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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper has been to discuss the long-range development planning process as it pertains to university growth and expansion, and to illuminate those components that are so vital to a successful plan. This study explores the development of a long-range development plan for the University of California Riverside.

Campus administrative officers, directors of campus planning, management personnel from the UC Office of the President, and planning consultants were interviewed to determine the composition of a successful long-range planning process. In addition, city and community officials and legislators were interviewed—along with some campus faculty, staff and students—regarding their views on the long-range planning process at the Riverside campus.

Results demonstrate that a strong academic plan drives a successful long-range planning effort. In addition, the majority of faculty, staff, students, and community and city officials believe that an open process, even if it solicited some negativism, is critical to the success of the plan. Academic involvement throughout the process is also implied as critical to the long-range physical planning effort.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT....................................................................................... iii

INTRODUCTION.................................................................................. 1
  Research Objectives......................................................................... 6
  Research Methods........................................................................... 7
  Literature Review........................................................................... 7
  Interviews....................................................................................... 7
  Limitations Of The Videotaped Interviews.................................... 10

LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AT UC RIVERSIDE........... 11
  Background.................................................................................... 11
  Long-Range Planning Process....................................................... 14

LITERATURE REVIEW AND DISCUSSIONS...................................... 20
  Strategic Planning.......................................................................... 20
  Faculty Involvement....................................................................... 29
  Community Involvement............................................................... 37

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS............................................................. 41

CONCLUSION................................................................................... 52

RECOMMENDATIONS....................................................................... 62

APPENDIX A: Interview Questions.................................................. 66

APPENDIX B: Planning Directors' Comments.................................... 71

APPENDIX C: Guidelines for Effective Strategic Planning.............. 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY............................................................................... 76
I. INTRODUCTION

Planning for growth in higher education has become extremely challenging. For instance, the twentieth century has brought an agenda to higher education that focuses on issues that the academic environment has paid little attention to in the past. Such issues include the incredible lack of fiscal resources with which to support the mission of higher education -- and growth and its impact on the external environment and how it is viewed in this present-day climate. Leaders and managers of public and nonprofit organizations, such as institutions of higher learning, must now learn to cope with these challenges not only for the present day, but for the years ahead. An important question must be posed: Will these leaders and their organizations be able to respond to the increasingly turbulent environments in which these organizations operate? In other words, how should leaders respond to dwindling or unpredictable resources; new public expectations; demographic changes; deregulation; upheavals in the national, local and state economics; and new roles for public nonprofit and business organizations? What should each of these organizations' missions be? (Bryson, 1987), The charge to universities across the nation today--to provide quality education in a time of tremendous growth--must be thoroughly and carefully planned.
With these changes, some of the complex issues facing higher education today range from the design of marketing techniques and coping with the decline in eighteen year-old enrollments, to building a campus-wide network for media communications. In response to this complex agenda of concerns, greater emphasis must be placed on the planning function (Gaffney, 1987). For example, to establish a sophisticated planning mechanism, planners today must have a good understanding of individual academic and administrative departments. Long-range strategies can then be devised which can take advantage of known strengths; and in that way the appropriate resources and facilities can be directed (Gaffney, 1987).

As higher education focuses on these critical changes through its strategic planning effort, it must also take into consideration the changing environmental conditions of American higher education that began in the 1980s and have led to increased sensitivity to the concept of planning (Scott, 1988). According to Robert Scott, President of North Carolina College, strategic planning is the number one concern for system-level presidents. He advises higher education administration that as they embark on a strategic planning process, planning initiatives must be numerous and well-documented. He also cautions institutions as they begin the planning process that they should be aware that another important consideration in the way colleges and universities
go about this strategic planning is the increased attention given to the external environment--social as well as physical. In an effort to address these concerns, the environments of academic organizations are now being analyzed for critical trends which now seem to emphasize community networking (Scott, 1988).

According to the National Association of College and University Business Officers, institutional planning is one of the most important responsibilities of college or university administration (NACUBO, 1977). One area of particular importance is the physical environment. The physical planning of facilities and infrastructure is a critical element of long-range planning in any campus environment. In order to accommodate the academic master plan and the growth forecasted for the various disciplines and programs in colleges, appropriate long-range physical planning must definitely take place.

For instance, the University of California has asked that a comprehensive long-range physical planning study be conducted by each of the nine campuses in the UC system. The completed plan for the UC system will assist future leadership as it determines the appropriate physical sitings of facilities as well as infrastructure needs. In addition, the plan will aide campus administration, the office of the president, as well as the legislature, in projecting facility needs that must be addressed by the state capital budget.
This long-range planning effort will assist the state as it focuses on the development of its general obligation and revenue bond process.

Effective physical planning in any university setting is a process which encompasses a number of essential elements rather than a monolithic construct. Physical planning, if it is to be effective in a university setting, has to involve many participants; various organizational interests with diffuse boundaries; an understandable taxonomy; and above all, flexibility (Brase, 1992). Physical planning must be derived from the institution's shared vision of its mission. The master plan is that "shared vision." However, the master planning process in the university environment is complex. For instance, research universities focus on faculty workload versus faculty research. Programs and course offerings in these universities are structured around the student that most likely will go into a Ph.D program and perform research of his or her own.

Facility and infrastructure needs are based on the master plan. Master planning in higher education is necessary and widespread, but it is often ritualistic and unsuccessful. The process at times placates--communicates to the campus community what it thinks they want to hear. It is often performed in a vacuum, in a robot-like atmosphere. The master planning process, therefore, must become a more integral part of the institution's thinking about its changes

Strategic planning as it is referenced in this paper is viewed as a thought process critical to long-range planning in today's environment. Long-range planning affects both the external environment and the internal environment of the academic institution as well. Higher education must address a host of concerns in today's planning environment that were not issues in past planning efforts such as impacts on local infrastructure. Long-range planning today must meet concerns registered by the local community. The institution must be aware of those issues and look to the community for support in its planning effort. The much-needed community support will only happen if the leaders of the long-range planning process strategically plan for growth. For example, by developing strong relationships with community and city leaders; by marketing the campus image and what it has done and will do in the future for its community. By doing so, the institution will have placed itself strategically in the most advantageous position possible. This position must provide the acumen to be able to address the environmental, structural, and internal issues that will be spawned by future growth in the most insightful and positive manner. The long-range development planning process must also contain certain essential components if the finished product is to successfully guide the campus through expansion over the years.
With this in mind, this paper specifically examines the dynamics of long-range physical planning in one educational environment: The Riverside campus of the University of California. Structured interviews were conducted with university, city and community people relative to the process. This paper focuses on planning for growth in higher education and addresses the value of strategic planning in a master planning process that planned for campus growth into the year 2005-06. This process, resulted in a long-range development plan for each campus of the University of California system; each is a well thought out, comprehensive plan that ultimately will assist in the overall expansion of the academic as well as the physical expansion of the university system.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The positive outcome experienced by UC Riverside as it begins to implement its plan, in comparison to its sister campuses, has created the genesis for the following research objectives of this paper:

1. To critically review the process used by the University of California Riverside in the development of its Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) with emphasis on (a) organization and committee staffing; (b) overall design and development of the adopted Long-Range Development Plan;
2. To develop an assessment of the overall strategic planning effort on the Riverside campus;
3. To examine the value of faculty input to the planning effort;
4. To demonstrate the value of positive community relationships in a politically and environmentally sensitive process;
5. To make recommendations for strengthening the process.

RESEARCH METHODS

To accomplish the research objectives two different sources were used:

Literature Review

Current literature related to planning for higher education, other nonprofit organizations and strategic planning were reviewed. Relevant literature in the areas of university planning, strategic planning, and political planning was reviewed in depth.

Interviews

Twenty-two interviews were conducted with various legislators, community officials, campus faculty, staff and students. In addition, campus faculty, administrators, staff and students as well as staff from the University Office of the President were interviewed to assess the long-range
planning process conducted at the UC Riverside campus. They were asked to comment on the strengths and weaknesses, if any. Those committee members who served on the long-range development planning committee were also interviewed. The nature of the interviews conducted were tailored to the specific information required.

In addition, administrators at the University Office of the President as well as the Directors of the Riverside real estate and campus planning units were asked to assess the critical components of a successful long-range development plan. Community leaders, legislators, and city officials were also interviewed to discuss the interaction of the University of California Riverside with the community and the importance of networking in a long-range planning effort. They were also asked to comment on their vision for the Inland Empire by the year 2005-06 and how they envisioned the role of the Riverside campus as it expanded over the next fifteen years. Interviews were videotaped to facilitate the analysis of interview results. (The questions developed for the interviews are included in this paper as Appendix I.) It was intended that the videotaped interviews would be presented to the University Board of Regents as a testimonial to the Riverside campus as it demonstrated to the Board, the community, and campus the support envisioned as necessary to a successful long-range plan--a relationship that is not enjoyed by some of Riverside's sister campuses. Therefore,
interview questions were tailored to specific respondents.

