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Over the past three to four decades the community college has experienced some tremendous periods of growth and success. Much of this has been due to a growing economy and a growing population. However, the future of the community college may be in for some changes. The effects these changes are having can mean opportunity or disaster depending on the readiness of the institution. The change occurring today requires future insight, swifter action, and a proactive response. Community colleges cannot afford to leave planning for crisis situations. A proactive stance must be taken and tough questions must be asked.

In 1991 the Seventy-second Texas Legislature tasked the Legislative Budget Board of Texas with the assignment of developing a long-range strategic plan for state government based on individual agency plans. The passing of House Bill No. 2009 required that all agencies of Texas State Government, including community colleges, develop a strategic plan.
The purpose of this study was to determine the significance of certain independent variables towards the perceived importance of three dependent variables - statements of purpose, statements of direction and statements of impact - found in the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template. Research shows that there are a number of planning paradigms which contain some form of strategic planning. Independent variables such as administrative levels of involvement, levels of experience, levels of strategic planning training, and college location could all be significant factors in determining the success of strategic planning. The results of this study may provide community colleges in Texas with information for better understanding characteristics influencing strategic planning, for identifying strategic planning program barriers, and for evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

A storm is coming, though you do not know the exact form or intensity. Gusty winds are whipping about and clouds are rising high into the sky. In many ways this one reminds you of others you have weathered in the past, but there is something just a little different. Perhaps it is the strange color of the sky or the fact that the winds are from a different direction than usual. You know the standard procedures -- pull in the sails and throw over the excess cargo -- and yet, this move often leaves you with time and cargo lost.

When you started this trip you had one mission, to transport the cargo and sell it for a profit. That mission has not changed. You pull out the map and look at the charted path. The storm is directly between you and your destination. Your natural inclination is to wait out the storm and deal with the lost time and cargo. Looking at the map again you notice another port. It's a little off course, but certainly reachable. Being a wise and experienced captain, you make your plans while there is still time.
Later that week you count your profits and rejoice over the new-found market for your goods. The added news that the old port was destroyed in the storm justified your decision, a decision that has given you first rights to new trade.

The scenario above could easily be applied to change in the Texas community college system. Budget reductions, changing expectations, changing economics, shrinking resources, increased population diversity, and expanding technology are all factors affecting the operations of the community college system. These changes often happen so fast that it is all an institution can do just to manage the business at hand. In order to meet the needs of the future, community colleges must develop plans that will prepare them for the changes that are ahead. This involves the process of strategic planning.

Strategic planning is a management function that generates the specific actions required or needed to execute an organization's strategy. It establishes organizational objectives, and decides what policies and plans are pertinent or rational in allocating organizational resources effectively and efficiently (Agwu 1992).

Community colleges are designed around the function of building communities while pursuing a desired future. Strategic planning can and should be an immensely useful part of this process. An ERIC search of "Strategic-planning AND Higher-education" provided 79 different references. Each
of these references referred to strategic planning as critical in preparing for future success. Unfortunately, strategic planning is often put aside because it is considered just another duty that detracts from the real mission, and it requires too much time to develop. Along with loss of time and effort, many are reluctant to try strategic planning because they lack understanding of the process and the factors that it includes. This lack of understanding is often a barrier to successful strategic planning for community colleges. Strategic planning models vary from institution to institution. Some are identified as continuous while others are defined as a single action performed every so many years. Some include a volume of pages while others can be placed on a single sheet (Martin, 1995). In spite of these differences certain factors remain common to most strategic planning programs. The following elements were provided by McClenney, LeCroy, and LeCroy (1991):

1) Planning to Plan: Organizational and Logistical Issues
2) The College Mission: Review and Clarification
3) Articulating Shared Values: The College and its Community
4) Environmental and Institutional Scanning
5) Identification of Strategic Issues
6) Formulation of the Strategic Plan
7) Presentation, Approval, and Dissemination
8) Implementation and Follow-up: Linking Strategy to Operations and Resources.

Golden (1993) included the following as key elements of strategic planning:

1) view of institutional mission
2) setting department goals
3) identifying and targeting audience
4) establishing interdepartmental links
5) setting out action, crisis, budget and evaluation plans in writing.

The Texas Strategic Planning Template (1995) grouped the elements of strategic planning into the following categories:

1) Statements of Purpose (SOP)
2) Statements of Direction (SOD)
3) Statements of Impact (SOI)

In this grouping they included elements found in most strategic planning models, and is a result of the seventy-second Legislature's decision in 1991 to develop a long-range strategic plan for state government, including community colleges.

Studies of strategic planning have been done using the descriptive research method, but there is a lack of quantitative research on strategic planning for community
colleges. Background information makes it evident that strategic planning is still relatively new in the community college system in Texas, and it indicates that quantitative research in strategic planning is still needed. Research into the perceptions of Texas community college administrators toward the importance of strategic planning for the Texas community college system is the focus of this study.

Statement of the Problem

Research shows that there are a number of planning paradigms, each of which contain some form of formal or strategic planning. The elements of strategic planning can be categorized into three major strategic planning factors: (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact. The perceived importance of each element may vary between institutions and could be a factor in strategic planning success. Independent variables such as administrative position, years of experience, levels of training, and institution location may be significant factors in the strategic planning process. A quantitative study of the perceived importance of strategic planning factors can provide helpful data for better understanding the strategic planning process, for determining strategic planning program barriers, and for evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state.
Purpose of the Study

Planning programs are very much like houses, they are not always the same, but they all share common elements which none can be without. Just as the perceived importance of common elements for houses can influence the construction process and outcome, so can the perceived importance of strategic planning elements influence the planning process and outcome. The purpose of this study was to determine the significance of certain independent variables toward the perceived importance of the major factors of strategic planning for Texas community colleges. The independent variables of interest in this study are: administrative levels of involvement, levels of experience, levels of training, and institution location.

Utilization of results by community and technical colleges should provide a better understanding of characteristics influencing strategic planning, help determine strategic planning program barriers, and provide a better understanding for evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state. It also establishes a framework for continued and expanded research in the area of strategic planning for Texas community colleges.
Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are presented as a basis for testing the purpose of this study.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and finance/business administrators towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 \]

where \( u_1 \) = presidents

\( u_2 \) = academic administrators

\( u_3 \) = student services administrators

\( u_4 \) = finance/business administrators

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of rural and urban community college personnel toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 \]

where \( u_1 \) = rural

\( u_2 \) = urban

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of inservice training toward the
importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 \]

where \( u_1 = 0 - 25 \text{ hrs} \)
\( u_2 = 26 - 50 \text{ hrs} \)
\( u_3 = >50 \text{ hrs} \)

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by years of experience in institutional planning towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 = u_5 = u_6 = u_7 \]

where \( u_1 = 0 - 3 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_2 = 4 - 7 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_3 = 8 - 11 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_4 = 12 - 15 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_5 = 16 - 19 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_6 = 20 - 23 \text{ yrs} \)
\( u_7 = >23 \text{ yrs} \)

Significance of the Study

Institutions often change from one planning program to another in hopes of finding greater success in institutional effectiveness. Evaluations of institutional effectiveness often fail to consider what characteristics influence strategic planning. Upon reviewing strategic planning models
It is evident that there is a lack of quantitative research on perceptions of planners towards the importance of strategic planning factors. Understanding the perceived importance of factors common to strategic planning models may provide a better understanding of the process and benefits of strategic planning. Independent variables such as administrative levels of involvement, levels of experience, levels of training, institution location, number of years in the current position and different planning models used may have a significant impact on the perceived importance of different factors in strategic planning.

The significance of this study is that it provides a framework for further studies into the evaluation of strategic planning for Texas community colleges.

Limitations

Due to the geographic limitations of the study, findings cannot be generalized beyond the community colleges in Texas.

Delimitations

This study was limited to the personnel directly responsible for the planning program. The study also assumed that the respondents answered truthfully and to the best of their ability.
Definition of Terms

1. **Mission** is the stated reason for institutional existence. It succinctly identifies what the institution does, and why, and for whom. A mission reminds everyone of the unique purposes promoted and served by the institution.

2. **Philosophy** is the stated expression of core values and operating principles for the conduct of the institution in carrying out its mission. It describes how the institution conducts itself as it does its work.

