

SUMMER 2006
EDL 572 -- EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AND PLANNING:
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CONTEXT ** 2 CREDITS

INSTRUCTOR &
CONTACT INFO: Jeffrey C. Sun
jeffrey.sun@und.edu
(701) 777-3452 [direct dial]; (701) 795-5742 [home office]; (443) 773-3452 [fax]
(701) 777-4255 [department office]; (701) 777-4365 [department fax]

OFFICE LOCATION: Room 207, Education Building

OFFICE HOURS: 30 minutes before each class meeting and following the end of each class meeting
as well as by appointment

MAILING ADDRESS: University of North Dakota
Department of Educational Leadership
231 Centennial Drive, MS: 7189
Grand Forks, ND 58202-7189

COURSE DESCRIPTION

A study of the planning process including topics such as establishing goals; assessing needs; identifying resources; and generating, analyzing, and selecting alternatives. Processes and techniques in planning will be emphasized.

COURSE OBJECTIVES/IDENTIFIABLE OUTCOMES

- (1) To introduce students to contemporary concepts and problems in institutional planning and systems
- (2) To identify the major categories of resources and to understand their interdependencies as well as relationships to other entities
- (3) To generate a list of identifiable, audience members
- (4) To connect various themes and concepts in planning and systems analyses
- (5) To distinguish the purposes of several instruments used for assessment
- (6) To define strategic planning
- (7) To understand and apply various strategic models
- (8) To differentiate the various classes of strategic models
- (9) To identify the various stakeholders and influential actors in the planning system
- (10) To critique current approaches to planning
- (11) To value the role of institutional research and suggest further development of these offices
- (12) To explain several of the processes, problems, and social phenomena through theories
- (13) To conduct an abridged review of the literature with a brief annotated bibliography on a specific area of institutional or system analysis
- (14) To collect and analyze one unit of institutional data

COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND CLASSROOM ETIQUETTE

- *Attendance and Engagement:* Your contributions to class discussions, and your absorption and reflection during the interactive components of the course add to your overall learning as well as to others in the class. Thus, attendance and engagement are mandatory.
- *Preparation:* Your level of preparedness directly impacts the course dynamics; therefore, readings and other assignments should be completed prior to the course meeting. In addition, absent a valid excuse or prearranged agreement, late assignments will not be accepted.
- *Opportunity and Openness:* The classroom should be a safe place to express ideas, opinions, and beliefs. Indeed, academic criticisms and discussions are critical elements of the course; however, behavior that obstructs traditional norms of academic freedom and mutual respect are not acceptable. Similarly, class participation is encouraged; at the same time, consideration of others such as providing others time to speak and learn should be respected. In other words, please provide opportunities for others to join the discussion.
- *Devices and Disruptions:* Please silence cell phones, beepers, and similar gadgets during class meetings. If you are on-call or an emergency signal is given, please quietly step outside of the classroom to address the matter.
- *Food and Physical Environs:* The class meetings are quite long. Although there will be periodic breaks, there may be times when you need to use the restroom, eat a snack in-class, or stretch a bit more. These are understandable needs. I only ask that you move quietly, keep the room clean, and avoid disrupting others. In addition, please feel free to provide me suggestions on how to make the physical environment and experience more comfortable.
- *Academic Integrity:* Adherence to academic norms and ethical standards is expected of graduate students. Your work must conform to University, College, and Department policies. Moreover, I wish to note that academic integrity consists of authenticity and proper attribution. Thus, fabrication of content and plagiarism will not be condoned. Violators of the academic integrity policy will automatically receive a failing grade for the assignment and will be brought before a committee to review the academic violation, which may result into dismissal from the program. Emphasizing this point further, I wish to remind everyone to please properly attribute works (see also, Code of Student Life, Rule 3-3; Graduate Academic Catalog section on Academic Standards).