The Vice Chancellor for Administration directed the long-range planning effort and I, as Director of Administration worked with the Campus Planning Department, the planning consultants, and campus administration in orchestrating the process. In this role I had an opportunity to view the plans and review the planning process of sister campuses in the University system and to attend Regents meetings where the plans submitted by the campuses were approved or disapproved. The Riverside campus was one of the last campuses to request Board approval. Being last, afforded us a learning opportunity as we watched the successes and failures of other UC campuses as they presented their long-range development plans to the Board of Regents for approval. I also watched as some of the campus plans even though approved by the Board, created dissatisfaction with faculty or the community, and the dissatisfaction eventually led to lawsuits or arbitrated compromise. Assisting in guiding UCR's process through the planning maize and seeing the results of the final plans and processes of other campuses, enabled me to better assess the criteria for a planning process that would be accepted and approved not only by the University Board of Regents, but the faculty, staff and students at UCR, as well as the external community.

References are cited in this paper that focus on the perceived weaknesses of other UC campuses in their long-range
planning processes and the subsequent negative community and faculty reactions that have resulted in postponement of Plan approval and in some cases, lawsuits brought against their Universities.

LIMITATIONS OF THE VIDEOTAPE INTERVIEWS

I raise the following concerns as limitations of the videotaped interviews as they relate to this research.

Some faculty members were invited to interview for the videotape who were politically important to the campus but who were not active participants in the planning process. Many of their comments regarding the process at the Riverside campus were biased and negative; and although negative remarks were encouraged, their comments were not as meaningful because they had not actively contributed to the process. Although eager to be part of the interview, these candidates were not able to provide credible input regarding the process and therefore should not have been selected to participate in the videotape.

Another limitation is that while there was extensive literature on strategic planning and faculty involvement, there is not much data which relates directly to community participation in the process. Therefore, the interviews with the city officials, legislators, and other community leaders played a crucial role in providing input to this research. Some of their comments however, could be construed as biased
because they were eager to satisfy the needs of UCR as it went forward to its Board of Regents for plan approval.
Another question also comes to mind: Much of the discussion in the videotaped interviews might have been skewed due to the fact that the interviewees were aware that they were being taped and that the video would be shown to a relatively important group of people. The members of the University of California Board of Regents are appointed by the Governor and some are considered both influential and powerful people in the State of California.

Another major limitation of the videotaped interviews is that the interviews were not conducted solely for the purpose of accommodating the research effort but they also served as a community relations tool for the campus as it sought approval from its Board for the long-range development plan. Some questions were tailored specifically for the client being interviewed.

The next section discusses the background behind long-range development planning at the University of California and the actual planning process that took place at the Riverside Campus.

II. LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AT UC RIVERSIDE

BACKGROUND

As mentioned before, the purpose of this research is to
evaluate the University of California Riverside's long-range strategic planning effort as it traversed along a highly compressed time frame of fourteen months. The research focuses on two components of that process--faculty involvement and community participation and support.

The Master Plan for Higher Education was originally created thirty years ago by the legislature of the State of California in order that all eligible students be afforded the opportunity to continue their education at the higher level (Master Plan for Higher Education--Renewed, 1987). One component of the Plan directed the University of California to accept the top twelve percent of those graduating high school seniors in the state of California. The rapidly increasing population growth in the state has dramatically affected enrollment pressures for the University of California and campus expansion as well as the addition of campuses to the University system are being considered. Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, Fred Zuker, stated during an interview, that demographics have indicated a strong population growth in the Counties of Riverside and San Bernardino. This growth carries a tremendous impact on the enrollment at the Riverside Campus (Zuker, 1993). For instance, enrollment at UCR has doubled in four years from approximately 4,300 students in 1985 to 9,500 in 1989 (UCR Facts, 1989.)

The recently completed long-range planning of the
University of California Riverside was a result of that dramatic growth facing the University system (UCR Long-Range Development Plan [LRDP] 1990.) In the process, the University Board of Regents explored options and alternatives in an attempt to accommodate the influx of students. Physical planning was especially critical in order to provide the best possible physical environment for the changing population—one that would continue to encourage the learning process. It was determined that an assessment of the present facilities on each of the nine campuses and their capacity for future growth would be performed. Towards that accomplishment, the Regents of the University of California mandated each of the University's nine campuses perform a Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) that would evaluate the capacity of the campuses in order to determine the expansion needs to accommodate the growth of the University of California system to the year 2005-06. A time line was established by the Board of Regents that asked each of the nine campuses to complete their planning process in a two-year period.

Before each campus could begin the process, enrollment targets had to be set by the Office of the President. In an effort to substantiate the need for a tenth campus in the UC System, Riverside was given the smallest target even though the demographics indicated greater growth potential. After much discussion, political pressure had to be solicited by
campus administration in support of a campus target of 18,000 before the UC Office of the President relented and agreed to increase the target. This political fiasco severely impacted the planning schedule at the Riverside campus--the smallest, and the one targeted for the greatest enrollment growth according to the demographics. The late start caused the campus to lose eight valuable months in the process. However, the University of California, Riverside completed its LRDP and received approval of the Plan at the October, 1992 Regents meeting.

Other than the political impasse mentioned earlier, the long-range planning process at the Riverside campus was carefully thought out. It was strategically planned so that the campus could place itself in the most politically positive position possible--one that would allow for the flexibility that is so critical to effective long-range physical planning. Faculty participation throughout this process and community involvement were two critical elements of the process. The LRDP of the Riverside campus carried the avid support of the external community as well as the campus community. The Academic Senate also approved the Plan wholeheartedly--as their faculty membership had participated in and contributed to the planning process that had taken approximately fourteen months to complete.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING PROCESS

The long-range physical planning process at the
University of California, comes on the heels of an approved academic master plan for the campus. Towards the accomplishment of the mandate given the UC campuses by the University Board of Regents, the Chancellor at the UC Riverside campus asked the Academic Senate Committee of Committees to nominate faculty from the various colleges and schools on the campus to update and refine an Academic Plan. The Plan was to incorporate new disciplines and programs into the already existing plan and to explore the possibility of eliminating small programs that no longer made a contribution to the academic excellence revered by the University of California. This plan would identify programs and research areas that the campus should establish or enhance in order to meet the needs of the anticipated population over the next decade. The Riverside campus as stated earlier, had been given an enrollment target by the UC Office of the President of 18,050 by the year 2005-06.

In addition, the Chancellor established a long-range physical planning committee. This committee was to work in tandem with the academic planning committee at UCR. It was charged with developing a plan for the siting of future academic facilities, parking lots and structures, infrastructure as well as road extensions, freeway overpasses, and causeways. The committee was comprised of Deans, Academic Senate Committee Chairs, the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management,
and the Vice Chancellor for Administration. Student and staff representation were in attendance, as well as the City Planning Director and the Director of the City of Riverside Redevelopment Agency.

In addition to this Long-Range Development Planning Committee, a steering committee was established that would focus on problem-areas and major concerns that arose out of the task force sessions. The Administrative Vice Chancellor, the Director of Campus Planning, and resource people such as the campus architect, the Director of the Physical Plant, the Parking Manager, and the Director of Environmental Health & Safety all served on the steering committee. Concerns of a more technical nature were posed to this particular Committee for exploration. Also involved were the members of the Steering Committee who were expected to interact with the City Public Works, Cal EPA, the AQMD, State Fire Marshall, and any other agency that might be able to provide valuable input into the plan. The Committee was expected to provide the Long-Range Development Planning Committee with options and alternatives to the various siting or infrastructure issues that arose during the task force sessions.

UC sister campuses as well as the Office of the President were sensitive to developing a plan that would meet the needs of the campus without aggravating the environment or causing legal entanglements with the community in a short twelve to fourteen month timeframe. Therefore, another
addition to the Committee, was a planning consultant firm.

The consulting firm was selected by an interview panel that consisted of representation from the Department of Planning and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Riverside as well as campus representation which included the Vice Chancellor for Administration, the Director of Administration, the Director of the Planning Office and the Director of Architects and Engineers. One consultant from the firm directed the process. This consultant played a critical role in the planning process particularly with the tight schedule mandated by the Regents. The charge to the firm was to guide the campus through the long-range development planning process. The planning consulting firm employed several technical consultants whose expertise ranged from landscape architecture, public relations, traffic, to environmental infrastructure. The firm rented space on the Riverside Campus so it could become involved on a daily basis with the campus community in order to interact with the long-range development planning and steering committees; and it wanted to coordinate its effort in assisting the campus in the development of a plan that would undertake the physical planning efforts required to meet the academic planning and enrollment goals established by the academic task force.

