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ABSTRACT

This study determined the extent to which the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries had implemented strategic planning, including the reasons, processes, problems, and benefits of strategic planning. The study also examined the relationship of the land-grant libraries' planning to that of the parent universities.

The research was modeled after Meredith's (1985, 1987) studies of strategic planning in higher education institutions. Descriptive statistics were used to compile the data which were compared to Meredith's results. Responses were also sorted by geographical area to determine where strategic planning was most and least prevalent.

The majority of land-grant university libraries reported that they had done strategic planning, with the 1890 libraries being involved in planning to a greater extent than the 1862 libraries. The number validated as doing bona fide strategic planning was substantially smaller. Further, only one-third of the universities used the term "strategic plan" to describe their regular planning system. The top three reasons that land-grant university libraries had initiated strategic planning were to improve the quality of programs, help meet and adapt to needed change, and improve overall management capabilities. The processes and steps which land-grant university library administrators had used in doing strategic planning were developed and carried out primarily by library staff. Generally, the processes that were used most extensively during
the strategic planning effort were also the most successful. The libraries were able to clarify and redefine their goals and objectives, clarify and redefine their mission and purpose, formulate and implement a library plan. The processes which were used least, and which were considered least successful, related to forecasting the external environment and matching external opportunities and threats with internal strengths and values.

The majority of the land-grant university libraries were somewhat satisfied with their planning and reported that strategic planning became easier with time. The greatest problem for the land-grant university libraries was an insufficient link between capital allocation and strategic planning. Although strategic planning was time-consuming, it produced improved communication and staff participation. Administrative support, both within the library and from the university, was also important.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The academic library has traditionally been viewed as "the heart of the University." While university administrators may have believed in this ideal, they have also long recognized that budget realities did not permit a protected status for the library. Ironically, the university library competed with the academic units it sought to serve while trying to obtain its share of limited resources. This situation presented a planning and budgeting challenge, particularly for the library director and the academic vice-president.

The economic, demographic, and technological changes of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s have created harsh realities for institutions of higher education. Coping with retrenchment and even the possibility of closure, many college and university administrators have realized that they must make hard decisions about programs, priorities and budgets. Previous planning systems, if used at all, have not been adequate for helping institutions prepare for a rapidly changing environment. In providing a framework for analyzing the institution's environment, strategic planning has been recommended as the most appropriate planning model for colleges and universities in this era of change.
In institutions where traditional planning and budgeting have failed due to the changing environment, the library has experienced serious consequences. Budget cuts, salary freezes, reductions in hours, and cancellations of journal subscriptions have been typical. These measures have had an irreversible effect on services, collection development, and personnel. Operating in a reactive mode, the library has not been in a position to take advantage of new technologies and information formats. Favoring a proactive stance, library administrators have also begun strategic planning.

Since the Morrill Act of 1862, land-grant colleges and universities have been the beneficiaries of federal and state support for agricultural and technological research and experimentation. Having had governmental support, these universities have developed libraries with large collections of books and journals. These research libraries have served as critical links in state and regional resource-sharing networks. As smaller institutions have been threatened by the changing environment, they have looked to research libraries such as the land-grant university libraries to augment their collections and services. Land-grant libraries have not been impervious to the environmental challenges facing all academic libraries: rising costs of materials, declining federal and state funds, and changes in technology. Successful planning in land-grant university libraries has benefitted the institution, the state, and nation-wide library networks.

Land-grant colleges and universities fell into two categories, however. Those founded by the Morrill Act of 1862 have developed into major state universities which are noted for their research,
agricultural services, and athletic programs. These institutions included: Ohio State University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Purdue University, and Cornell University. In 1890 a second Morrill Act authorized the creation and support of agricultural and mechanical colleges for blacks in the southern states. The schools founded through the 1890 Morrill Act have remained historically black institutions. Tuskegee University has been one of the best-known 1890 land-grant institutions. Others included Florida A & M, Kentucky State University, and North Carolina A & T State University. (A full list of both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions is included in Appendix III.)

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether and to what extent land-grant universities and their libraries have implemented strategic planning.

Subproblems

The subproblems which the study addressed were:

1. To determine which 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and their libraries have implemented strategic planning.

2. To identify why the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries initiated the strategic planning process.

3. To identify the processes and steps used by land-grant university library administrators in their planning efforts.
4. To identify what problems land-grant university library administrators encountered in the planning process.
5. To identify the results and/or benefits which land-grant university libraries received from the planning effort.
6. To determine whether a difference existed in the implementation of strategic planning between the 1862 land-grant university libraries and that in the 1890 land-grant university libraries.