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The University will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact the Office of Disability Support Services. At the Grand Forks campus, you may reach the staff at 190 McCannel Hall or (701) 777-3425 v/tty. Services are available to students who are registered and submit appropriate documentation. As your instructor, I am happy to discuss specific needs with you as well.

COURSE EVALUATION/GRADING

25% Class Participation & Preparedness

30% Book Presentation

45% Project

A	90-100	B	80-89	C	70-79
---	--------	---	-------	---	-------

Class Participation: Class participation includes contributions to class discussions, analysis and synthesis of the readings, application of theories and concepts, and in-class assignments.

Presentation: Two groups will be formed prior to the first day of class. Each group will present one of the assigned books. Presentation length is expected to be **2½-3hours** (excluding two 10-minute breaks). The presentation must include an overview of the text, emphasis on key concepts and practices, engagement of dialogue among your peers (particularly with those who did not read the

book), and participatory activity (or activities) to apply principle concepts and reinforce substantive knowledge learned. A handout with more details will be distributed two weeks before the presentation date. [2nd weekend]

Project: A final group project with an individual paper constitutes the largest portion of your grade. A handout describing the final group project and the individual memorandum will be distributed prior to the first class meeting. This website, <<http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/>>, may serve as a model (or as a benchmark) to the group project deliverable. [July 17 at 9:00 am(CDT)]

REQUIRED TEXTS & MATERIALS

Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H.D., & Dolence, M. G. (1997). Strategic change in colleges and universities: Planning to survive and prosper. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [for Group A: *Strategic Planning*]

Brewer, D. J., Gates, S. M., & Goldman, C. A. (2001). In pursuit of prestige: Strategy and competition in U.S. higher education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. [for Group B: *Prestige*]

Chronicle of Higher Education (access to weekly paper)

Articles, see Reading Assignments below.

OPTIONAL: OTHER RESOURCES

Burke, W. W. (2002). Organization change: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). A university for the 21st century. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Howard, R. D. (Ed.) (2001). Institutional research: Decision support in higher education. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.

Knight, W. (Ed.) (2003). A primer on institutional research. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.

Massy, W. F. (Ed.) (1996). Resource allocation in higher education. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Tierney, W. G. (Ed.) (1998). The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Weick, K. E. (2001). Making sense of the organization. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS

Academic Quality Improvement Program: <http://www.aqip.org>

American Association for Higher Education: <http://www.aahe.org/>

Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning: <http://www.acsp.org/default.htm>

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges: <http://www.agb.org>

Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers: <http://www.appa.org/>

Association for Institutional Research: <http://airweb.org/>

College and University Professional Association for Human Resources: <http://www.cupahr.org/>

Society for University Planning: <http://www.scup.org/>

State Higher Education Executive Officers <http://www.sheeo.org/default.htm>

COURSE SCHEDULE & ASSIGNMENTS

WEEKEND 1

OVERVIEW

§1.A: INTRODUCTION TO PLANNING & ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- 1.A.i [Glossary of terms used in the practice of institutional research.](#)
- 1.A.ii Ehrenberg, R. G. (2004). [Why universities need institutional researchers more than they realize?](#) [SKIM]
- 1.A.iii Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. [Administrative Science Quarterly, 23](#), 604-632. [SKIM]
- 1.A.iv Hearn J. C., & Corcoran, M. E. (1988). An exploration of factors behind the proliferation of the institutional research enterprise. [Journal of Higher Education, 59](#)(6), 634-651. [OPTIONAL]

RESOURCE-BASED FACTORS

§2.A: PHYSICAL/INFRASTRUCTURE

- 2.A.i Carlson, S. (2001). Colleges struggle with a 60s legacy: Ugly, wasteful, and outdated buildings. [Chronicle of Higher Education, 47](#)(49), A23 et seq. [SKIM]
- 2.A.ii Wasley, P. (2006). The power of a neighborhood. [Chronicle of Higher Education, 52](#)(35), A27-A29.
- 2.A.iii Caruthers, J. K., & Layzell, D. T. (1999). Campus master planning and capital budgeting. In L. Lapovsky & M. P. McKeown-Moak, [Roles and responsibilities of the chief financial officer](#) (New Directions for Higher Education, no. 107) (pp. 73-81). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]
- 2.A.iv June, A. W. (2004). As it seeks more room, Columbia treads carefully. [Chronicle of Higher Education, A29](#) et seq.
- 2.A.v Amsden, D. J. (2005). Using behavioral research to assist in the redesign of university plazas. [Planning for Higher Education, 33](#)(2), 31-38.