It was decided that the LRDP Committee and the planning consultants would meet twice a week to discuss and develop scenarios and alternatives that would meet the future
physical needs of the campus. Input from the various committee members was recorded with large colored marking pens onto drawing boards affixed to the meeting room walls. At the end of the meeting, all comments, concerns, issues, and resolutions were fully documented in large lettering for all participants to review before being transferred into a draft planning guide to be used by the Committee.

Public hearings were also held every 6-8 weeks both on and off campus. The hearings were announced in local newspapers and radio stations, and notices were placed in the campus newspaper encouraging participation of both the external and the campus communities. The public hearing forums were established to solicit input not only from the external community but the campus community as well. In addition, the Campus Planning Department established a manned-booth in the campus Commons area every Wednesday afternoon in order that those people who could not attend the public hearings would have an opportunity to provide comments and ask questions.

Information on the planning agenda and schedule were conveyed to the public by the UCR campus newspaper, the local Press-Enterprise, the KUCR radio station, and flyers that were distributed through the campus mail system to all departments on campus.

At the outset of the planning process, a long-range planner and an environmental attorney from the UC Office of
the President were appointed to attend task force sessions every two months. In addition, they were often available at the campus planning office if additional input was required from a systemwide perspective. These representatives were responsible for briefing the administration at the Office of the President as the process evolved.

As the process continued over the following months, a long-range development plan that addressed pertinent physical planning issues was developed. These planning efforts culminated in a document and long-range development plan that was submitted to the Academic Senate and to the Chancellor for approval. Following campus approval, the Plan was presented to the Senior Vice President for Administration at the University Office of the President for further approval. Upon completion of this arduous process, the Plan was subsequently presented to the University Board of Regents for adoption.

The Plan met the needs called for by the Academic Plan which focussed on the core of the campus as the academic center. But it also addressed the issues of administrative growth which included the physical plant, facility siting with attention to aesthetics as well as location, and expansion west of the campus into the community environs. The Plan assisted the campus administration as it began to address how it would provide the most ideal physical environment, conducive to learning and research activities,
and accommodate a student population of twice the present enrollment. This mission included appropriate siting of new facilities, expanding further west into the City of Riverside, accommodating the concerns of the external community, and continuing to promote the underpinnings of the University of California which is teaching, research, and community service.

The results of this study illuminate the importance of strategic long-range planning and emphasize those areas critical to a long-range planning process. If those areas have been appropriately addressed in the process, expansion should occur in a non-threatening, orderly, fashion with both campus and community support.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategy is key in planning. Raymond Orbach, Chancellor at the University of California Riverside, suggests that strategic planning is determining "what do we want to do, what do we want to be, and how do we want to get there" (Orbach, 1992). Strategy is not necessarily a term used only in comprehensive, long-term planning, but it is an invaluable tool in short-term planning as well. Literature reviewed for this study agreed that planning for expansion affects the community and city at large in today's fluid political environment, and requires political acumen, knowledge of infrastructure concerns, both short and long term, and a host
of issues that require strategic thinking. The LRDP accomplished at the University of California Riverside, established a planning framework which included a variety of planning studies that addressed several issues. Strategic planning was critical in this endeavor. According to The National Association of College and University Business Officers, strategic planning begins with a statement of mission, purpose or philosophy which should precede all planning efforts (NACUBO, 1977).

Strategic planning was developed as a concept to be considered as part of a framework of planning and control systems of large organizations; it became further defined according to Chan (1987) by college and university planners who focussed on explaining the concept in relation to the management of higher education (Stuart, 1987). According to John Bryson, planner and author of several journal articles for the Journal of the American Planning Association, strategic planning has been defined as an effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it (Bryson & Einsweiler 1989). Bryson goes on to say that strategy is the extension of a mission to form a bridge between an organization and its environment. He further defines strategy as the continuing basis for ordering adaptations toward more broadly conceived purposes (Bryson & Einsweiler 1989). The importance of considering the outside community
environment in a planning endeavor is further stressed by planners Wechsler & Backoff in the statement that the pattern of strategy in a public agency is determined not only by the plans and actions of its leaders but also by forces in its external environment. Bryson's concern for the "fluid political environment" (Bryson & Einsweiler, 1987), is further illuminated in Wechsler & Backoff's statement that both organizations and environments can change over time, and because different agencies operate under different conditions, no single strategy is universally viable (Wechsler & Backoff, 1990). They further define strategy as reflecting the existing balance of internal and external forces and say that efforts to change must aim at affecting that balance.

Colleges and universities with comprehensive strategic plans need to be aware of these points because they are anomalies. Most institutions continue to operate in a never-changing continuum, a framework that neither encourages successes nor eliminates failings. A strategic planning process could provide both an impetus and blueprint to any institution interested in not only expansion, but downsizing (Dawson, 1991). It is also important to note that the most frequent cause of weak master plan implementation is the failure by the college's leaders to have a clear sense of where the institution is going and then strategically planning for where and how it wants to go.
The first requirement for a successful plan is that a university's leaders engage in strategic thinking about the future before they start the master plan. Flexibility in a long-range development plan is not only essential, but is above all of the other necessary elements in a successful plan (Brase, 1992). Wendell Brase, Vice Chancellor for Administration at the University of California, Irvine, warns against a plan that is too rigid, too encompassing or too monolithic. Strategic planning is key in order to build in the fluid necessary for the flexibility component (Brase, 1992). Strategic planning requires broad scale information gathering and exploration of alternatives, if the plan is to include flexibility and in order to address future implications of present decisions (Bryson & Einsweiler, 1989).

Strategic thinking (planning) is, however, not over when the architects and planners arrive. The strategic thought process must also continue throughout the physical planning process as well in order to create a document with enough flexibility to accomplish the goals and objectives in a future environment filled with unknowns (Biehle, 1991).

Literature reveals, however, that there is no clear definition of "ongoing planning" as discussed by Biehle. In general, the term is indiscriminately used to describe what effective planning is. Stuart has determined that there are three basic components of ongoing study and planning: people,
processes, and assessment. The mission of strategic planning--to be ongoing and continual--is illuminated in the operational definition that strategic long-range planning consists of a systematic process both continuous, cyclical, adaptable, and integrated with budget and resource allocations that involve most units of the institution, built upon qualitative and quantitative information gathered through research and studies which form the basis for planning; as a result of these processes, change often occurs (Scott, 1987).

Only a small portion of postsecondary institutions actually use strategic planning methods directed at assessing internal and external factors when making plans for the future as an approach to managing and decision making in their physical planning efforts. Academe has trouble for instance, because most of the work on strategic planning has focussed on the for-profit organizations as public planners must be very careful to tailor strategic planning approaches to serve their purposes and situations. In addition, public planning is often distorted by the legislation governing or requiring its use (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1989).

Comprehensive or public planning is also limited by the structural location of the planning agency within government. Planners may be limited, through no fault of their own, in the kind of planning they can practice; therefore, key decision makers may reach the unwarranted conclusion that
public planners cannot be strategic planners (Bryson and Roering, 1988). However, according to Bryson, strategic planning approaches in the private sector can help public and nonprofit organizations deal with their dramatically changing environments, and, thus, can help them to be more effective.

Strategic planning systems are applicable to both public and nonprofit organizations, regardless of the nature of the organization. In private sector planning, it makes sense to coordinate decision making across levels and functions and to concentrate on whether the organization is implementing its strategies and accomplishing its mission. This can be applied to public sector planning as well. Resources are scarce—the environment is sensitive—strategic thought process must be incorporated into long-term planning. Bryson cautions the use of strategic planning, however, if the "roof has fallen in." Strategic planning may have to be put on the back burner if there is a need to fill a key leadership position, or if a fiscal resource problem, (i.e. cash flow) exists.

Often institutions prefer to rely on a gifted leader instead of a formal strategic planning process. Bryson supports this particular concept if the leadership is indeed gifted, but states that realistically it is rare for any leader to have all of the information necessary to develop effective strategy and to develop the kind of commitment necessary for effective implementation (Bryson and Roering,
One of the constraints of strategic planning in the private sector is corporate style planning which typically focusses on the organization and what it should do to improve performance and not on the community or its environs. "Strategic planning focuses on achievement of the best 'fit' between an organization and its environment. Attention to mandates and the external environment, therefore, are thought of as planning from the 'outside in'" (Bryson and Roering, 1987). Attention to mission and values and the internal environment is considered planning from the 'inside out' (Bryson & Roering, 1987). Bryson describes a strategic planning process for public planning purposes that consists of seven steps. The process encompasses broad policy and direction setting; internal and external assessments; attention to key stakeholders; identification of key issues; development of strategies to deal with each issue, decision making, and/or action; and continuous monitoring of results.