Definition of Terms

Assumptions: Supposeions about an institution and its environment which must be stated explicitly and monitored against the external and internal environments for possible change.

Contingent strategies: Alternative courses of action which may be used in place of primary strategies because of environmental change.

Effectiveness: The degree to which implemented strategies produce the desired results.

Environment: The geographical setting of an institution, as well as the economic, political, technological, and demographic trends and events external to it which affect and influence its operation. Factors such as organizational structure and climate are part of the internal environment.

Environmental scanning or tracking: The formal, ongoing process of monitoring the external environment to assess the impact of various trends on the institution (Jacob, 1988, p. 129).
Goals: Broad statements identifying long-range objectives and activities that an organization plans to pursue.

Land-grant university: An institution of higher education established under the provisions of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. Under the terms of the first act, Congress granted 30,000 acres of federal land for each member of the Senate and the House of Representatives, with the land to be sold to provide a permanent endowment for the establishment in each state of "at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as related to agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life" (U.S. Code 1988 Title 7 S 301; July 2, 1862 c. 130, 12 Stat. 503; Aug. 30, 1890, c. 841, 26 Stat. 417).

The Morrill Act of 1890 provided each state with an additional appropriation and stipulated that funds be withheld from colleges which discriminated on the basis of race except for those in states which had separate facilities for blacks and whites. One result of this act was the establishment of 17 agricultural and mechanical colleges for blacks in the southern states.

Long-range planning: A systematic process by which the administrators of an organization can identify goals and objectives for the organization to achieve within a five-to-ten year time frame.

Management by objectives (MBO): A term coined by Peter Drucker to refer to the concept, method, and practice of working
toward the accomplishment and maintenance of organizational effectiveness through realistic goals, objectives, and functions as developed by the appropriate managers in the organization (Banki, 1986, p. 541-2).

**Master planning**: The systematic process of looking and thinking ahead in order to recognize and identify future trends, analyze the relationship between the trends and organizational objectives, and develop an efficient and economical course of action (Banki, 1986, p. 26).

**Mission statement**: A brief description of what an organization is, why it exists, and the unique contribution it can make.

**Objectives**: Specific measurable and time-limited actions or activities which support the goal statements.

**Open systems theory**: A conceptual model which links the interactive nature of an organization with its environment (Hanson, 1991, p. 128).

**Operational planning**: The process of identifying and obtaining resources and using them effectively and efficiently to accomplish stated measureable objectives within a short time frame.

**Planning process**: The steps and actions required to create a functional strategic plan. The planning process is continual.

**Policies**: Those formal principles, procedures, assumptions, and practices that govern how an institution operates. These should be consistent with and supportive of an institution's mission and strategic plan (Jacob, 1988, p. 130).
Program planning and budgeting (PPBS): A management technique for measuring the benefit produced by each activity or unit in the organization; it may be used as a tool in cost-benefit analysis (Johannsen and Page, 1990, p. 237).

Project evaluation and review technique (PERT): A computer-implemented or -assisted management planning and control technique developed in the Polaris system defense program. It is designed to assist administration and management with planning, research, actual and potential problem-solving, and decision-making, organizing, monitoring, evaluating, and controlling (Banki, 1986, p. 735).

Resource allocation: The process of identifying, acquiring, prioritizing, allocating, and assigning all the needed resources, including staff, expertise, equipment, materials, funding, etc., to complete specific actions (Jacob, 1988, p. 130).

Strategic planning: A continuous and systematic process by which the administrators of an organization can analyze its strengths and weaknesses, assess the environment in which the organization competes, and determine short-to-medium range objectives, the implementation of which will position the organization advantageously within a changing environment.

Strategy: From the Greek strategos, leader of an army; is used outside the military to mean a plan or method for achieving specific objectives or carrying out specific activities.

Strengths: Those characteristics that make an institution better able than others to achieve its goals and objectives.
**Threats:** Conditions in the environment that can interfere with an institution's plans, survival, or welfare.

**Vision:** A statement of the desired future state of an institution or unit, which usually represents an improvement over its current state and which requires the application of specific resources and actions for achievement.

**Weaknesses:** Those characteristics or conditions that work against or prevent an institution's achieving its goals and objectives.

**Zero-based budgeting (ZBB):** A financial planning, organizing, management, review and control method and process in which a precise description of, and justification for, activities and programs is necessary before budget resources can be allocated (Banki, 1986, p. 1006).