- 2.A.vi Weinberg, A. (2005). An alternative to the campus club med. Chronicle of Higher Education, B13-B14. [OPTIONAL]

§2.B: HUMAN

[We will discuss in greater detail in EDL 552, Academic Administration and EDL 553, Higher Education Finance & Budget.]

- 2.B.i Swenk, J. (1999). Planning failures: Decision cultural clashes. Review of Higher Education, 23(1), 1-21. [OPTIONAL]

§2.C: FINANCIAL

[We will discuss more in-depth issues in EDL 553, Higher Education Finance & Budget]

- 2.C.i Jones, D. (1999). Linking strategic planning and budgeting. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. [OPTIONAL]
- 2.C.ii Powers, J. B. (2000). The use of institutional incentive grants for strategic change in higher education. Review of Higher Education, 23(3), 281-298. [OPTIONAL]

DATA & DIAGNOSTICS

§3.A: ASSESSMENT ISSUES

- 3.A.i Borden, V. M. H., & Owens, J. L. Z. (2001). Measuring quality: Choosing among surveys and other assessments of college quality. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.
- 3.A.ii Terenzini, P. T. (1989). Assessment with open eyes. Journal of Higher Education, 60(6), 644-664.

§3.B: SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

- 3.B.i Review websites and services – [SKIM]
- (a) College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ): <http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/>
 - (b) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP): <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cirp.html>
 - (c) ACT Survey Services: <http://www.act.org/ess/index.html>
 - (d) National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): <http://nsse.iub.edu/index.cfm>
 - (e) Noel-Levitz: <http://www.noellevitz.com/>
 - (f) Rand Council for Aid to Education – Collegiate Learning Assessment: http://www.cae.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm
- 3.B.i Russell, A. B., & Winter, S. B. (2002). Compendium of national data sources on higher education (5th ed.). Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers. [OPTIONAL- THOUGH HIGHLY RECOMMENDED: I highly recommend that you spend a minute or two skimming through the attachments.]

DATA-DRIVEN DECISION-MAKING & PRACTICE

§4.A: CLIENT PARTICIPATION AND SUPPORT: The Collegiate Experience

- 4.A.i Ashburn, E. (2006). "Building a culture", Chronicle of Higher Education, 52(4), A36-A38.
- 4.A.ii Hoyt, J. E., & Lundell, M. (2003). The effect of student characteristics and student affairs interventions on college retention: The need for frontloading services (pp. 1-31). Annual Meeting for the Association for Institutional Research. [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]
- 4.A.iii Braxton, J. M. (2004). Five strategies to improve student retention. NASPA Leadership Exchange, 18-21. [OPTIONAL]
- 4.A.iv June, A. W. (2004, Aug. 13). The making of a megadorm: Three Chicago colleges have teamed up to build the nation's largest joint residence hall. Chronicle of Higher Education, 50(49), A23.