Bryson outlines the above process as public-sector strategic planning that provides a framework for discussing corporate-style strategic planning approaches and its applicability to public agencies. The process begins with an internal agreement or strategy for planning among decision makers whose support is necessary for successful plan formulation and implementation. The second step involves the identification of the mandates confronting the agency and the
clarification of the organization's values or needs. Identification of the external threats is the next crucial step to the process, followed by an analysis of the organization's own strengths and weaknesses and the identification of alternatives which allows for a fall-back position.

According to Wechsler and Backoff, much of the management literature on strategic planning perspectives that focuses on comprehensive planning and purposeful choice and action by managers and planners has generally been connected with private business organizations not with public institutions. The effectiveness of strategic planning in physical planning is only now being studied.

Comprehensive planning has always been the process for the public sector planner. However, the focus was on the community--not the organization and how it can improve--how it will fit (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1989). Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions that shape the nature and direction of growth within constitutional bounds and institutions of higher learning must learn to utilize the strengths in this strategic planning process, not only in the overall master plan but throughout the process into the physical implementation of facilities.

Even though the process may seem complicated, institutions of higher learning can and should, because of
its contribution, adapt to the strategic style of physical planning. For instance, an organization's strategy can be found in the pattern of major non-routing decisions, choices and actions that set direction to the future. Public agencies can use this pattern to pursue a variety of activities, including formal planning, goal setting, policy adoption and implementation, development of programs or changes in the emphasis among them, and reorganization of structure (Wechsler & Backoff, 1989).

Another important contribution of strategic planning is scanning the environment--something to which the public sector used to feel they were immune. Environmental sensitivity allows organizations to do smarter, more focussed planning and improve its ability to understand the risks associated with the alternative courses of action. It seems obvious that the public sector cannot assume to live in a vacuum any longer merely because it is a public agency (Kaufman and Jacobs, 1987).

Strategy development will provide a fairly clear picture--from grand conception to detailed implementation--of how the organization can meet its mandates, fulfill its mission, and deal effectively with the situation it faces (Bryson, 1988).

However, many managers groan at the prospect of another new management technique. They feel that they are the victims of some sort of perverse, never ending management
hazing. However, strategic planning is not just another passing fad. Strategic planning is building on the nature of political decision making (Bryson and Einsweiler, 1989). Even though some managers are bothered by strategic planning techniques, there would appear to be merit in the consideration of business literature as it touts strategic long-range planning. In these efforts, one "must do different things," or "do things differently" in changing times (Hardy, 1987).

It is important, therefore, for managers to understand that the pattern of strategy in a public agency is determined not only by the plans and actions of its leaders but also by forces in its external environment. Both organizations and environments change over time, and different agencies operate under different conditions with no single strategy being universally viable. However, public agencies, like other complex organizations, operate in turbulent environments that impose rapidly changing demands, requiring substantial adaptive capacity. In short, the public sector must learn to adopt strategic planning methods into their long-range planning process (Wechsler and Backoff, 1989).

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Another critical component in the long-range planning process at institutions of higher education, is faculty involvement. The question is asked: Is faculty
participation in the planning process a necessity or a luxury? As institutions of higher learning engage in strategic planning, faculty planning becomes an urgent concern (Floyd, 1985). Plans that are developed by administrators and architects and then handed down from those offices, have little chance of long-range success. Academic departments working with the planner on the details of a master plan can make a huge difference in the successful use of a long-range plan. Intensive interaction between planners and users, including student and faculty forums and "town meetings," can do much to create interest, excitement, and a willingness to work harder to implement the plan (Biehele, 1991).

However, in the case of the more "elitist" institutions, this eagerness is easier said than done. It is strange that academics who are usually eager to find new subjects of study--even to the point of seeking out obscure topics--have completely neglected the environment in which they actually live and work. They care more about the space planning of the ancient Minoans than about American universities (Turner, 1987).

The higher education literature over the years has concluded that active faculty participation is intrinsically valuable for effective decision making (Floyd, 1985). Floyd goes on to say that if the decision-making process is low in intrinsic satisfaction or altogether extrinsic, it often
results in frustration for administrators and faculty. A common dilemma facing universities and colleges today, according to Floyd, is that "faculty expresses obligation and competence to participate, but low priority on actual participation" (Floyd, 1985). Actual and formal faculty participation occurs at the departmental level and on academic personnel and directly-related curriculum issues. But the lack of time, motivation, and expertise often inhibit involvement beyond college or departmental boundaries. Faculty input in a non-academic process is often seen as a stumbling block. However, critics should know that faculty participation is often used simultaneously and uncritically with power, autonomy, and influence in higher education (Chan, 1987).

It has been said that faculty involvement is cumbersome and some feel that it seems to encourage a very time-consuming and unnecessary delay, but it is viewed by many as an absolutely necessary process for successful university planning. Biehle says that if faculty involvement occurs throughout the process, the resulting plan will not only provide an attractive well-arranged physical environment for scholars and their students but also enhance the learning that goes on at the institution (Biehle, 1991).

If academic units are given strong encouragement to develop programs, a lively entrepreneurial spirit prevails. An environment hospitable to many different kinds of
decentralized initiatives is created (Kennedy, 1991). It seems clear, therefore, that during these times of budgetary turmoil, unknown enrollment targets, and lack of human and fiscal resources, academic leadership of schools and departments will have to undertake more responsibility and more authority.

Unfortunately, though, the complexities of strategic long-range planning, the urgency of decision making, and an increasingly competitive environment appear to overshadow the preference for timely and adequate consultation. The emphasis of the long-range planning process lies on the planning staff and on the "business side of the house"; and the role of faculty tends to become obscure, resulting in a great shift of power away from faculty to administration. This threat appears to turn the academic culture from the collegial normative value to utilitarian (Kennedy, 1991).

On many campuses institution-wide committees are appointed to guide the planning process. However, it has been observed that a large separate faculty committee structure can hinder the development of a decision-making culture (Chan, 1987). A smaller group with a clearly delineated mission tends to be more productive. Although legitimacy and right of faculty participation in institution-wide decision making are well established in higher education, the desire for actually shaping policy and "creating from the beginning" seem low. However, persistent encouragement of ad hoc involvement is a
Most factors affecting faculty vitality are traceable to the reward system and the condition of work life (Brase, 1988). The planner's emphasis on improving the work conditions may serve as an incentive to broaden and enhance faculty participation as they spend time and energy in developing plans for increasing direct support for research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Although some enticement and cajolament is necessary, it must be understood that requesting faculty involvement and subsequent input is not a game and is not to be treated lightly. Faculty responsibility to the long-range plan is crucial, and the burden of soliciting honest and vital participation is placed with the planner. Therefore, to strengthen the faculty role in the planning process, the planner should develop a productive working relationship by providing timely information, orienting them to the strategic planning process, assisting in surveying faculty concerns and needs, and devising effective strategies for communication with the faculty at large (Chan, 1988). Open communication between the faculty and central administration is paramount to obtaining faculty contribution to the long-range plan.

Only an institution with an undemanding or nonexistent vision can afford to ignore the way that academic ideals, values, and character find their expression—or fail to do so—in the physical development of a campus. Institutional
researchers and campus planners must analyze not only the campus land forms and natural assets, physical limitations, pre-existing development patterns, physical problems, and unrealized development potential, but also its academic goals, educational ideals, and the values that define institutional character (Brase, 1988).

If an institution has a process which appears orderly, involves few participants, generates few contradictions, surfaces few controversial issues, and responds neatly to administrative authority, the institution is either standing still and has no need for an effective planning process, it is small, or it is headed for trouble (Brase, 1988). Brase also says that physical planning has to do with the essence of an individual's experiences of his physical surroundings in relation to his beliefs about the institution's values. In order to incorporate the university's mission and priorities into the long-range development plan, the administration must consult regularly with faculty groups. Drafts of the planning documents should also be distributed. A planning update assessing the planning process should be available and provided in a timely manner (Chan, 1988).