3. **External/Internal Assessment** is an evaluation of key factors that influence the institution. Detailed evaluation of trends, conditions, opportunities, and obstacles directs the development of each element of the strategic plan. It must include quantitative, but may also include qualitative issues. External factors may include economic conditions, population shifts, technological advances, geographical changes and statutory changes. Internal factors may include management policies, resource constraints, organization structure, automation, personnel, and operational procedures.

4. **Goals** are the general ends toward which agencies direct their efforts. A goal addresses issues by stating policy intention. They are both qualitative and quantifiable, but are not quantified. In a strategic planning system,
goals are ranked for priority. Goals stretch and challenge an institution, but they are realistic and achievable.

5. **Objectives** are clear targets for specific action. They mark quantifiable interim steps toward achieving an institution's long-range mission and goals. Linked directly to institution goals, objectives are measurable, time-based statements of intent. They emphasize the results of agency actions at the end of a specific time period.

6. **Outcome measures** are indicators of the actual impact or effect upon a stated condition or problem. They are tools to assess the effectiveness of an institution's performance and the benefit derived from it. An outcome measure is typically expressed as a percentage, rate, or ratio.

7. **Strategies** are methods to achieve goals and objectives. Formulated from goals and objectives, a strategy is the means for transforming inputs into outputs, and ultimately outcomes, with the best use of resources. A strategy reflects budgetary and operational resources.

8. **Efficiency measures** are indicators that quantify an institution's cost, unit cost, or productivity associated with a given outcome or output. Efficiency measures are generally expressed in unit costs, units of time, or other ratio-based units.
9. **Explanatory measures** are quantitative indicators that provide additional information that contribute to the understanding of an institution's operating environment.

10. **Action plans** are detailed methods specifying how a strategy is implemented. Task specification includes staff assignment, material resource allocation, and schedules for completion. Action plans break strategies into manageable parts for coordinated implementation of goals and objectives. Action plans specify detailed cost and expenditure information.

11. **SOP** Statements of Purpose are those elements of the strategic plan that address mission, philosophy, and purpose of an institution.

12. **SOD** Statements of Direction are those elements of the strategic plan that address goals, objectives, strategies, and action plans.

13. **SOI** Statements of Impact are those elements of a strategic plan that address outcomes, outputs, efficiency, and effectiveness.

14. **President** is the chief executive officer of the college administrative system.

15. **Academic Administrators** are those administrators who are directly responsible for the academic functions of the college.
16. **Student Services Administrators** are those administrators who are directly responsible for all student services that do not fall under academic instruction.

17. **Finance/Business Administrators** are the college administrators who are directly responsible for financial and business operations related to college operations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Over the past three to four decades the community college has experienced some tremendous periods of growth and success. Much of this has been due to a growing economy and a growing population. However, the future of the community college may be in for some changes. Budget reductions, changing expectations, and increasing technology are requiring community colleges to take a serious look at the future of the institution. Workforce and economic development are becoming strategic components of community college systems as business and industry are showing greater interest in regional and community training capabilities. Brockey (1996, p. 10), said it this way, "Even though you are downsizing, you still have to plan where your workers of the future are coming from."

The effects these changes are having can mean opportunity or disaster depending on the readiness of the institution. The change occurring today requires future insight, swifter action, and a proactive response. What is unfortunate about planning is that it is often ignored until a crisis exists (in which case it is too late) or until it
is required by some authority who is so far removed from the process that no one really understands why it is being done.

Community colleges cannot afford to leave planning for crisis situations. A proactive stance must be taken and tough questions must be asked. Warford (1980, p. 4) made the following comment: "For me, the main question that looms is, 'how can community colleges respond in a more significant way to the training needs of this nation?'"

A proactive response to this question indicates a sense of vision, just one part of strategic planning. Strategic planning is the first step towards preparing for the future. It not only gives vision, direction, and focus to the institution, but according to the Texas Legislature it is also part of future appropriations requests.

During the 1950s and 1960s, both business and academic organizations made significant progress in adopting various forms of formal planning. Modernization along with technical advances in management approaches through the use of computers and other forms of communication equipment combined to spur new interest and imagination in the management agenda. The planning form that gained momentum and acceptance during that time was long-range planning. Long-range planning is the formulation of new objectives, development of alternative strategies, evaluation of possible strategies, benefits and risks of proposed alternatives, evaluation of internal and external
opportunities, and finally the choice of a plan and the commitment of resources.

Although planning techniques and processes have changed over the years, planning in itself is not new but in fact has been around for centuries. King Solomon himself speaks of the necessity of planning. "A prudent man foresees the difficulties ahead and prepares for them; the simpleton goes blindly on and suffers the consequences." Proverbs 22:3 (Living Bible, 1972). This does not mean that planning is reserved only for those in high positions. Even Winnie the Pooh defined planning as what you do before you do something so that when you do it, it's not all mixed up.

Webster's New World Dictionary (1984) defines the words strategic and strategy as follows: "Strategic -- characterized by sound strategy; favorable; advantageous." "Strategy -- the science of planning and directing large scale military operations, of maneuvering forces into the most advantageous position prior to actual engagement with the enemy."

Strategy is a term derived from the Greek word for general, strategos. Over the years the term strategy has taken on new meanings. The term strategy has been used to refer to the actions of different organizations to anticipate, respond to, and generally withstand the dynamic nature of today's turbulent environment. A strategy consists
of major organizational objectives and plans of action to reach those objectives.

According to Webster (1984), the word strategic implies sound strategy and favorable or advantageous position. Strategic planning gives the community college an advantage over future changes. However, the development of a strategy for gaining the advantage over change is not enough. For the community college, strategic planning is a significant policy-making and direction-setting activity (McClenney et al., 1991). The goal of strategic planning is not primarily the production of plans - it is more appropriately described as a series of critical decisions that cumulatively shape the future of the community college. In every good strategic plan you will find good decisions being made. Planning always requires making decisions. McClenney (1989) defined strategic planning as simply wise decision making.

Halfond and Diffenbach (1992, p. 19) defined strategic planning as follows:

Strategic planning is not merely an exercise in vision or institutional aspirations, but becomes a difficult, exacting, and self-critical inquiry into an institution's future. The interrelationship of factors becomes key as academic leaders determine the appropriate mix of pursuits for the future.
Clear vision and leadership are also seen as essential elements to strategic planning (Desrochers, 1994). Still strategic planning is more than just vision. Vision must be combined with focus, direction, and action, otherwise it is only dreaming. Strategic planning refers to a type of planning system which concerns itself with the major issues of an organization and one which is congruent with elements outside the internal environment of the organization. Strategic planning is the development of a good match among the demands and opportunities presented by the external environment.

Central Florida Community College provided the following definition for planning in the institutional effectiveness model presented at the annual conference of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Planning is generally defined as the set of actions and decisions made which lead to the development of strategies and the implementation of activities designed to help the college accomplish its adopted mission. Planning helps the administration allocate resources, adopt to changes in the environment, and coordinate activities leading to fulfilling commonly accepted mission (1995, p. 3).

Although the technology of strategic planning and management has been used for years by business, industry,
the federal government, and the military, it is still in the early stages of adoption in much of post-secondary education. Community colleges have been especially slow in adopting strategic planning and management technology. Groff (1989, p. 42) provided the following comments on strategic planning for community colleges.

This technology for institutional advancement is based upon the following:

1. comprehensive assessment of the external environment of the college's service area,
2. critical analysis or audit of the college's internal environment,
3. development of visions and alternative scenarios flowing from the assessment of the external environment and the audit of the internal environment,
4. selection of strategic options,
5. refinement of the strategic options into tactical alternatives, and
6. specification of the management strategy to assist the college in advancing toward the preferred scenario.

Still there is more to strategic planning. Colleges must also refine the evaluation component and thereby provide a means of closing the loop for institutional renewal. This is often a part of strategic planning that is
missing in many models. One basic model for strategic planning is displayed in Figure 1 (Groff, 1989, p. 42).

New planning programs and models are continually being reviewed and adopted by colleges across the nation in hopes that success may be guaranteed for the future. Establishment of mission statements, statements of purpose, development of goals, institutional evaluation, internal/external environment assessment, accountability, and many other program essentials are all being considered to improve planning and make better decisions. Although each planning paradigm has its own unique dimension, there is an interrelationship that can be found in all of them.