§4.B: "FORMER" CLIENT SURVEYS

- 4.B.i Cabrera, A. F., Weerts, D. J., & Zulick, B. J. (2005). Making an impact with alumni surveys. (New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 126) (pp. 5-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]
- 4.B.ii Review: <http://www.washington.edu/oea/pdfs/reports/OEAReport9808q.pdf> [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]
- 4.B.iii Hoyt, J. E. (2004). Understanding alumni surveys: Theory and predictors of donor status. Annual Meeting for the Association for Institutional Research. [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]

DATA COMPARISONS: ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACHES

§5.A: BENCHMARKING

- 5.A.i Labianca, G., Fairbanks, J. F., Thomas, J. B., Gioia, D. A., Umphress, E. E. (2001). Emulation in academia: Balancing structure and identity. Organization Science, 12(3), 312-330.
- 5.A.ii Ruben, B. D. (1999). Toward a balanced scorecard for higher education: Rethinking the college and university excellence indicators framework. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Organizational Development and Leadership, Rutgers University. [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]
- 5.A.iii Mosier, R. E., & Schwarzmuller, G. J. (2002). Benchmarking in student affairs. In B. E. Bender & J. H. Schuh, Using benchmarking to inform practice in higher education (New Directions for Higher Education, no. 118) (pp. 103-112). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [PRINT & FOLLOW ALONG WITH PRESENTATION]

- 5.A.iv Doerfel, M. L., & Ruben. B. D. (2002). Developing more adaptive, innovative, and interactive organizations. . In B. E. Bender & J. H. Schuh, Using benchmarking to inform practice in higher education (New Directions for Higher Education, no. 118) (pp. 5-27). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.A.v Lipnick, J. (2004). Benchmarking at your institution. NASPA Leadership Exchange, pp. 25, 27. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.A.vi Bensimon, E. M. (2004). The diversity scorecard: A learning approach to institutional change. Change, 36(1), 44-52. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.A.vii **CASE STUDY:** Institutional Effectiveness at Metropolitan Community College [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]

DATA COMPARISONS: SYSTEM APPROACHES

§5.B: QUALITY APPROACHES

- 5.B.i Arif, M., & Smiley, F. M. (2004). Baldrige theory into practice: A working model. International Journal of Education Management, 18(4/5), 324-328. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.B.ii Birnbaum, R. (2000). The life cycle of academic management fads. Journal of Higher Education, 71(1), 1-16. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.B.iii Koch, J. V., & Fisher, J. L. (1998). Higher education and total quality management. Total Quality Management, 9(8), 659-668. [OPTIONAL]

§5.C: BEST PRACTICES & OTHER WORDS OF ADVICE

- 5.C.i Simard, C., & Rice, R. E. (n.d.). The practice gap: Barriers to the diffusion of best practices. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Organizational Development and Leadership, Rutgers University. [OPTIONAL]
- 5.C.ii McCredie, J. W. (2000). Planning for IT in higher education: It's not an oxymoron. Educause Quarterly, 23(4), 14-21. [OPTIONAL]

§5.D: FEASIBILITY

- 5.D.i Barnes, S. V. (1999). A lost opportunity in American education?: The proposal to merge the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. American Journal of Education, 107(4), 289-320.

DATA COMPARISONS: PEER PROCESS

§6.A: ACCREDITATION (“Peer” Driven)

- 6.A.i J.F. Volkwein, et. al., (on-going). Meeting Minimum Standards, Attaining Goals, and Improving: A Working Paper on Accreditation in American Higher Education. http://www.ed.psu.edu/cshe/pdfs/Volk_Accreditat_Paper.pdf [OPTIONAL]
- 6.A.ii Lubinescu, E. S., Ratcliff, J. L., & Gaffney, M. A. (2001). Two continuums collide: Accreditation and assessment. In M. Kramer, M. A. Gaffney, E. S. Lubinescu, & J. L. Ratcliff, How accreditation influences assessment(New Directions for Higher Education, no. 113) (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. [OPTIONAL]

§6.B: PROGRAM REVIEW

- 6.B.i Mets, L. A. (1997). Planning change through program review. In M. W. Peterson, D. D. Dill, L. A. Mets, & Associates, Planning and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning postsecondary institutions (pp. 340-359). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. [OPTIONAL]