It is also important to realize that the trend to link academic and physical planning cannot be overstated (Brase, 1988). Institutional land use decisions tend to be irreversible. Institutions have to live with their design mistakes for a long time. Therefore, an institution's
landscape design and building design should express its academic values (Brase, 1988). Brase continues that a problem occurs when the campus-built environment fails to support the institution's academic values. Architecture will shape the way people will experience an institution, whether or not the architecture was shaped by the institution's values. This line of reasoning does not necessarily argue for involving institutional researchers in physical planning; it does call for breaking down those over-specialized roles we call institutional researcher and campus planner (Brase, 1988).

In a good planning process many participants are involved, and the influence and authority for the results are diffused. The planner understands his role when attempting to integrate the academic and physical planning process. No one person is in charge of planning (Brase, 1988). Participants who care are essential but not sufficient to ensure that an effective planning process will emerge. In an effective physical planning process, the role of the chief planner will be that of only a catalyst.

In order to be an effective catalyst, the planner must be able to articulate the institution's ideals and character. Again, faculty should be consulted. They are a valuable resource for finding answers to such questions such as the following:

- What stories do we recognize as valid expressions
of our ideals and character?

- What do we value as symbols of special significance?
- What are the institution's most prized assets? For instance, what place do we first take our visitors?

These questions underlie physical planning in a campus setting and demonstrate further how the planning process can either foster or thwart the physical expression of an institution's character. Faculty input to these questions is key to learning the important traditions and purposes of the campus and will assist in providing the visual keys so necessary to successful planning.

Certain academic goals and values become pivotal determinants for the institution's physical character. For instance, an open, supportive relationship between administration and faculty can direct the planning process in addressing the physical planning and design issues which bear distinct relationships to the institution's ideals, values, and character (Brase, 1988). Planners must work at broadening faculty participation in order to create a climate for change and open dialogue (Chan, 1987). Communication should be conducted in formal and informal settings and at university and departmental levels.

Faculty involvement, however, must be well thought out. Their research is tantamount to their lives; and in order to obtain direct and active participation, the appropriate
strategy should correspond to the direct planning stages. For example, some faculty will be crucial at the initial phase; others should only be employed at the implementation phase. Faculty members should seek to participate in strategic physical planning only when the agenda has a direct bearing on their envisioned needs.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

This paper has discussed the importance of using strategy in long-range planning, and the critical need for faculty involvement in the process. However, input from the community in which the institution resides is absolutely necessary as well if the plan is to succeed.

Public organizations are responsible to many stakeholders--individual, group, community, or other organizations--that can place a claim on the public agency's attention, resources, or output. External threats and opportunities as well as internal strengths that affect the organization will also affect the stakeholder. The distinction between what the concerns are in the community and those of the campus culture, is essential to the planning process. This recognition occurs through a process that monitors a variety of political, economic, social and technological forces that affect the planning effort. If community involvement is included throughout the process it will assist in preventing surprises that might appear along the way of the planning process. Only an open, communicative
process that solicits feedback, both negative and positive from the community, can provide the control or awareness so necessary to an effective, productive, long-range development plan. The organization will then have the opportunity to provide various scenarios to explore alternative futures (Bryson and Roering, 1987).

Communities across the nation share common constraints in paying for growth. The supply of federal, state and local revenues available to pay for growth is dwindling. Therefore, words of wisdom for planners and public organization administrators are fairness, flexibility, innovation and opportunism (Barneby, 1988). Steven Drown, environmental attorney for the University of California system, stated in a recent interview that "there are no more free rides." Colleges and universities are no longer 'elitists'; they are now competing with the private sector in their need to accommodate growth and subsequent expansion (Drown, 1991). In order for a smooth and orderly planning process to occur—one that will satisfy the university's needs and those of the external community--community concerns and issues must be taken into consideration early in the planning process.

Planning makes a difference--something has been changed. When the external environs are affected social power often has to be utilized in order for the change to take place. Social power is the ability to alter behavior and therefore is important to the planning effort. A planner's ability to
capitalizing on social power in the community requires networking—the building of a common relationship between all constituencies (Benveniste 1989). In addition, Beneveniste says that planners cannot insist on only purely technical issues because their interlocutors bring up the political implications of any reform.

The planner, using community input, must identify the practical alternatives for resolving issues sensitive to the community and those alternatives must move to eliminate the barriers to the achievement of the alternatives. To focus on barriers assures the stakeholders that there is a genuine desire to satisfy concerns, and it assures that strategies developed will deal with the difficulties directly and not haphazardly (Kaufman and Jacobs 1987). Moreover, planning is a problem of choice and of values and benefits from coordination and consensus building (Beneviste 1989). Additionally, Beneviste goes on to say that planning that is effective planning is a management tool designed to help organizations cope with uncertainty and that this process should be used to seek consensus.

In order to take advantage of the state's scarce resources, communities must continue to support many kinds of capital expansions. If higher education is to be included in the community's wish list, a constant dialogue and indoctrination between the university planning team and the community must take place (Barneby 1988). Good planning is
more an art than a science. According to Beneviste, it is dependent on sage assessment, careful planning, relationships and the ability to find assistance in formulating questions and developing answers (Beneviste, 1989). Beneviste describes the first two characteristics of planning as "defining the institution's relationship to the external as well as the internal environment and depending on inputs from a variety of functional areas in those environments. Planning is nested in a world where opposition is inevitable, political issues are intertwined with legal requirements, and technical issues are connected with economic issues (Beneveniste 1989).

Building relationships that allow for the give and take so necessary in an effective planning process is critical. However, networking alone is insufficient. Effective planning does not always require formal participation, but participation is needed when conflict cannot be satisfactorily negotiated. Too often planners are not able to create the necessary forums to resolve conflict, nor are they able to take into account the needs of diffused communities of interest. When these concerns occur, the planning effort is aloof and distant and does not address the needs of those it serves. If a participatory planning process is not in place, the planning exercise will derail (Beneveniste 1989). According to Beneveniste, much important work takes place outside formal channels because emergent
ideas and activities are not always properly recognized by and linked to a formal structure. For instance, to get things done, a planner has to know who the right people are and where they are located. Therefore, building relationships over periods of time and soliciting feedback on a continual basis creates a mutual trust that is invaluable to the planning process (Beneveniste, 1989). In order to accomplish a long-range development plan that addresses the infrastructure needs of the campus, (both present and future and the subsequent impact that enrollment growth will bring to the City), a long-term relationship with the community and city officials must be in place. Riverside City Councilman, Jack Clarke emphasized this very concept in his interview when he referred to the relationship between the City and the University of California Riverside as a "positive, working relationship" that had been established over the years (Clarke, 1992). Senator Robert Presley further underscored this philosophy during his interview when he stated these kinds of relationships "do not happen overnight" (Presley, 1992.)

IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The major findings and discussions in this study are derived from information received from campus administrators, UC Office of the President, Committee members of the Long-Range Development Planning Committee, and UC department directors. In addition, information was gathered through
interviewing faculty, staff, students and members of the community. This information was analyzed by the Vice Chancellor for Administration, the Director of Administrative Services, and the Director of Campus Planning on the Riverside campus. Major findings and discussions are presented below.

**Finding 1:**

The establishment of a steering committee that encouraged faculty involvement throughout the planning process at the dean/chair level was critical to the process of long-range planning at UCR.

**Discussion of Finding:**

The first priority at the Riverside campus as it began to coordinate the long-range planning process, was to establish a steering committee that was composed of academic management, i.e., Dean and Program Directors. Facility staff served as a resource to the Committee. Campus administrators felt that faculty input on the committee should be represented by the academic management level in order to maintain a sense of credibility. In addition, academic administration was thought to lend a balance to the Committee that would support objectivity and well-roundedness required in the formulation of a long-range plan. This finding is further supported by Floyd's article, "Faculty and Planning," where it states that as institutions of higher learning
engage in strategic planning, faculty planning and involvement become an urgent concern. Marvin Nachman, Chair of the Academic Senate of the Riverside Campus, concurred during his interview that faculty involvement at this level is critical to the success of the long-range planning process (Nachman, 1992).

The plan adopted by the Riverside Campus is a "precinct" plan (UCR LRDP, 1992), wherein colleges and their auxiliary units are sited together. The precinct concept was conceived by the faculty that served on the steering committee. The faculty felt that a geographical "next-door" relationship between colleges and programs would encourage a diverse interaction between disciplines. They saw value in grouping the facilities together and encouraging students of all interests to interact on a regular basis. Faculty input played a major role in this decision as the concept was not originally endorsed by administration, the campus administration actually supported the concept of dividing the academic core of the campus. This plan would have located several facilities across the freeway to the West of the campus. However, with perseverance throughout the process, faculty involvement is credited for developing a long-range plan that dovetails facility siting and programmatic concerns and issues that hopefully will accommodate the vision of both faculty and administration.