![Figure 1. Basic Model for Strategic Planning and Management](image)

**Evaluation**

An interrelationship among strategic planning, assessment and TQM is stressed by Muffo (1992) with the idea
of an integrating philosophy. Shirley (1988) notes that the strategic, operational, and unit-level decisions represent the destination points in any effective strategic planning venture. Others like Lisensky (1988) are adding assessment and feedback to the measures of goals and mission.

Donsky (1992) listed the following planning paradigms in a paper presented at a Conference of the Southern Association for Community College Research.

1) Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting (POSDCORB)
2) Formal Planning
3) Long Range Planning
4) Master Planning
5) Contingency Planning
6) Systematic Planning
7) Program Planning and Budgeting systems (PPBS)
8) Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT)
9) Management By Objective (MBO)
10) Delphi Studies
11) Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB)
12) Future Research
13) Quality Circles
14) Strategic Planning
15) Total Quality Management (TQM)
While various paradigms exist for planning in community colleges, from master planning to quality circles, three major categories often appear in planning activities; strategic or formal planning, operational planning, and effectiveness measures. Donsky (1992, p. 9) provided an Integrated Planning Effectiveness Model (IPEM) showing the relation of the three categories (Figure 2).

Figure 2. An Integrated Planning Effectiveness Model

General Robert E. Wood, Ex-Chief Executive Officer of Sears, Roebuck, and Co., provided another diagram of what he
thought were the major elements of strategic planning. In his model there were four major elements - mission, objectives, goals, and activities. The major elements were divided into two separate categories - Strategic/formal and Tactical/operational (see Figure 3). These two different categories of planning are generally accepted by most planning administrators.

Spanbauer, (1992) identifies the following elements for quality planning:
1) Determining mission and purpose
2) Defining strategic directions
3) Identifying and prioritizing programs and course needs.
4) Involving all instructors in the planning process
5) Integrating planning with budgeting
6) Recognizing the need for planning to be continuous and flexible.

Albrecht (1994) lists five elements in strategic planning.

1) Vision
2) Mission
3) Strategic Concept
4) Strategic Initiatives
5) Outcomes

Other concerns include external environment, accountability, vision and values, technology and personal costs, new program initiatives, client-centered philosophies, cost studies, and the personnel program cost factor (Dewey, 1994).

Keener (1989) identified four ingredients believed to control and guide the progress of the development strategy. Each of these ingredients affect design, implementation, maintenance, evaluation, delivery and impact of a plan. Keener lists the following four factors as inherently tied to strategic planning:
1) external environment
2) institutional perspective;
3) individual performance; and
4) the internal system

Katler and Fox (1985) identified the external environment as the "macroenvironment" of the institution. It consists of large-scale fundamental forces that shape opportunities and pose threats to an institution. The institutional perspective is the internal environment which includes institutional mission, strengths and weaknesses. Individual performance is the factor made up of the people designing and activating a plan.

McKinnon (1994) believed that there were four basic principals that should be a part of strategic planning.
1) all senior administrators participate directly in every aspect.
2) planners focus on substance not form and design the plan to be simple and flexible, and
3) all level of staff contribute to the process. A planning committee should consist of senior administration, full-time and part-time faculty members, students, members of the Board of Governors, and staff from various departments.

Phelan (1993) identified three common components to strategic planning:
1) Development of a mission statement
2) Analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT).
3) Strategy development.

In the document, Strategic Plan for Texas Community Colleges, 1994-2000 (1995), the following parts were identified as necessary:

1) Mission
2) Philosophy
3) Purpose
4) Scope and Function
5) Objectives and Measures

The Texas Strategic Planning Template (1995), divided strategic planning into three categories; statements of purpose, statements of direction, statements of impact. These three categories provide an accurate description of all the major elements of strategic planning (Figure 4).

**Strategic Planning Elements**

From this review of the strategic planning literature, it was found that there are certain elements that can be identified in some form or another as part of most strategic plans. These elements can be grouped under three major categories.

1. Statements of Purpose (SOP)
2. Statements of Direction (SOD)
3. Statements of Impact (SOI)
Figure 4. Texas Strategic Planning Template

Knowing that each of these elements are found in most all planning programs brings up the question as to why programs differ in execution, size, and effectiveness. It would be impossible to identify all of the variables that influence all the planning programs in Texas community.
colleges, but there are some variables that are easily identified and can be tested using statistical methods. The identification of the perceived importance of strategic planning factors would provide a foundation for understanding variables that have a significant impact on strategic planning, for determining strategic planning program barriers, and for evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state.

When Texas community colleges were polled by a group of graduate students from Baylor University, the following programs were identified as being tried for the first time (Hastings 1992):

1) Strategic Planning
2) Decentralization
3) TQM
4) Empowerment

The identification of strategic planning in this list shows that there is still a need for research and improvement in the strategic planning programs of Texas community colleges.

Identifying the significance of different variables on strategic planning in the community college system is important not only to the process but also to the understanding and evaluation of the different programs of planning being used. Planning for change could mean the difference between being a developing or deteriorating institution.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was designed to identify the perceived importance of strategic planning factors for the 72 community colleges in Texas. The instrument used to collect the data was a single questionnaire. The questionnaire was provided to planning administrators responsible for each of the 50 community college districts in Texas. Data were collected, analyzed and reported.

Research Design

In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, the data collection methods and procedures were designed to obtain the perceptions of importance for elements of strategic planning in Texas community colleges. This study was designed to evaluate the significance of certain independent variables on strategic planning in Texas community colleges. The information is presented in three sections: (1) Selection of Population and Sampling Procedures. (2) Data Gathering, (3) Data Treatment Analysis.
Selection of Population and Sampling Procedures

The populations targeted by this study were made up of full-time community college presidents, academic administrators, finance/business administrators and student services administrators (n = 285). The samples were selected using college catalogs and association directories. All data were collected using a questionnaire.

All survey respondents remained anonymous and no data linked to any individual subject were identified in the manuscript. Confidentiality of all information submitted has been maintained throughout the study as promised to the subjects in a cover letter accompanying the survey.

Data Gathering

The questionnaire used was a single questionnaire delivered to the respondent via the postal service or electronic mail (fax or E-mail). A cover letter was included that gave instructions on how to complete the questionnaire and its purpose in the study of characteristics of influence in strategic planning for Texas community colleges. The questionnaire collected data on the three categories of elements identified in the Texas Strategic Planning Template. The elements of the different categories were measured for perceived importance. The questionnaire provided the following scale:

(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)
On the scale, respondents were asked to rate the importance of the element, that is, how important they thought the element "should be" in planning.

Example: "Outcome measures should be measures which lead to a valid conclusion and enable decisions to be made concerning institutional action."

(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very important)

In this example, outcomes are ranked as "very important" in relation to the importance that objectives lead to valid conclusions and decisions.

Validity of the questionnaire was based on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board selection of this plan provided by the Texas Legislative Budget Board and the fact that most all of the community colleges are using the planning process developed for HB 2009 (Anglin, 1996) In conjunction with this, the survey was also checked for validity and reliability. In doing this the elements of the questionnaire were first randomly sorted. Then the elements were provided three community college administrators in the state of Texas with strategic planning experience. Each person was asked to rate the elements by importance and to sort them according to the specified categories -- statements of purpose, statements of direction and statements of impact. In each of the returned responses the items were rated as important to strategic planning with a
complete sorting of the elements into the appropriate categories.

Once the questionnaire was tested for validity it was then tested for reliability. Ten members of the faculty and administration at Grayson College were then selected to take and retake the test with a 5 day separation period. The reliability of the questionnaire was then checked using a reliability test. Elements of the questionnaire with reliability scores below .60 were removed form the questionnaire. After completion of this process there were 27 questions remaining on the questionnaire. The final questionnaire was then sent to a professional printing company where it was printed on one sheet of paper and copied for distribution. A total of 285 questionnaires were printed and mailed along with a return self-addressed stamped envelope.

The dependent variables were the three categories of the Texas Strategic Planning Template. The categories are as follows:

1. Statements of Purpose (SOP)
2. Statements of Direction (SOD)
3. Statements of Impact (SOI)

The independent variables included: Administrative position in the community college, college location, amount of inservice training received for strategic planning, and years of experience in institutional planning.
Data Treatment Analysis

The steps utilized in this portion of the study included:

1) Identifying the hypotheses
2) Selecting the appropriate statistical test/tests
3) Choosing the appropriate alpha level, i.e. .05 or .01
4) Collecting data and computing the test statistic; and
5) Accepting or rejecting the hypotheses

This section provides an explanation of the procedures used in approaching the data for each hypothesis. Each hypotheses is accompanied by a description of the associated treatment of the data.