MORE DATA RESOURCES

§7.A: NATIONAL DATA SOURCES

- 7.A.i Review websites and data - [SKIM]
(a) U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics
<http://www.nces.ed.gov/>, <http://www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/SurveyGroups.asp?Group=2>
(b) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics <http://www.bls.gov/>
- 7.A.ii National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (2002). A basic guide to federal information resources. Washington, D.C.: Author. [SKIM]
- 7.A.iii Malika Kabbouchi, M. (n.d.). Millennium strategic planning: Scanning the horizon of higher education data sources and web sites. Miami, FL: Florida International University. [SKIM]
- 7.A.iv Brint, S. (2002). Data on higher education in the United States: Are the existing resources adequate?. American Behavioral Scientist, 45(10), 1493-1522. [OPTIONAL]

POLICYMAKING: ANALYSES OF DATA

§8.A: ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES

- 8.A.i Whiteley, S., & Skuja, E. (2004). Using institutional research to influence university policymaking. Annual Meeting for the Association for Institutional Research. [OPTIONAL]
- 8.A.ii Chaffee, E. E., & Jacobson, S. W. (1997). Creating and changing institutional cultures. In M. W. Peterson, D. D. Dill, L. A. Mets, & Associates, Planning and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning postsecondary institutions (pp. 230-263). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. [OPTIONAL]
- 8.A.iii Francis, J. G., & Hampton, M. C. (1999). Resourceful responses: The adaptive research university and the drive to market. Journal of Higher Education, 70(6), 625-641. [We'll read this article together in-class. Please print and bring to class.]
- 8.A.iv **CASE STUDIES:** Rocky Mountain College, Muskingum College, University of the Ozarks, Bellevue University, University of Hartford (August 1, 2003) [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]

§8.B: PUBLIC POLICIES

- 8.B.i Frost, S. H., Hearn, J. C., & Marine, G. M. (1997). State policy and the public research university: A case study of manifest and latent tensions. Journal of Higher Education, 68(4), 363-397. [OPTIONAL]
- 8.B.ii **CASE STUDY:** Arnone, M. (2004). Plan sparks fierce debate on reorganizing Arizona higher education. Chronicle of Higher Education, 51(7), A23. [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]

SPECIAL PLANNING ISSUE: CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGE

§9.A: CRISIS MANAGEMENT

- 9.A.i Mitroff, I. I., Diamond, M. A., & Alpaslan, C. M. (2006). How prepared are America's colleges and universities for major crises?: Assessing the state of crisis management. Change, 38(1), 60-67. [OPTIONAL]

WEEKEND 2

NON-PRESTIGE GROUP

- 10.A.i Volkwein, J. F., Grunig, S. D. (2004) Reputation ratings in higher education. CSHE Research Brief. http://www.ed.psu.edu/cshe/pdfs/Volkwein_Brief.pdf
- 10.A.ii Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 370-403.

Comment: Students who are NOT presenting in the "prestige group" should review these readings.

ALL STUDENTS

- 11.A.i US News & World Report (undergraduate and graduate)
- 11.A.ii Fain, P. (2006). Big dreams in the bluegrass state. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(34), A29-A31.
- 11.A.iii Wilson, R. (2001). Ohio State "taxes" departments to make a select few top-notch, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A8 et seq. (Ohio State 2010 Plan) [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]
- 11.A.iv Scorecard, Ohio State: http://www.osu.edu/academicplan/scorecard_2003.pdf [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]

NON-STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP

- 12.A.i Paris, K. A. (2003). *Strategic planning in the university*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.
- 12.A.ii U.C. Berkeley (2002). *U.C. Berkeley strategic academic plan*. [SKIM]
- 12.A.iii Barman, E. A. (2002). Asserting difference: The strategic response of nonprofit organizations to competition. *Social Forces*, 80(4), 1191-1222. [OPTIONAL]

Comment: Students who are NOT presenting in the "strategic planning group" should review these readings.

ALL STUDENTS

- 13.A.i CASE STUDY: Community-centered planning at Connecticut College, Parts A & B [SKIM] [Print and bring to class]

FINAL PROJECTS

- 14.A.i Review website: <http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/>