**Finding 2:**
UC Planners and Administrators strongly agreed that theCampus Academic Plan was the genesis of the physical long-range planning effort, and, therefore, faculty input wascrucial to the process.

Discussion of Finding:

Faculty input was considered critical to the long-range planning process. During a telephone interview, Chris Adams,Director of Long-Range Planning for the University Office of the President, acknowledged that the academic plan was the driving force behind the long-range development plan (Adams, 1992). According to Dilip Anketell, Director of Campus Planning, campus administration did not want to appear that they were taking the lead in the planning process (Anketell 1992). Therefore, they were in agreement that their role was to support programmatic and faculty concerns. This decision about the role of the academic plan was emphasized in the section of "Directors' Comments" where it is stressed that a strong academic plan with consensus from the bottom to the top--assistant professors to the Dean to the Chancellor--is critical to the success of long-range planning effort of an institution of higher learning. This is reinforced by Brase's statement that "the most frequent cause of weak planning implementation is the failure by college leaders to have a clear sense of where the institution is going" (Brase, 1988). Stressing the need for a solid academic plan, Bryson
says that often institutions rely on a gifted leader instead of a visionary academic plan. He goes on to say that rarely does a leader have all of the information necessary to develop an effective strategy or the kind of commitment necessary for implementation (Bryson, 1988). Therefore, input from a diverse faculty constituency should be solicited not only in the formation of the academic plan, but for a successful long-range development plan as well.

External planning consultants indicated that planners and administration could only provide support, that faculty involvement was actually crucial in the planning effort. The consultants felt programmatic issues and the ten to twenty year capital expansion program, were actually driven by constant faculty input. An interview with Robert Sena, Vice President of Royston, Hannamoto and Alley, a planning consulting firm hired to oversee the long-range planning process on the Riverside Campus, confirmed that the issue of discipline interaction as it relates to facility siting is best addressed by faculty (Sena, 1992). He felt that the plan could not be successfully implemented if it did not include continual faculty input.

Faculty involvement was especially viewed as necessary whether the issue was traffic circulation, planned open space, or academically-driven program issues. For instance, the case of the faculty demonstrations against adoption of the Long-Range Development Plan at the University of
California Irvine Campus emphasizes further the importance of solicitation of faculty involvement throughout the entire process. According to Vice Chancellor Nycum, at Irvine, faculty input was not solicited relative to the traffic issues created by the long-range development plan on the Irvine campus (Nycum, 1993). Therefore, the Irvine Academic Senate and campus administration have still not reached agreement on the two new buildings planned to come on-line within the next five years. This demonstrates even further that interaction between those involved in planning is essential. According to James Biehle's article on "Successful Master Planning," an intensive interaction between the planners and faculty can do much to create interest, excitement, and a willingness to work diligently towards plan adoption (Biehle, 1991).

Finding 3:
Campus administration and planning staff viewed faculty input as critical in order to avoid the need for amendments to the Long-Range Development Plan.

Discussion of Finding:
Review of UC campus's long-range development plans and subsequent implementation of their capital programs revealed that amendments to the capital program often become necessary because faculty members were not involved throughout the entire planning process. Throughout the University of
California system, amendments to the campus long-range development plans must be approved by the Regents. However, according to Director Anketell, preparation of the amendment for regental review is tedious, time consuming, can impact the timing of funding for capital construction and affect the project standing in the capital queue (Anketell, 1992). Consequently, faculty contribution gives the long-range plan credibility that cannot occur without faculty involvement.

**Finding 4:**

Campus administration, the UC Office of the President staff, and the UC Riverside campus planning staff felt that credibility with the community and the city played a major role in an amiable approval of the long-range development plan.

**Discussion of Finding:**

UC staff supported the concept of working hand-in-glove with the local community and city officials in an effort to avoid politically sensitive issues that may have been damaging to acceptance of the Plan. Counsel Drown stated that responsible planning for growth and its impacts on the community could not occur in a vacuum or the plan would not be successful (Drown, 1991). The relationships so critical in the planning process, both short and long-term, were cited by Senator Robert Presley as "not happening overnight" (Presley, 1992). Consequently, commitment to the community by the
Finding 5:

The UC administration stressed strategic planning as key to developing relationships with the community and its officials.

Discussion of Finding:

According to Bryson, "Strategy is the extension of a mission to form a bridge between an organization and its environs. Physical planning in today's marketplace must incorporate a strategy in its thinking process" (Bryson, 1987). Thomas Nycum, Vice Chancellor for Administration at the Riverside Campus, concurs that strategic thinking is not isolated to comprehensive planning, but must be incorporated into all aspects of long-range planning. The Vice Chancellor describes physical planning as carrying a tremendous burden to the external community and sees long-term, strategically-planned relationships with the community, its officials, and legislators as critical to the success of any long-range planning effort today (Nycum, 1993). Riverside saw these important points, and the campus today is seeing the fruits of its political labors. The campus has spent the last ten years, establishing political relationships and building credibility with the local legislature. Recently the state legislature approved funding for a new Fine Arts Building for the Riverside Campus. Other campuses have seen little or no
support for their Humanities and Social Sciences buildings in the state capital program. Riverside credits their success with developing strong, supportive relationships both locally and at the state level. The City of Riverside provided overwhelming support for the LRDP. The importance of a strong town and gown relationship--such as exists between UCR and the City of Riverside--was stressed by Councilman Jack Clarke during his interview (Clarke 1991.)

Finding 6:
A lack of support for the LRDP demonstrated by the community or city would have endangered approval by the Board of Regents as well as hindered the planning process.

Discussion of Finding:
Those campus planners interviewed viewed community support for the planning effort and the resultant LRDP as making project administration easier in the long run. They raised concern about a planning process where the foundation was not built on community involvement and support. Chris Adams, Director of Long-Range Planning at the University Office of the President, alluded to the difficulties incurred by other University of California campuses in accomplishing their planning effort in an environment of negative publicity, law suits, and compromise with the local community and city officials (Adams, 1992). Director Anketell further supported this conclusions based on a UC Davis case in point.
Davis administration has never been interested in cultivating positive relationships with the community of Davis. Campus administration developed an elitist attitude. They felt that the University contributed so much to the community that working together in an expansion effort was not necessary (Anketell, 1992). Therefore, the UC Davis LRDP is presently in litigation with the City of Davis. The issue is the impact on the environment and infrastructure. The Chancellor has been recently reassigned. Differences with the community and its officials is cited as paramount in his reassignment. Therefore, it seems apparent that good planning, according to Barneby, is more an art than a science (Barneby, 1988).

**Finding 7:**

During the interview process, leaders of the community and the city strongly encouraged an open process with the local community, as well as any public agencies that might be involved in the planning process, i.e., state, county, city, and/or federal agencies if necessary.

Discussion of Finding:

Community and City leaders felt strongly that they should play a major role in the planning process. This conclusion was further supported by Councilman Clarke, who indicated that a close working relationship with all public agencies would encourage a process wherein the resultant Long-Range Development Plan would address issues of concern
of the various public constituencies (Clarke, 1992). Benveniste encouraged the planner to capitalize on social power which required community networking (Beneviste, 1989). Specifically, the UC Riverside campus invited members of the City Council, City Planning, and the City Redevelopment Agency to sit on its long-range planning committee.

**Finding 8**

The planning consulting firm that had been hired to oversee the process was not as overwhelming in its support of the need for community participation.

Discussion of Finding:

The campus community and city leaders were more interested in the issue of networking and building relationships with the external community than the planning consultants. According to Planning Director Anketell, the consultants viewed their role in the process as that of working the physical planning effort through a maize, attempting to keep the process on schedule, and maintaining the necessary focus (Anketell, 1992). Bob Sena, from the planning firm of Royston, Hammamoto and Alley, indicated that too much community involvement could redirect the project focus and it could become littered with public issues causing the process to lose sight of its objective. The findings demonstrated that although the external planning consultants
were in favor of continuous faculty input and involvement, they were not as supportive of community input.

Further discussion with Bob Sena indicated that although he felt that community participation should be critical in the planning process, past experience revealed that the community tended to often focus on non-related issues and sensitivities, and lost sight of the overall, more global objective. An attempt to resolve the concerns often cost several weeks in the project schedule (Sena, 1992).

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to critique the long-range development planning process of the University of California Riverside. Faculty members involvement and their role in the long-range development planning process as well as the importance of developing strong, positive community relationships in a strategically motivated process were all considered.