Identifying The Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were the basis for testing the purpose of this study.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and finance/business administrators toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

H₀: \( u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 \)

where \( u_1 \) = presidents
\( u_2 \) = academic instruction administrators
\( u_3 \) = student services administrators
\( u_4 \) = finance/business administrators
Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of inservice training toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 \]

where \( u_1 = 0 - 25 \) hrs
\( u_2 = 26 - 50 \) hrs
\( u_3 = >50 \) hrs

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of rural and urban community college personnel toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 \]

where \( u_1 = \) rural
\( u_2 = \) urban

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by years of experience in institutional planning toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 = u_5 = u_6 = u_7 \]

where \( u_1 = 0 - 3 \) yrs
\( u_2 = 4 - 7 \) yrs
Each hypothesis indicates that there should be no significant difference in the mean value of the response scores for each of the independent variables. Differences would indicate that the score is statistically significant.

Selecting the Appropriate Statistical Test/Tests

The purpose of this study was to determine the significance of perceived importance for certain independent variables on elements of strategic planning for Texas community colleges. The elements were measured according to their perceived importance in institutional strategic planning. The raw data were entered into the SPSS program using the following scale.

(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

Example: “Outcome measures should be measures which lead to a valid conclusion and enable decisions to be made concerning institutional action.”

(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

In this example, outcomes are ranked as unimportant with the extent to which implemented objectives lead to valid conclusions and enable decisions. Statistics package
SPSS was used to perform a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA), and analysis of variance (ANOVA) if the MANOVA showed a significant difference in the three major factors of strategic planning.

A review of literature was conducted to determine background information on factors of strategic planning. A questionnaire was developed to determine the perception of importance for each element of strategic planning. The three categories include statements of purpose, statements of direction, statements of impact.

The null hypothesis was analyzed using MANOVA. The test statistic, the computed F ratio, was compared with the critical F value. If the computed F ratio exceeded the critical value, the null hypothesis was rejected. If not, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The critical value was set at the .05 significance level.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected from completed questionnaires returned by four categories of administrators from community colleges in the state of Texas. Surveys were mailed to the college presidents, academic administrators, student services administrators and finance/business administrators (n=285). This includes those administrators from colleges with multiple campuses. The purpose of the study was to determine the significance of certain independent variables towards the perceived importance of major categories of strategic planning elements for Texas community colleges. The analysis of data in this chapter provides the descriptive statistics of this study and the answers to the four hypotheses. Any significance in the dependent variable responses are also discussed.

The survey instrument used for this study (see Appendix A) was divided into three sections with each section corresponding to the three sections specified in the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template -
statements of direction, statements of purpose, statements of impact. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of twenty-seven different items. There were 285 surveys mailed (n = 285) and 166 returned, giving a 58% return rate.

All respondents were asked to provide their administrative position, (president, academic administrator, student services administrator or finance/business administrator); the location of the college (rural or urban); the strategic planning training they received in hours; and the number of years in institutional planning. In the following tables the number of questionnaires returned is provided along with the number of responses and non-responses to each demographic question.

In Table 1 showing the administrative positions of the surveyed population it can be seen that there were eight of the returned surveys that did not indicate administrative position. The results also show a smaller than desired return in the categories of student service administrators and business/finance administrators. For institutional planning experience the returns are reasonably distributed with all but one of the returned surveys responding to this question (see Table 2).
College location was also well distributed with only six questionnaires returned with no response to this question (see Table 3).
### TABLE 3

**COLLEGE LOCATION RESPONSE FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Location Identified</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Returns</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of hours of inservice training received in strategic planning was weighted on the 0-25 hour response with eight not responding to the question (see Table 4).

### TABLE 4

**STRATEGIC PLANNING TRAINING RESPONSE FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25 Hours</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50 Hours</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50 Hours</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training Identified</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Returns</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall the data show an adequate distribution in each category.

The responses to the twenty-seven (27) different items of the survey can be seen in Table 5. In this table the mean value, variance, standard deviation and number of responses
for each item is provided. The response mean values shown on this table are generally high on the 10-point Likert scale requiring further analysis of the variance and standard deviation of each item.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements of Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements of Direction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements of Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 provides a more visual picture of the descriptive statistics of the questionnaire items. As was
shown before, the mean values were weighted towards the top end of the scale showing a general agreement that all of the items are important to the development of a strategic plan. Items requiring further analysis are those having a large variance or standard deviation. Those in this category are items number 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

Figure 5. Mean, Variance, and Standard Deviation

When reviewing the items identified, it was found that these element items included such words as priority,
methods, measure, quantify, quantity, continuous, and performance. Further analysis might identify some concerns about methods and measures of strategic planning.

When the statistics are grouped by independent variable category, the findings were similar. Analysis of Table 6 shows that the mean value of the scores for administrative positions range from around 8 to 9. The standard deviations also show that the scores range, on average, about 1 point from the mean. Only in one case does the standard deviation vary from this. The standard deviation for presidents in statements of direction is only .1401. This score shows that the presidents are in closer agreement to the importance of the statements of direction. On the other extreme, the standard deviation of statements of impact for the academic administrator group is 1.3052. In both cases an indication for further study can be developed. Tables 7-9 provide the statistics for levels of experience, college location, and training time. No significant findings were identified in the analysis of these categories.

An analysis of the overall statistics for each of the dependent variables (see Table 10) provides similar results. For mean value of importance, SOP is rated highest at 9.35 with a variance of .59. From these values it was found that purpose is of greatest importance to the strategic planning
process and that there is very little variance in this rating.

### TABLE 6

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE BY POSITION AND STATEMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Statements of Purpose (SOP)</th>
<th>Statements of Direction (SOD)</th>
<th>Statements of Impact (SOI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Presidents</td>
<td>Mean = 9.2791 SD = .7748 Range = 3.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5756 SD = .1401 Range = 3.6925</td>
<td>Mean = 8.4888 SD = 1.0186 Range = 3.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrators</td>
<td>Mean = 9.3469 SD = .7653 Range = 3.6000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.6460 SD = 1.0122 Range = 5.4615</td>
<td>Mean = 8.2431 SD = 1.3052 Range = 5.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Business</td>
<td>Mean = 9.2235 SD = .9692 Range = 3.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.6018 SD = .8678 Range = 3.0000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5292 SD = 1.0335 Range = 3.7778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service</td>
<td>Mean = 9.5429 SD = .7325 Range = 3.0000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.8791 SD = .6323 Range = 2.3077</td>
<td>Mean = 8.7989 SD = .7783 Range = 2.6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE BY EXPERIENCE AND STATEMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>Statements of Purpose (SOP)</th>
<th>Statements of Direction (SOD)</th>
<th>Statements of Impact (SOI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>Mean = 6.4400 SD = .7529 Range = 2.6000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.7641 SD = .8148 Range = 2.7692</td>
<td>Mean = 8.7259 SD = .9520 Range = 3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.2346 SD = .6862 Range = 3.8000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.7219 SD = 1.1412 Range = 5.4615</td>
<td>Mean = 8.4631 SD = 1.2483 Range = 5.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.1780 SD = .7310 Range = 2.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.4192 SD = .9693 Range = 3.3077</td>
<td>Mean = 8.0711 SD = 1.0919 Range = 4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.5733 SD = .6584 Range = 1.8000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5682 SD = 1.0442 Range = 3.8923</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5037 SD = 1.2827 Range = 4.5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.2000 SD = .1110 Range = 3.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.6564 SD = .6139 Range = 2.2308</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5037 SD = .7175 Range = 2.1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.3825 SD = .8900 Range = 2.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.8421 SD = .8521 Range = 3.6154</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5587 SD = .9741 Range = 3.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;23 years</td>
<td>Mean = 9.4077 SD = .5642 Range = 1.8000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.8047 SD = .8424 Range = 3.0000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.3761 SD = 1.3860 Range = 5.7778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE BY LOCATION AND STATEMENT CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Statements of Purpose (SOP)</th>
<th>Statements of Direction (SOD)</th>
<th>Statements of Impact (SOI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Mean 9.4109</td>
<td>Mean 8.7682</td>
<td>Mean 8.5916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .7094</td>
<td>SD = .8139</td>
<td>SD = .9884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 2.6000</td>
<td>Range = 3.3077</td>
<td>Range = 4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Mean 9.2592</td>
<td>Mean 8.5344</td>
<td>Mean 8.2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .8575</td>
<td>SD = 1.0076</td>
<td>SD = 1.2493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 3.6000</td>
<td>Range = 5.4615</td>
<td>Range = 5.8889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9

**MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE BY TRAINING AND STATEMENT CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Time</th>
<th>Statements of Purpose (SOP)</th>
<th>Statements of Direction (SOD)</th>
<th>Statements of Impact (SOI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25 hours</td>
<td>Mean = 9.2000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5829</td>
<td>Mean = 8.3856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .8861</td>
<td>SD = .9910</td>
<td>SD = 1.1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 3.6000</td>
<td>Range = 5.4615</td>
<td>Range = 5.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50 hours</td>
<td>Mean = 9.4667</td>
<td>Mean = 8.8153</td>
<td>Mean = 8.7340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .6096</td>
<td>SD = .7015</td>
<td>SD = .7417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 2.2000</td>
<td>Range = 2.6154</td>
<td>Range = 2.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75 hours</td>
<td>Mean = 9.4000</td>
<td>Mean = 8.5913</td>
<td>Mean = 8.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .7856</td>
<td>SD = .6419</td>
<td>SD = 1.0834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 2.2000</td>
<td>Range = 1.8077</td>
<td>Range = 3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75 hours</td>
<td>Mean = 9.5030</td>
<td>Mean = 8.6597</td>
<td>Mean = 8.2626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .6876</td>
<td>SD = 1.0123</td>
<td>SD = 1.3712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 3.2000</td>
<td>Range = 3.6923</td>
<td>Range = 5.7778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOD has the second highest mean value at 8.67 and a variance of .83. The assumption here would be that SOD's are of less importance than SOP's with a slightly larger variation in the perceptions of the respondents.

The lowest mean (8.48) was found in the SOI with a variance of 1.10. From these values it was found that SOI is important to strategic planning, but of less importance than SOD or SOP. This high variance (1.21) should also be noted. This high variance indicates that of the three categories SOI has the greatest variation in perceived importance. The question in this case would be, what part of the elements of SOI caused the respondents to vary in their perception of importance.

Crosstabs using the different independent variable groups and subgroups provided for further analysis. In Tables 11-13 the data were analyzed to determine the number of respondent crossovers in the different combinations of subgroups. For instance, in Table 11, it can be seen that
there are 14 respondents that crossover into the two subgroups: (1) those who received less than 25 hours of inservice training in strategic planning training, and (2) those who have less than 3 years of experience in institutional planning experience.

Table 11 provides additional background information about the respondents of the questionnaire. From this table we can see that strategic planning training is well distributed throughout the experience categories and is not strongly weighted on any one category. The larger numbers in the 0-25 hours category indicates that only a limited amount of training has been received in strategic planning.

Table 12 shows the greatest crossover in presidents with over 23 years of experience and academic administrators with 4-7 years of experience. Further analysis indicates that finance/business and student services administrators
generally have less experience in institutional planning than do presidents and academic administrators.

### TABLE 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Category</th>
<th>0-3 years</th>
<th>4-7 years</th>
<th>8-11 years</th>
<th>12-15 years</th>
<th>16-19 years</th>
<th>20-23 years</th>
<th>&gt;23 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The crosstab of Location by Experience (Table 13) confirms Anglin's (1996) research that rural community colleges have been performing strategic planning longer than urban colleges. Further analysis of these data will determine if the added experience has any effect on the perceived importance of the elements of strategic planning.

### TABLE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>0-3 years</th>
<th>4-7 years</th>
<th>8-11 years</th>
<th>12-15 years</th>
<th>16-19 years</th>
<th>20-23 years</th>
<th>&gt;23 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statements of Purpose</th>
<th>Statements of Direction</th>
<th>Statements of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements of Purpose</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.7801</td>
<td>.6456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of Direction</td>
<td>.7801</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>P=</td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of Impact</td>
<td>.6456</td>
<td>.5427</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.001</td>
<td>P=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses were then checked for correlation as seen in Table 14. From Table 14 we can see that all of the dependent variables correlation r values range from .5427 to .7801. In each case the P value is less than .000 showing a significant relationship between the variables.

The fact that there is more than one independent variable and more than one dependent variable requires the running of a MANOVA. The high correlation between the dependent variables further validates the need for MANOVA statistical testing. This process controls for type I error that may lead to the rejection of a true hypothesis. The MANOVA was run using the Wilks test and the results are provided in table format. Each of the hypotheses are stated below. Following each hypothesis is a table showing the statistical significance of the test. Each table is followed by a discussion of the results.
Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and, finance/business administrators towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 \]

where \( \mu_1 \) = presidents
\( \mu_2 \) = academic instruction administrators
\( \mu_3 \) = student services administrators
\( \mu_4 \) = finance/business administrators

In Table 15 an analysis was made to determine if there are any differences in the perceptions of the four different groups of administrators toward the three categories of strategic planning - SOP, SOD, AND SOI. If any significant differences were discovered, further analysis of the data using univariate testing was done to identify which dependent variable differs from the other.

**TABLE 15**

MANOVA STATISTICS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F</th>
<th>Hypothesis DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93806</td>
<td>1.08753</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>367.64</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Hypothesis 1 the statistical tests produced no significant multivariate $F$ values. The decision was therefore made to fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and, finance/business administrators towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact. Because there are no significant differences in the perceptions of administrators in different positions toward the dependent variables SOP, SOD, and SOI, it might be concluded that all administrators have the same perception of the level of importance of each of the three categories, SOP, SOD, and SOI.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of rural and urban community college administrative personnel toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

$H_0 : u_1 = u_2$

where $u_1 =$ rural

$u_2 =$ urban

The statistical tests produced no significant multivariate $F$ values (see Table 16). The decision was
therefore made to fail to reject the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of rural and urban community college administrative personnel toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

<p>| TABLE 16 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA STATISTICS FOR COLLEGE LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings lead to the conclusion that, when categorized by location, the four groups of college administrators do not differ in their perceptions of SOP, SOD, and SOI.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of inservice training towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

H₀: u₁ = u₂ = u₃

where

u₁ = 0 – 25 hours

u₂ = 26 – 50 hours

u₃ = > 50 hours
The MANOVA test for Inservice Training (see Table 17) was used to determine what perception differences toward the importance of strategic planning elements might be found when the surveyed community college administrators are categorized by levels of training. The statistical tests produced no significant multivariate F values. The decision was therefore made to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

**TABLE 17**

**MANOVA STATISTICS FOR INSERVICE TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F</th>
<th>Hypothesis DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Training</td>
<td>0.97012</td>
<td>1.12827</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of inservice training towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact. From these results it might be concluded that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of importance of strategic planning elements for community college administrators when categorized by inservice training levels.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when
categorized by years of experience in institutional planning
towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b)
statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

\[ H_0: u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = u_4 = u_5 = u_6 = u, \]

where \( u_1 = 0 - 3 \) years

\( u_2 = 4 - 7 \) years

\( u_3 = 8 - 11 \) years

\( u_4 = 12 - 15 \) years

\( u_5 = 16 - 19 \) years

\( u_6 = 20 - 23 \) years

\( u_7 > 23 \) years

The statistical tests produced no significant multivariate F
values (see Table 18). The decision was therefore made to fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by years of experience in institutional planning towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact. From these results it might be concluded that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of institutional planning experience.
TABLE 18
MANOVA STATISTICS FOR INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate F</th>
<th>Hypothesis DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.9129</td>
<td>0.79834</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>438.89</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holding the alpha significance level at .05 the effect size, as well as power, were computed for the data statistics in order to test the probability of making a Type II error. This error is made by not rejecting a false hypothesis. In all cases, the power is less than desirable (<.70), increasing the likelihood of not rejecting the hypothesis when it should have been rejected. Therefore, it can not be assumed with confidence that there actually are no differences in the mean scores of the independent variable categories.

