As part of the development of a new budget process, Interim President Hittinger also disbanded the 22-member University Council. According to Hittinger, “In early August, Ron Ulrich (chairman of the Board of Trustees) and I spent the day meeting with a cross-section of faculty and staff. One issue on everyone’s mind was the future of the University Council. Many saw the council as an important initiative, but one whose value was waning.”

He further added, “The members of the council have worked hard and done a good job. This is no reflection on their efforts. There are clearly many different ways to seek input from the campus on university-wide issues. By disbanding the council now, we are also providing the next president with additional flexibility to establish new ways of seeking advice from the campus.”

One carryover from the University Council was the formation of a group similar in makeup to the Planning and Budgeting Working Group. Beginning in the fall of 1997, Hittinger will chair a group of faculty and administrators who will be known as the Planning and Budgeting Working Group. Serving on the committee are: Provost Nelson Markley; Deans Bobb Carson, Patti Ota, Harvey Stenger, and Ron Yoshida; Vice President for Finance and Administration Rhonda Gross; Assistant Vice President for Resource Management James Tiefenbrunn; Vice President for Advancement Jill Sherman; Vice President for Public Affairs Ken Smith; Neil Simon, chair of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee; and Al Moe from the Faculty Steering Committee.

The charge to the Planning and Budgeting Working Group is to assist in the preparation of a first draft of next year’s budget, engage the campus community in discussions about the draft budget and funding priorities, and to advise the president in the development of the budget to be presented to the Board of Trustees in January. This group will draft a series of proposals to be discussed by the campus community. A campus brown bag luncheon, to be held in early October, is intended to obtain input on different tradeoffs in the budget. For example, participants will look at the pros and cons of increased compensation, growth in departmental expense budgets, funding for new initiatives, and so forth. During November, written comments about the budget proposals that are submitted by the campus community will be discussed by the Planning and Budgeting Working Group and will provide guidance for the final stages of the construction of the budget to be presented to the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees in January 1998.

In other matters of governance, all university standing committees continue to operate as specified. Hittinger said, “Lehigh has a well-established set of faculty committees that have been the basis for faculty governance for many years.” He noted also that he and the provost “are both committed to working effectively with these committees during the coming year and to their role as the primary vehicle of faculty
governance. In addition, I am inheriting from President Likins an outstanding team and a sound administrative structure with clear lines of authority. I will expect all of us working in administration to use this structure to both consult the appropriate people on current issues and opportunities and to provide good communications throughout the Lehigh community.”

The Faculty Steering Committee takes on a more central role in this new governance structure. This committee, which, according to the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, is to meet monthly with the president, may be asked to meet more frequently with the president and provost to guide issues to appropriate faculty committees and to bring their reports to faculty meetings in a timely manner.

In terms of administrative linkages in wake of the absence of the University Council, Hittinger now meets biweekly with his direct reports, including the vice presidents, the executive director of Athletics, the executive director of the Alumni Association, and the director of the Iacocca Institute. The purpose of these meetings is to coordinate communications. The provost meets biweekly with the four deans, now called the Council of Deans. In addition, the provost meets biweekly with his three vice provosts.

SAFAHRIS (Student, Advancement, Financial, and Human Resources Information Services)

The SAFAHRIS project began in the spring of 1996 with the primary purpose of developing a system “to improve dramatically our operating practices, our client services, and the way in which we use enterprise information as a strategic institutional resource to improve our decisions and provide services.” The SAFAHRIS project will eventually provide redesigned operating processes and new information systems that will be widely and easily accessible to Lehigh faculty, staff, students, and alumni. The project takes its name from those systems it will replace, Lehigh’s Student, Advancement, Financial, and Human Resource Information Services.

A Process Re-engineering Team began in September 1996 “to develop an expanded vision of the SAFAHRIS project, to identify the key processes to be redesigned, to establish a priority order for selecting processes to redesign, and to identify the preferred order of implementation of the new systems required to enable the redesigned processes.” The team consulted with senior administrators and process stakeholders. An outside consultant facilitated the work of the team. This group completed and issued Phase I Report: Progress Report and Recommendations in the spring of 1997. This report includes a vision statement, a plan for the project, proposed implementation strategy, and detailed specifications for the new information services and systems.
The SAFAHRS Project continues as a set of overlapping phases. The primary activity of the transition Phase 1.5 was to gather information about current commercial systems to determine their cost and whether they can meet Lehigh’s needs. This process was completed in early September 1997. Further information continues to be gathered, and efforts will be undertaken to inform appropriate campus constituencies and seek their input. Other Phase 1.5 activities are to create the project organizational structure, name committee members, and begin implementation of some “early successes” projects such as upgrading the university’s Web-based interfaces.

Phase 2, which began in July 1997, addresses the redesign of the student services processes and the replacement of the student information system. Potential areas for redesign include a student services center, integrated (Web-based) student information systems, casework/specialist job pools, imaging and document management technologies, and new user desktop computers to enable access to these new services. System installation will begin no earlier than spring 1998.

Phase 3 will provide for the development of a decision support system to provide students, faculty, and staff with summaries of university information of general interest in an easy-to-use format. Phase 4 will involve the redesign of the finance and human resources processes and replacement of those information systems. Phase 5 will redesign processes and replace the advancement information system.