The paper supported the concept that acceptance of the long-range development plan by the majority of the campus, the community, and subsequent approval by the University Board of Regents can only be accomplished if a strong academic plan was in place. In addition, if there is continual faculty involvement in the process and strong community ties and strategic networking taking place, the plan would be more easily accepted.
This study also revealed that a strong academic plan is the foundation of the long-range development plan. The academic plan, however, must reflect the mission, goals, and strategy of the university, and must suggest as well, a framework for the development of programmatic statements.

In addition, this paper found that faculty involvement throughout the process was vital to a successful long-range development plan and its acceptance by the campus and subsequent approval by the Board of Regents. This concept was supported by Floyd's findings that active faculty participation to the planning process is intrinsically valuable for effective decision making.

Additionally, the results of the interviews supported Chan's position that open communication between the faculty and the administration is essential in obtaining faculty input and subsequent faculty buy-in.

Brase's comment that only an institution with nonexistent vision can afford to ignore the way that academic ideals, values, and character find their expression is fully supported by this paper, and this idea was especially demonstrated by those interviewed.

Another example supporting the theory that faculty input is critical in the process, is the case of the University of California at Irvine. The campus experienced a severe setback in the approval of its long-range development plan as faculty input had only been solicited to address those
academic client-issues that affected siting and configuration of academic facilities. Traffic impacts, long-range parking needs, and the identification of open space were not presented to the faculty for discussion. It became apparent that future traffic patterns would place a definite negative impact on the faculty housing development located on the Irvine campus. When campus administration submitted the campus' long-range development plan to the UC Board of Regents for approval, faculty gathered to demonstrate against approval. After the demonstration, the issues of traffic patterns and circulation at UC Irvine were revisited. Approval of the plan was tabled until the campus administration was able to come to a satisfactory solution with the faculty. Because of the delay, the time line for the long-range planning prognosis for the entire system, established by the UC Office of the President, was greatly affected.

UCR learned from the mistakes of its sister campuses. The Riverside campus of the University of California has just completed the campus long-range development plan. The plan was recently submitted to the University Board of Regents for approval and was approved without question.

Faculty contributions to the long-range planning process on the Riverside Campus were also found invaluable to all aspects of the Plan. For instance, faculty members were asked to chair as well as to serve on various planning
committees. In addition, faculty support of the LRDP was critical in obtaining Board approval of the plan and the Riverside Academic Senate warmly embraced the LRDP. Campus administration encouraging the faculty to play a major role in the planning process instilled a feeling of faculty ownership of the Plan, therefore, ensuring faculty acceptance of most of the Plan; this in turn, created a foundation for the approval.

A critique of the planning process on the Riverside Campus by all who participated in the process and in the public hearings has revealed that the resultant LRDP is a solid, strategically-sound long-range development plan--one that is flexible enough to guide the campus through the next fifteen years of growth in a sensible and sensitive manner without constant amendment.

Strategic planning in higher education was considered to be forward thinking. The majority of those interviewed supported the concept of strategic planning not only for public agencies, but for higher education as well. The results also confirm Bryson's theory that strategic planning can help public agencies become more effective, and that strategic planning is one way to help organizations and communities deal with changing circumstances. In fact, in a recent interview, Dr. Jon Hutchison, Director of Real Estate Development at the UC Riverside campus, stressed that strategy in long-range planning is critical. He went on to
say that "economics as well as aesthetics must be considered in the planning process," and this can only be accomplished through strategic planning (Hutchison, 1992).

The University of California in San Diego, was eager to demonstrate to the Board of Regents, and the UC Office of the President that the campus should absorb the future enrollment growth in Southern California. Their position was that the campus could accommodate the projected growth without the need for additional land or facilities. In an effort to sell this concept to the Board and the President's Office, their Plan was not strategically thought-out. It was short-sighted. The planning effort was old-school public sector planning. The campus overlooked the possibility of attractive real estate acquisitions that might become available in the future. The Plan did not address the issue of land banking. Their ambition generated a short-sighted planning effort that did not allow for flexibility in their long-range development plan (UC San Diego LRDP, 1990).

According to Jon Hutchison, Director of Real Estate at UCR, planning must be strategically thought-out in order to build in flexibility (Hutchison, 1992). In an attempt to demonstrate that growth could be accommodated by the campus without the need for inclusionary land or space, the campus lost sight of long-range goals. Subsequently, the campus has found that now they are unable to justify to the UC Board of Regents a rationale that would allow them to take advantage
of opportunities that have presented themselves during the present economic turndown. Their LRDP has closed its doors to any land banking opportunities for years to come. This incident further supports the statement that strategic planning is essential in developing flexibility into a successful long-range plan.

Chris Adams, Coordinator for the long-range planning process at the UC Office of the President, further supports the rationale for building flexibility into the LRDP. He said in a recent interview, that "the long-range development plan is a tool, not a bible" (Adams, 1992). He indicated that flexibility is critical in the development of this tool and that it can only be built into the plan through strategic planning. Hardy's position that the lack of resources should be forcing public agencies to react to business literature which encourages strategy and "doing things differently" is also supported by the previous findings discussed.

Community involvement proved to be critical to the long-range planning process as the Riverside campus prepares for growth and expansion into the external environs. The long-range planning process at the Riverside Campus has been looked upon by the external community leaders and city officers as sensitive to the needs of the community environs. The campus has been applauded by the community for planning its growth and subsequent physical expansion as a part of a community--not as an isolated geographical area comprised of
faculty, staff, and students with differing agendas. The warm acceptance of this Plan is further demonstrated in the videotaped interviews of those legislators and city and community officials who spoke in support of the Plan and its adoption by the UC Board of Regents.

All in all, the interviews conducted with the city and community leaders supported this paper in its position that an open planning process and credibility with the city and community is essential in obtaining political approval of the long-range plan. Some campuses, unfortunately, do not understand this importance. Campuses in the University of California system are presently in litigation because of the lack of support by surrounding communities. UC Santa Cruz did not include city representation on their long-range planning task force. Santa Cruz campus administration also never established a networking or bridge-building relationship with the city of Santa Cruz. Growth has impacted the already scarce infrastructure resources of this city, and the lack of a mediating relationship has caused much ill will. Presently, the City of Santa Cruz has a law suit pending against the University Board of Regents because of the impact university growth will bring to the city's present infrastructure. This particular case definitely supports the hypothesis of this paper: positive, external relationships are critical to community approval of a university's long-range plan.
This critique of the planning process at the University of California Riverside concludes that positive networking with the external community in the strategic planning process can help all campuses build on their strengths. It also concludes that campuses can take advantage of major opportunities while they embark on expansion programs in a world that is relatively hostile to growth. However, the impacts of anticipated growth on city and community infrastructure and other inherent environmental issues, have yet to be determined. Yet, the relationship nurtured by UC Riverside and the open planning process conducted by UCR, have guided the campus through a successful planning process to a plan that addresses both growth and expansion; and, hopefully, it will mutually benefit both the City of Riverside and the University.

The importance of credibility with the city and the community for plan approval was reinforced by those interviewed. In addition, the interviews supported Bryson and Roering in their theory that this planning effort is affected by a variety of political, economic, and social forces. As stated by Kaufman and Jacobs, the results also reinforce the fact that the open process does identify barriers and assists in determining the alternative plans. One variation of this was the lack of overwhelming support of this hypothesis by the planning consultants; this was a surprise. However, an open planning process with the
community and city heavily involved does take an inordinate amount of time on the part of the consultant, and it can hamper the accomplishments of the finished project in the time frame designed by the consultant. Their response could be biased by this fact.

A City/University task force consisting of campus administration, as well as planning and facility staff established by the Riverside campus several years ago has been an invaluable tool in accomplishing programs that have been mutually beneficial to the city as well as the university. This group of university personnel, community leaders, and city officials have been responsible for much of the success of the campus' long-range development planning process as it has created a positive relationship between the University, the City, and the community.

Upon completion of the planning process, which took approximately fourteen months, the Riverside Campus of the University of California submitted its Long-Range Development Plan to the UC Board of Regents for approval at the Fall, 1992 Regents meeting. In addition, a videotape demonstrating support of the Plan and its process by legislators, city officials, community leaders, campus faculty, students, and staff was also presented to the Regents. Immediately upon viewing the videotape, the LRDP was adopted unanimously by the Regents. Comments by the Board to the campus administration indicated they felt the campus had satisfied
the myriad of issues and concerns that accompany a planning effort and that they were comfortable with the results.