Effect size defines the degree to which a phenomenon exists (see Table 19). The effect sizes in the statistics are considered low and provide some concern as to the sufficiency of the sample size although the sample size for this study included the entire population of the specified community college administrators in the defined categories.
Analysis of the data for outliers was also done and the outliers were removed. The statistics were rerun for significance and power. In each case the improvement in power and significance were less than desirable. For that reason the results of the tests after outliers were removed are not provided in this study.

One final test was performed to determine any significant difference in the perception of importance by the four administrative categories (presidents, academic administrators, student services administrators, and business/finance administrators) toward each item (1-27) on the questionnaire (See Appendix C). A one-way ANOVA using the Tukey-B test with a significance level of .05 was used.

Differences found were used to identify specific element items of the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template which could present difficulties in the
strategic planning process. After running the ANOVA for each item of the questionnaire, the following results were found.

A significance F value of .0144 was found for use of internal/external strategic planning evaluations (Item 6 of the questionnaire). From this statistic it might be concluded that there are some differences in the perceived importance of this item to Texas Community College administrators (see Table 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0801</td>
<td>5.0267</td>
<td>3.6374</td>
<td>.0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>200.3830</td>
<td>1.3820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>215.4631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tukey-B test identifies the significance difference between business/finance administrators, and presidents and academic administrators. An analysis of the three groups may identify people-oriented versus production-oriented personalities. The terms "quantitative" and "qualitative" may be the influencing factors of Item 6: "External/internal assessment should be a qualitative and quantitative..."
evaluation of factors influencing the institution's mission."

A significant difference was also found in the analysis (see Table 21) of Item 14: "Institutional strategies should be exact methods for achieving institutional goals and objectives."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 14 Between</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.2622</td>
<td>12.0874</td>
<td>4.1876</td>
<td>0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>420.5432</td>
<td>2.9003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>456.8054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference here is between business/finance and student services administrators. The adjective in this that might account for most of the variation is "exact." Again, it might be assumed that many people dealing with numbers (business/finance) tend to be more exact than administrators who deal mostly with people (student services administrators). A review of the crosstabs (Table 12) also shows student services administrators having less institutional planning experience than other administrative groups.
The final item showing a significant difference is Item 26: "Efficiency measures should be reliable measures which justify the cost of collecting and retaining the data." The significant difference here is found between student services administrators and academic administrators (see Table 22). Again it was found that student services administrators are one of the differing groups.

**TABLE 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 26 Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.9806</td>
<td>9.3269</td>
<td>3.6237</td>
<td>.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>368.0602</td>
<td>2.5738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>396.0408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an analysis of the item, the words "efficiency" and "justify" stand out as probable causes of the differences in perceptions. As was seen before, measurement and the decision making elements are often where the differences are found.

**Summary**

The quantitative analyses described in this section provide a measurement of the perceived importance of certain categories of strategic planning in Texas community
colleges. The statistical significance of this study based on the sampled data from the administrators of 72 community colleges in Texas provides insight on the perceived importance of strategic planning elements and is helpful in understanding characteristics influencing strategic planning, identifying strategic planning program barriers, and evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state.

The findings of this study show to a certain degree of confidence that community college administrators, when categorized by administrative position, college location, inservice training and years of experience in institutional planning do not differ on the perceived importance of the strategic planning elements provided in the Texas Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template. Each of the three dependent variable categories are perceived as being very near to the top end of a 1-10 importance scale with no significant difference found in any of the mean scores of the independent variable categories. Only when an ANOVA is run for each individual item were any differences found in the mean values of the administrative groups (three out of 27 items). An analysis of these three items tends to point toward items dealing with outcomes measurement or assessment.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1991 the Seventy-second Legislature tasked the Legislative Budget Board of Texas with the assignment of developing a long-range strategic plan for state government based on individual agency plans. The passing of House Bill No. 2009 required that all agencies of Texas State Government, including community colleges, develop a strategic plan. On January 31, 1992 the Texas legislative Budget Board issued to all State agencies a copy of Planning for Texas Tomorrow: Instructions for Preparing and Submitting Agency Strategic Plans. This document described the strategic planning process, defined its key elements, and prescribed a format for the preparation and submission of State agency strategic plans.

In a previous study of the impact of state-mandated strategic planning on Texas public community colleges and technical colleges, Anglin (1996, p. 64) found that most all of the college strategic plans comply with the seven steps identified in the strategic planning process.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the significance of certain independent variables towards the perceived importance of three dependent variables - statements of purpose, statements of direction and statements of impact - found in the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template. Research shows that there are a number of planning paradigms which contain some form of strategic planning. Independent variables such as administrative levels of involvement, levels of experience, levels of strategic planning training, and college location could all be significant factors in determining the success of strategic planning. The results of this study may provide community colleges in Texas with information for better understanding characteristics influencing strategic planning, for identifying strategic planning program barriers, and for evaluating strategic planning program models and outcomes throughout the state.

Methods and Procedures

A questionnaire was developed from the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template. Each item of the questionnaire pertained to a particular element of the template. The items were developed and a measurement method was devised using a Likert 10-point scale. The scale was
labeled to indicate the importance of each item on the questionnaire. A one (1) on the scale indicated no importance while a 10 indicated very important.

Validity of the questionnaire was based primarily on the fact that most all of the community colleges in Texas are using the planning process developed for HB 2009. (Anglin, 1996) In conjunction with this, the survey was also provided to 3 strategic planning administrators around the state for further validity verification. The elements of the questionnaire were first randomly sorted and then provided to the administrators with a request to rate the elements by importance and sort them according to the specified categories - statements of purpose, statements of direction and statements of impact. In each of the returned responses the items were rated as important to strategic planning and sorted into the appropriate categories.

Once the questionnaire was tested for validity it was then tested for reliability. Ten members of the faculty and administration at Grayson College were then selected to take and retake the test with a 5 day separation period. The reliability of the questionnaire was then checked using an SPSS reliability test. Elements of the questionnaire with reliability scores below .60 were removed from the questionnaire. After completion of this process there were 27 questions remaining on the questionnaire
The survey instrument used for this study (see Appendix A) was divided into three sections with each section corresponding to the three sections specified in the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template - statements of direction, statements of purpose, statements of impact. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of twenty-seven different items. Two hundred and eighty-five surveys were mailed (n=285). Completed questionnaires were returned by 166, giving a 58% return rate.

All respondents were asked to provide their administrative position, (president, academic administrator, student services administrator or finance/business administrator); the location of the college (rural or urban); the strategic planning training they received in hours; and the number of years in institutional planning.

Limitations

Due to the geographic limitations of the study, findings cannot be generalized beyond the community colleges in Texas.

Delimitations

This study was limited to the personnel directly responsible for the planning program. The study also assumed that the respondents answered truthfully and to the best of their ability.
Discussion

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and, finance/business administrators towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

The statistical test produced no significant multivariate F values, therefore, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypothesis. This would imply that regardless of which Texas community college strategic plan is reviewed, each would contain the elements described by the questionnaire, and that every administrator has the same perception of their level of importance regardless of any external influences or mandates. It would also indicate that every strategic plan should be similar in content and form. Although this may be true, it does not address the degree to which each of these elements are reported or documented. Prior research shows that some strategic plans are highly detailed while others are merely statements, some are volumes while others can be contained on a single page.

The ANOVA test of each item identified only three of the 27 items with a significant difference between the mean scores of each administrative position - items 6, 14, and 26. Item 6 pertains to qualitative and quantitative
assessment of internal and external factors influencing the institution's mission. When comparing the MANOVA test of categories against the ANOVA of each item, one might have to question why administrators' perceptions differ. Analysis of the item shows the difference to be between finance/business administrators, and presidents and academic administrators. However, reasons for these differences were not measured in this study. Therefore, no conclusions can be made from these findings without further research.

Item 14 deals with "exact methods" used to achieve the goals and objectives established in a strategic plan. A Tukey-B test found the significant difference to be between finance/business administrators and student services administrators. It would appear that finance/business administrators and student services administrators differ in the importance of exact methods of achievement in strategic planning. Strong comments were provided by respondents praising the process over the product. One respondent indicated that the process is far more important than a "stifling adherence to a planners template" (see Appendix B).