Faculty Senate

On July 1, 1997, a draft for a Lehigh University Faculty Senate Constitution was placed on the university’s computer network, and on August 15, 1997, a hard copy of the document was mailed to all members of the university community. This draft was the result of discussions that began in the Faculty Steering Committee during the spring semester of 1997. At the April 28, 1997 University Faculty meeting, the Faculty Steering Committee presented a motion that was passed by the university faculty, authorizing them to put together a constitutional task force to draft a senate proposal to send to the university faculty by July 1, 1997. The Faculty Steering Committee also was charged with the task of developing a consultative process through the fall of 1997 that would culminate in a university-wide faculty vote in the spring of 1998.

The constitutional task force of 11 faculty members, led by Hannah Stewart-Gambino, worked for two weeks in June of 1997 to draft the document that was circulated on July 1, 1997. The task force included faculty from all four colleges: College of Arts and Sciences (Hannah Stewart-Gambino, Carl Moses, Rosemary Mundhenk, Daniel Ou-Yang and Nicola Tannenbaum); College of Business and Economics (Professor Emeritus James Hobbs and Mary Beth Deily); College of Education (Dean Ron Yoshida and Richard McAdams); and College of Engineering and Applied Science (John Ochs and Gerald Lennon). Joan Spade attended these
meetings to record the process for the Middle States self-study. Members of the constitutional task force consulted *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* to assess current committee structures are also listened to the concerns of faculty in their colleges.

The primary goals of the constitutional task force were to produce a governing structure of the faculty which would result in 1) greater efficiency, with less duplicative or irrelevant work; 2) clearer lines of authority and accountability; 3) enhanced possibility for consensus building; and 4) a stronger, clearer faculty voice in relation to administration and the Board of Trustees.

The consultative process began in September 1997. Each committee chair on the Faculty Steering Committee took the proposal for the Faculty Senate Constitution to his or her committee to discuss and respond. The constitutional task force presented the proposed constitution and the consultative process at an October or November meeting in each of the colleges. The constitution also was discussed in a meeting with the deans and the provost in October 1997. In each of these venues, individuals were asked to submit in writing their suggested revisions to the Faculty Steering Committee. A constitutional convention will be held on the last Thursday before classes begin in January 1998 in which the author of each proposed revision will be given an opportunity to explain his or her revision, and votes will be taken on these proposed revisions. After the constitutional convention, an amended document will be produced that will be sent to the university faculty for a vote.
Chapter 6
Conclusions
January 1, 1998

This chapter was written after the campus community reviewed the draft of the self-study and offered their comments. The Middle States Steering Committee that authored this document is pleased with both the self-study and the comments that we have received in response to the earlier draft of this report. We believe that this document is an accurate description of strategic planning and implementation as it occurred during the Spring of 1997 when we collected these data. However, Lehigh University is an ever-changing system.

When the process of the self-study began, former President Likins selected the topic of implementation of strategic planning because he recognized that improvements could be made in that aspect of the university. As we collected our data, it became clear that the procedures used for strategic planning itself could be strengthened. During the course of our analysis of the implementation of strategic planning on campus, we asked for suggestions for improving the current processes. This document can only be useful to the university if it is used to strengthen the system of strategic planning and implementation.

Since beginning this study, there have been many changes in the administrative structure of the university (these changes are described in Chapter 5). President Likins has left the university and Interim President Hittinger is leading the university's current planning efforts. In addition to a new provost, two of the four deans of our colleges have changed, and two new vice-presidents were appointed since we collected the data for this self-study. As such, the context for the university's procedures for the strategic planning and its implementation has changed considerably.

In addition, a new president will take the helm at Lehigh within a year. The Middle States Steering Committee hopes this report will provide the new president with an opportunity to see what has and has not worked in the past as well as list our suggestions for change.

This self-study can be, and already is, an important locus for change within the university. Interim President Hittinger has used the descriptions of strategic planning and the recommendations in this report in two major decisions. He disbanded the University Council and is now working directly with university standing committees. In addition, he realigned the budgeting and planning process to increase the
correspondence between the two processes. One of his top priorities during the Fall 1997 semester was to integrate the planning process into budget decisions (described in Chapter 5).

Provost Markley is also responding to recommendations in the self-study report as he revises the procedures of creating the annual Operating Plan. He will work with Academic Affairs to develop a departmental planning process requiring that deans provide direct feedback to departments. A distinction will be made between university-wide academic priorities and discipline-specific priorities within departments, both of which are important and deserve serious attention in the planning process. Other changes will be made to make the yearly planning process less of a bureaucratic exercise. He will change the format and possibly the name of the Operating Plan, focusing more on campus data that can be used at all levels to analyze trends and set priorities. The annual Operating Plan will put less emphasis on a pro-forma checklist of yearly goals. Changing campus planning into a two-year cycle is also under consideration.

In response to this document, changes are in process in other areas of the campus as well. The new dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Dean Carson, has restructured the process by which department chairs meet with him in the Dean’s Advisory Council, meeting at times only with the chairs from one of the three divisions within the college (humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences) rather than with the larger group. He believes this revised format will facilitate strategic planning and greater efficiency within the college.

In addition, Vice Provost Smeaton has begun an assessment of the instruments used by Student Affairs to measure outcomes as well as the procedures for incorporating the findings of their outcomes measures into the planning process. Vice Provost Hirshon also has used the findings of the self-study to reassess processes within Information Resources, instigating several changes described in Chapter 3.

Even in places where the implementation of strategic planning seems to be working, units are fine tuning their processes in response to the self-study. It is clear that the process of gathering data for this self-study stimulated people to think about the importance of planning and individuals' roles in that planning process. Several retreats have been held in units across the university since we began this self-study.

The Middle States Steering Committee is pleased that, despite major changes in the university’s decision-making structure, this report already has been used to effect change. We hope that this report will continue to provide a vehicle for change as we look to the past to plan for the future.