The unanimous approval of UCR's LRDP upon the heels of other UC campus plans that were not approved, demonstrated further the necessity to incorporate strategy into the process. Strategic planning places the campus in a position that will allow campus administration to best address even those unknown issues that will be brought on by growth and expansion.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are a result of the interviews conducted for this study with campus administrators, university planners, community leaders, legislators, faculty, staff and students, as UCR administration implemented a long-range development planning process that led to approval of the campus long-range development plan. In addition, a review of relevant literature further supported the conclusion that a long-range development planning process that addresses the expansion and siting of facilities and infrastructure for an institution of higher education must include two critical elements: Continuous faculty involvement and positive community and city relationships that can only be developed through a strategic networking process. Findings indicate that without these two essential components, the plan may have to be continuously amended which could cause the plan to lose credibility. Research has revealed that if the process lacks community support, expansion will be cumbersome and painful because growth and its impacts affect the community environs and its infrastructure. With this in mind, the following suggestions should be considered when developing strategy for the planning process:

1. Establish a campus planning task force consisting of faculty leadership. Finding 1 stresses the importance of structuring the steering committee
with deans and department chairs. The finding further reveals that the administration and staff support should be considered as a resource to the committee.

2. As indicated in Finding 2, the Campus Academic Plan was the genesis for the planning document. Therefore, faculty input should be continual throughout the process. All planning issues should be brought to the faculty for input, i.e., academic program issues, facility siting, traffic patterns, infrastructure, and housing.

3. Develop relationships for the campus with community officials and legislators with long-term goals in mind. As indicated in Finding 6, a hand-in-glove working relationship with the community and city can assist in dealing with politically sensitive issues.

4. Establish a committee or task force comprised of campus and city administration to address issues that will impact both the city and university.

5. In an effort to address issues that concern the community, invite members of the committee to sit on the planning committee.

6. Schedule open public hearings to brief the public on the long-range development plan and the impacts to the community and its environs.
7. Schedule open forums for the campus community to brief them on the development of the Plan. See Appendix III for additional guidelines for effective strategic planning for facility expansion in higher education.

The planning process is a delicate one as growth is a sensitive subject. During this time of environmental awareness--growth, development, expansion, facility outreach of any kind it is often reacted to in a negative manner. Open space is valued as never before. Not only what kind of facility, but the kind of activity that will supplant open space is scrutinized. Organizations, both public and private must be sensitive to the environmental impacts of expansion--i.e. traffic patterns and circulation, air quality, noise factors, and benefits to the community must be taken into consideration when planning for expansion. As campus tentacles reach ever farther into the community, campus, administration is experiencing the same stumbling blocks that once faced industry. Expansion efforts are not necessarily embraced just because the institution is one of higher learning. Research and review of experiences shared by the campuses of the University of California, and the successes and failures of each as they complete the long-range development plan mandated by the University Regents, have assisted in supporting the hypothesis that long-range planning in today's environment must incorporate strategic-
thinking and faculty and community involvement in long-range planning.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
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QUESTIONS DEVELOPED FOR VIDEOTAPED INTERVIEW
LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE

Senator Robert Presley:

1. What are the implications for UCR of the projected growth for the Inland Empire to the year 2005?
2. What issues should be considered in UCR's long-range planning process?
3. What is your vision of the role of the University in the long-range plan of the Inland Empire?

Howard Hayes, managing editor of the Riverside Press Enterprise:

1. What are the growth implications for the Inland Empire to the year 2005?
2. What issues should be considered in UCR's long-range planning process?
3. What is your vision of the role of the University in the long-range plan of the Inland Empire?

Terry Frizzel, Mayor, City of Riverside:

1. How do you view the relationship that exists between the City of Riverside and the University of California Riverside?
2. How will the City benefit from university growth?
3. What do you envision as the role of the University of California Riverside in the City's long-range plans?

Doug Weiford, Riverside City Manager (Retired)

1. How do you view the relationship that exists between the City of Riverside and the University of California Riverside?
2. How will the City benefit from university growth?
Jacke Clarke, Riverside City Councilman

1. How do you view the relationship that exists between the City of Riverside and the University of California Riverside?

2. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

Merle Gardner, Planning Director, City of Riverside

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

2. How does UCR fit into the City's general plan for development of University Avenue?

Magi Gulati, Director, Riverside Redevelopment Agency:

1. What is your view of the UCR Planning process?

2. How will the City benefit from University growth?

Robert Heath, Associate Dean, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences:

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

2. What issues should the Long-Range Development Plan address?

Brian Copenhaver, Dean, College of Humanities & Social Sciences:

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

2. What issues should the Long-Range Development Plan address?

Walt Henry, Associate Dean, Graduate School of Management:

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

2. What issues should the Long-Range Development Plan address?

3. Are you satisfied with the finished plan?
Irving Hendrick, Dean, School of Education:

1. What issues should the UCR Development Plan address?
2. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

John Letey, Chair, Physical Resources Planning Committee:

1. What issues should the Long-Range Development Plan address?
2. Are you satisfied with the finished Plan?

Marv Nachman, Chair, Academic Senate:

1. What issues should the Long-Range Development Plan address?
2. Are you satisfied with the finished Plan?
3. What do you see as the role of the Long-Range Development Plan in planning for university growth?

Norton Younglove, Riverside County Supervisor:

1. What kind of relationship exists between the City, the County of Riverside, and the University?
2. What do you see as the role of the Long-Range Development Plan for the community?
3. What is your view of the UCR planning process?

Susan Braddock, President, Staff Assembly:

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process?
2. Is it important to involve staff in the planning process?

Drew Esperance, Graduate Student Association:

1. What is your view of the UCR planning process so far?
2. Is it important to involve students in the planning process?
Seymour Van Gundy, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences:

1. How do you envision the future role of the
2. What impacts do you feel university growth will bring to the environs?
APPENDIX B

PLANNING DIRECTORS' COMMENTS
Following are comments provided by some of the university directors. Although they did not directly relate to the hypothesis, the comments do contribute to the study, and should be taken into consideration in the planning process.

1. A strong academic plan with consensus from the bottom (middle), for example, deans and support involvement, to the top, such as the chancellor, is critical to long-range planning success. [Academic input may not be solicited from Assistant Professors or Visiting Lecturers therefore the lowest level at the academic classification would probably be in the middle, i.e. Associate Professor.]

2. A steering committee is critical, but will only carry a positive impact if it consists of strong leadership at a high level. [The Steering Committee at UCR consisted of Vice Chancellors, Deans, Department Chairs and Directors.]

3. Input must be solicited from the housing administrator, and the transportation and parking directors at the concerns are logistic issues that must be addressed early in the process in order for comprehensive facility siting to take place.]

4. A realistic schedule must be mapped out with clearly-defined milestones.

5. The RFP for the consulting firm should allow for the mix and match of subs in order to get the strongest team. [Various sub-contractors are a part of the consulting firm contract--i.e. traffic circulation, landscape architects, etc. Many firms use the same subs. The RFP should specify that subs other than those selected by the firm, can be used.]

6. The environmental impact report is the component that has caused the greatest concern to the campuses as well as the general community

7. A thorough traffic study must be completed. There should be ample time allowed for public hearings.
APPENDIX C

GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE STRATEGIC PLANNING
The following guidelines, although not directly-related to the research hypothesis, are informative and important to the long-range planning process.

1. Goals must be set. Reference Chancellor Ray Orbach's statement on strategic planning says, "determine what you want to be; where you want to go; and how to get there."

2. Goals and objectives must be strategically planned in order to include necessary flexibility. The Long-Range Plan must contain the flexibility that will allow for alternative planning when necessary.

3. Strategic thinking/planning should be imposed throughout the process. The university or campus should always place itself in the most advantageous position possible. No longer are public agencies free of scrutiny or public criticism by virtue of being a public agency.

4. The campus should consider contracting for an external planning consultant to guide the planning process. External consultants tend to lend objectivity and assist the process in maintaining focus and schedule.

5. All planning issues should be brought to the faculty for input, i.e. academic program issues, facility siting, traffic patterns, infrastructure, and housing.

6. Hot spots should be addressed early in the process before the issues become obstacles. If faculty concerns are met up front, they will be easier to mitigate and academic senate support will be easier to solicit.

7. The Long-Range Plan should be visionary. The Plan should be sensitive to the "unknown" targets of opportunity that may present themselves to the campus in the future.

8. The Long-Range Plan should be viewed as a tool--a guide for planning campus expansion into the future. It is not set in concrete.

9. The campus should create a network with the city and community, involving them in campus decision-making whenever possible.
10. A City/University task force should be established early on in the process and the relationship should be nurtured and fostered not only during the long-range planning process, but into implementation and the status-quo.

11. Open public hearings should be held regularly to discuss issues of concern. These meetings will develop a campus/community relationship that will assist in the mitigation of the impacts that will be brought on by campus expansion.
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