Item 26 addresses measures which justify the cost of collecting data to measure the efficiency of the institution in obtaining the goals and objectives in a strategic plan. The difference here may be due to the cost of obtaining
certain goals, that is, are some goals worthy of greater costs than others and are those results quantifiable. These differences were identified between academic administrators and student services administrators.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by levels of inservice training towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

The statistical test produced no significant multivariate F values, therefore, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Because there are no significant differences in the perception of administrators when categorized by inservice training toward the dependent variables SOP, SOD, and SOI, it might be concluded that the perceived importance of the key elements of the Strategic Planning Template provided by the Texas Legislative Budget Board is the same for all administrators in Texas community colleges. Why is there no difference in perceived importance? Are these perceptions established in other planning paradigms such as long range planning? Further study of strategic planning would be required to determine what separates strategic planning from other planning paradigms. Although Anglin's study (1996) indicated that college presidents believed strategic planning to be
different from long range planning, there are no qualitative or quantitative studies which distinguish these formal differences.

In Anglin's study (1996, p. 77) she found that rural Texas community college have been practicing strategic planning longer than urban schools, probably because of the greater economic impact. Using the results of that study and this one, it appears that length of time in the strategic planning process may not be a statistically significant factor for determining the perceived importance of strategic planning elements. This assumption, however, would require further study to substantiate.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of rural and urban community college administrative personnel toward the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

The statistical test produced no significant multivariate F values, therefore, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypothesis. From the results it can be concluded that there is no difference in the perceived importance of the strategic planning for Texas community college administrators when categorized by location. Thus, it can be concluded that perceived importance does not vary
for administrators when categorized by student enrollment and economic factors that vary with location.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of community college personnel when categorized by years of experience in institutional planning towards the importance of (a) statements of purpose, (b) statements of direction, and (c) statements of impact.

Hypothesis 4 determines the perceived importance of strategic planning elements for Texas community college administrators when categorized by institutional planning experience. Any statistical significance found in this test would have provided some insight on institutional planning experience and perceived importance of strategic planning elements. The statistical tests produced no significant multivariate F values (see Table 18). The decision was therefore made to fail to reject the null hypothesis. If perceptions are the same, then what factor influenced all respondents to rate the three categories high with no significant difference in their response?

Each hypothesis indicates that there are no significant differences in the mean scores of the dependent variables (statements of purpose, statements of direction and statements of impact) by the different subgroups of the independent variables. The statistical tests failed to produce any significant differences in any of the cases of
the four hypotheses and therefore all of the null hypotheses failed to be rejected.

Implications For Future Strategic Planning

Agreement on the importance of the strategic planning elements provided by the Texas legislative Budget Board was not considered a barrier to implementing the strategic planning in Texas community colleges. In Anglin's work (1996), Texas community college presidents were found to believe that the process of strategic planning provided some real benefits that are both tangible and intangible with the greatest benefit being the unification and coordination within the institution (p. 78). This study validated the previous study by Anglin as can be seen to a large extent by respondent comments see Appendix B). In every planning effort there is a certain amount of unification and coordination that is inherent to the process itself. What separates these elements of importance in strategic planning from the same elements in some other planning paradigm? If strategic planning is indeed a relatively new process to community college planning, why is there no sign of progression in the perception of importance when scores are categorized by training or experience?
Conclusions

In the study no significant differences were found in the perceptions of community college presidents, academic instruction administrators, student services administrators, and finance/business administrators toward the importance of statements of purpose, statements of direction, and statements of impact. Regardless of administrative position, college location, training received, or institutional experience, all of the elements of the Strategic Planning Template are considered important. One respondent called these the "motherhood and apple pie" statements of strategic planning. From these results it might be assumed that all colleges will place a high value on the importance of each section of the strategic planning elements. However, the statistical data are lacking in power. An increase in sample size would provide greater power to this study and reduce the possibility of Type II error. This increased power would provide greater confidence to the conclusions.

Recommendations for Additional Research

The findings of this research study address the perceived importance of the three categories of strategic planning - SOP, SOD, AND SOI. These findings have brought about several new questions pertaining to strategic planning in Texas community colleges. These questions include such
things as differences between faculty and administration; differences in strategic planning and other planning paradigms; and, the LBB Strategic Planning Template itself. Specific questions as found in chapters IV and V include the following:

1) Why is there no difference in perceived importance?
2) Why is there no sign of progression in the perception of importance when scores are categorized by training or experience?
3) What separates these elements of importance in strategic planning from the same elements in some other planning paradigm?

In order to answer these questions further study is suggested as follows:

1) Conduct a follow-up study to determine differences of perceived importance of strategic planning elements between administrator and faculty.
2) Conduct a study to show how elements are categorized different planning paradigms.
3) Investigate the satisfaction of administrators and faculty for the strategic plans developed using the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template.

While the results of this study provide some helpful information, there is still some question as to what makes strategic planning successful. If all of the administrators
agree to the importance of the strategic planning elements then there must be some other factor that determines the success of the strategic planning process for various institutions. Because, in Anglin's study, 54% of the Texas community college presidents believed strategic planning to be more of an art than a science (1996, p. 52). Thus, from Anglin's study and this one it could be concluded that even after all of the elements of the strategic planning process are completed there is still an intangible element of "the art of strategic planning" that has yet to be defined and measured.

It has been said that vision without action is only dreaming, action without vision is merely passing the time, but vision with action can change the world. If all of the elements of the Strategic Planning Template are considered important, what is the element that unites the vision and action of a strategic plan into something that will change the future?
APPENDIX A

SURVEY
Appendix A

Survey

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas and would greatly appreciate your assistance. The enclosed questionnaire has been developed from elements of the Legislative Budget Board Strategic Planning Template as provided by the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Please take some time to complete and return this survey by FAX, e-mail or the postal service, no later than November 4, 1996. The FAX number and e-mail address are provided below. Your responses will be kept in strict confidence. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,
Rod Minatra
P.O. Box 486
Van Alstyne, TX 75495

FAX (903) 482-5481
e-mail RMINATRA@aol.com

Instructions:
Please rate each of the following planning elements by circling or "X-ing" out the appropriate response. Rate the elements according to how important you think the element "should be" in planning.

Rating Scale:
(Unimportant) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  (Very Important)

Example:
Outcome measures should be measures that lead to a valid conclusion and enable decisions to be made concerning institutional action.
(Unimportant) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  (Very Important)

In this example, this element of strategic planning was ranked as very important.

Questionnaire

Statements of Purpose
1) The institutional mission statement should be clearly stated and understood throughout the institution.
(Unimportant) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  (Very Important)
2) The institutional mission statement should be realistic for the foreseeable future.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

3) The institutional mission statement should be the foundation for the rest of the planning process.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

4) The institutional philosophy statement should be clearly stated and understood throughout the institution.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

5) The institutional philosophy statement should be the basis of conduct for carrying out its mission.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

**Statements of Direction**

6) External/internal assessment should be a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of factors influencing the institution's mission.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

7) External factors should include economic conditions, population shifts, technological advances, geographical changes and statutory changes.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

8) Internal factors should include management policies, resource constraints, organizational structure, automation, personnel, and operational procedures.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

9) Institutional planning goals should be the ends toward which the college directs its effort.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

10) Institutional planning goals should be developed and documented in order of priority.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

11) Institutional planning goals should be derived from the external/internal assessment.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

12) Institutional objectives should be clear targets for specific action.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

13) Institutional objectives should be developed and documented in order of their impact on the mission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) Institutional strategies should be exact methods for achieving institutional goals and objectives.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Institutional strategies should be easily understood.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Institutional strategies should be action-oriented methods which cross program and division lines for the institution.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Action plans should be detailed methods showing how to implement the strategies.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Action plans should be inclusive for all institutional departments and programs.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statements of Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) Outcome measures should be logically and directly related to the institutional goals and objectives.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Outcome measures should be reliable tools to assess the effectiveness of the institution’s performance.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Outcome measures should be measures which lead to a valid conclusion and enable decisions to be made concerning institutional action.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Output measures should be directly related to the institutional strategies.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Output measures should be measures showing the quantity of work performed (i.e., people served, services offered).</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Output measures should be continuous measures of the same thing over a period of time.</td>
<td>(Very Important)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25) Efficiency measures should be indicators which quantify costs or time associated with given outcomes or outputs.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

26) Efficiency measures should be reliable measures which justify the cost of collecting and retaining the data.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

27) Efficiency measures should be a reflection of change in performance.
(Unimportant) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Very Important)

RESPONDENT INFORMATION (Please check or fill-in applicable information)
Administrative position in the community college:
- President
- Academic Administrator
  - Vice President
  - Dean
  - Chair
- Finance/Business
- Student Services

College Location:
- Rural
- Urban

Amount of inservice training received for strategic planning:
- 0 - 25 hrs
- 26 - 50 hrs
- 51 - 75 hrs
- >76 hrs

Years of experience in institutional planning:
- 0 - 3 yrs
- 4 - 7 yrs
- 8 - 11 yrs
- 12 - 15 yrs
- 16 - 19 yrs
- 20 - 23 yrs
- >23 yrs

Additional Comments:
APPENDIX B

RESPONDENT COMMENTS
Respondent Comments

- 022 "too much jargon, not enough action"

- 023 "good luck! It never is as simple as mission, goals, objectives when one deals with people!"

- 026 "I have attempted to be realistic in my responses - all planning and outcome measures are 'tools' only. Realistically, if your measures show that art, theater, and football lose money by every known measure, I bet your institution will keep these departments. I have taught Str. Planning in grad schools but for the same reasons that Stanley Marcus keep[s] the 'downtown store' open, colleges & universities will keep some programs - planning, measurements & customers, be damned!"

- 047 "Your survey results are going to be less reliable than if you had defined your terms precisely. What are the differences you intend between strategies - action plans; outcomes - outputs not all respondents are formally familiar with meanings assigned by the LBB."

- 073 "Not involved in community college strategic planning directly, but have an interest in greatest efficiency (impact) internally and externally of the institution."

- 077 "Unfortunately, education is attempting to implement management practices used by business and industry (and since has been basically abandoned by business and
industry) in an attempt to apply teaching and learning
cost effectiveness and measurement in a standardized,
computer collected, procedural manner. What is occurring
here will not result in better quality and efficiency of
education. It will create a lot more clerical jobs and
terrific (great) amounts of paper work that takes away
additional time from the preparation for class time. You
will see great gains in measuring efficiency but,
unfortunately, even greater losses in quantity and
quality of education."

- 081 "In this age of accountability, institutional
planning may be overrated (& often misused) as a concept
or a tool which truly moves the institution forward.
There is still much misunderstanding of terminology and a
widespread lack of 'buy-in' by faculty. The public,
although espousing a general belief in 'performance
measures,' still judges an institution more by indirect,
anecdotal image measures such as - athletic success,
quality & socio-economic status in incoming (not
outgoing) students, historical position in state, alumni
'spirit', etc. Sorry for the cynicism, but strategic
planning & performance evaluation are still important in
the boardroom, but seldom penetrate the classroom or
living room."
• 086 "Active participation in strategic planning process, but not assigned overall responsibility for planning process."

• 095 "Institutional planning is very important; however, administrators, etc. don't seem to know how to plan. Sometimes, I don't think they really want to plan or use planning information to manage the institution. The biannual budgeting process seems to lock out any planning beyond a two-year period. Seems to me planning could be done 5, 6 years out if one wanted to do so."

• 108 "Academicians are probably the worst planners in the Western Hemisphere! Strategic planning, as vital as it is, is not well understood by most college/university planner/managers. A great deal more training would be appropriate."

• 117 "The survey reflects a very classical concrete and rigid view of institutional planning - one with its origins in MBO Strategic approaches often may vary from this rigid model, especially in more open organizations. In these, the process of building consensus and the will to act toward a goal is more important than a stifling adherence to a planner's template. Goals are terribly important and durable. Action plans are fluid, rapidly changing, and opportunistic."
• 124 "Student outcomes? Teaching/learner outcomes?"

• 134 "I am curious regarding the intent of this study. The elements are the 'motherhood & apple pie' of planning. How could anyone suggest any are not important?"

• 141 "Institutional planning is important, but many variables impact the direction of the college in a given time period."

• 144 "All of the elements you've listed are important to the planning process. I'm glad you included efficiency measures - so much time can be spent on planning functions (meetings, sharing governance, getting input & data, measuring results, etc. etc.) that it's hard to get regular work done. Of course, planning is critical to get the right work done and make sure everyone is going in the same direction."

• 146 "You may wish to add subcategories [under Respondent Information - Student Services] otherwise you have no means of discriminating responses in this category. Also reflects a bias against Student Development division which questions the validity of research reliability as a means of measuring executive leadership response to planning. As the response section is constructed it only measures the responses of presidents and Academic Vice
presidents. Is you intent of the study only to measure these two categories of executive leaders?"

• 150 "Good luck with your study!"

• 151 "The mission statement is the driving-force for the institution. By making the mission and philosophy clear, the rest falls into place such as programming, student support services, financial & administrative planning, etc."

• 152 "In my opinion, the value of strategic planning comes from the process as much or more than from the product. The actual mission statement and philosophy statement are not as important as the organization and community cohesion which develop as a result of collaboration on the future of the institution. The roles of the facilities and the steering committee are critical to a successful strategic planning process."

• 153 "If possible, I would appreciate a copy of the results."

• 154 "Not a good survey — will not stratify well enough — It’s like asking the question 'Do you still abuse your wife?'"
APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS AND ALL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS
Table 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS AND ALL QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2677</td>
<td>.7559</td>
<td>1.5152</td>
<td>.2131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>71.3378</td>
<td>.4989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.6054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5631</td>
<td>.1977</td>
<td>.2665</td>
<td>.8494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>106.0736</td>
<td>.7418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>106.6687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6108</td>
<td>.2036</td>
<td>.2254</td>
<td>.8766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>130.0581</td>
<td>.9032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>130.6689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0200</td>
<td>1.0067</td>
<td>1.0243</td>
<td>.3839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>140.5446</td>
<td>.9828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>143.5646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5808</td>
<td>.5270</td>
<td>.4544</td>
<td>.7148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>165.8205</td>
<td>1.1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>167.4014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0801</td>
<td>5.0267</td>
<td>3.6374</td>
<td>.0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>200.3830</td>
<td>1.3820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>215.4631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1262</td>
<td>1.0421</td>
<td>.8711</td>
<td>.4577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>173.4510</td>
<td>1.1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>176.5772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8449</td>
<td>.2150</td>
<td>.2238</td>
<td>.8798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>138.3483</td>
<td>.9608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>139.1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8819</td>
<td>.2940</td>
<td>.2694</td>
<td>.8474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>157.1181</td>
<td>1.0911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>157.9990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2682</td>
<td>2.0894</td>
<td>.9397</td>
<td>.4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>320.1845</td>
<td>2.2235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>326.4527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4208</td>
<td>1.1403</td>
<td>.6852</td>
<td>.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>239.8285</td>
<td>1.6641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>243.2493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5252</td>
<td>.1751</td>
<td>.1562</td>
<td>.9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>160.9544</td>
<td>1.1063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>160.9536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2210</td>
<td>2.4070</td>
<td>1.3577</td>
<td>.2582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>255.8257</td>
<td>1.7728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>263.0467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.2822</td>
<td>12.0874</td>
<td>4.1676</td>
<td>0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>420.5432</td>
<td>2.9003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>455.8254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
<td>F Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2981</td>
<td>2.0964</td>
<td>1.6132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>188.6952</td>
<td>1.3013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>194.9933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4947</td>
<td>.1649</td>
<td>.0844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>278.5053</td>
<td>1.9546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>280.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>3.0701</td>
<td>1.4393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>309.2998</td>
<td>2.1331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>318.5101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1343</td>
<td>.3781</td>
<td>.3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>168.8389</td>
<td>1.1644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>169.9732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0268</td>
<td>1.3423</td>
<td>.9321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>208.8054</td>
<td>1.4400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>212.8322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5129</td>
<td>1.1710</td>
<td>.7847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>216.3798</td>
<td>1.4923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>219.8926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8788</td>
<td>.9596</td>
<td>.6570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>210.3104</td>
<td>1.4605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>213.1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0212</td>
<td>3.0071</td>
<td>1.1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>372.0260</td>
<td>2.5835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>381.0473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7657</td>
<td>1.5886</td>
<td>.7078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>318.7208</td>
<td>2.2445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>323.4863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.3448</td>
<td>6.4483</td>
<td>2.4933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>372.4120</td>
<td>2.5862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>391.7568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.9806</td>
<td>9.3269</td>
<td>3.6237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>368.0602</td>
<td>2.5738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>396.0408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4615</td>
<td>3.1538</td>
<td>1.1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>380.2936</td>
<td>2.6594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>389.7551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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