**Significance of the Study**

One key element which has distinguished strategic planning from other planning models is the assessment of the institution's environment. This process has provided a systematic approach for the review and analysis of the institution's strengths and weaknesses with the aim of making the institution more competitive. The notion of competition, an integral element of business strategy, has become a critical factor for higher education in several areas. State-supported colleges and universities have vied with prisons, social services, and K-12 educational programs for state funds. As the traditional college-age population has decreased, colleges and universities have competed for the "best and brightest" students. There has continued to be a demand
for capable minority students and faculty. Corporate and commercial training programs have also presented a challenge, especially in vocational education. Cope (1983, p. 146) has stated that higher education faces scarcity, and scarcity creates a climate of competition and combativeness. In the states which support both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions, competition between the two for limited financial resources has grown.

In-depth studies of strategic planning in higher education have focused primarily on small private colleges (Anderson, 1978; Chaffee, 1984; Keller, 1983). The recession of the mid-1970s and the decline of the traditional college age population threatened the existence of private colleges. Strategic planning, with its emphases on mission, identity and market niche, was viewed as the appropriate planning model for survival. Land-grant universities, on the other hand, have not been threatened with extinction. The recipients of both state and federal funding, these large universities have operated in a different environment. A question appropriate for this study was whether strategic planning was necessary for a land-grant university?

During the 125th anniversary of the Morrill Act of 1862, an assessment of the mission of land-grant universities pointed out that many of these institutions have questioned their purpose (Mooney, 1987). The following issues have been raised: Have the land-grant universities kept up with the times? Have they served the constituencies they were intended to serve? Whom should they serve? Have they placed too much emphasis on agriculture through federally financed cooperative-extension programs and agricultural experiment stations?
Should a similar system be developed for providing sustained federal financing to help these universities transfer expertise in other fields, such as business management, international trade, or manufacturing? How should they be distinguished from other institutions? Has the scope of land-grant institutions been too narrow to deal with an increasingly global economy? Several specific points of contention were: the nature of research projects, federal aid for agricultural programs, and the identity of land-grant institutions in smaller, less agricultural states. In brief, the land-grant universities have been challenged by changes in the environment to consider and redefine their missions, not only to meet the needs of the citizens in their home states, but also to address national and international concerns.

Jaschik and Mercer (1992) have cited various legal and political pressures being applied to black colleges. The issue of segregation has continued to exist in Mississippi, prompting the Supreme Court to suggest that some states should consider merging nearby historically black with predominantly white institutions. The turnover in presidential positions and scandals involving allegations of misconduct and misappropriation of funds have seriously handicapped administrative effectiveness in a number of schools. The 1890 land-grant institutions affected by such problems include Kentucky State University, South Carolina State University, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Virginia State University, and Alabama A & M University. In contrast, Florida A & M and North Carolina A & T have thrived, attracted better students, and provided a solid education.
Even in a climate of rapid change and limited financial resources, the 1862 land-grant universities have not been threatened by extinction. However, specific programs, untenured faculty positions, and particularly the library materials budget have been vulnerable to budget cuts. Administrators at these universities have dealt with internal competition as well as with the budget battles between institutions within a state higher education system.

The value of strategic planning as a useful model in such an environment has been questioned. Have the 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions actually done strategic planning? Was strategic planning a prescriptive process which was discarded when a crisis happened? Or, did the institutional implementation of strategic planning provide alternative approaches to dealing with crises and thereby helped the university to survive with minimal damage? What strategies have land-grant institutions adopted to ensure their survival and their competitiveness?

As a unit within the university, the library has been greatly affected by institutional and environmental change. The financial and political situation of the library has been regarded as a key indicator of a university's values and priorities. Thus challenges to the mission and competitive position of land-grant universities have created comparable challenges to the ability of their libraries to serve. A determination of how the land-grant university libraries have done strategic planning could potentially benefit other academic libraries, particularly those in similar circumstances.
Conceptual Framework

Having originated in business and the military, strategic planning has become more widely used in colleges and universities. The theoretical roots of strategic planning included open systems theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978), planned change strategies (Hansen, 1991; Lippitt, 1985), and management decision-making models. Strategic planning has become one of the most recent in a long line of planning systems. It has incorporated elements of many forerunners, such as long-range planning, master planning, program planning and budgeting (PPBS), and management by objectives (MBO). The process has been based on an open systems approach and should be continuous.

Peter Drucker (1974, p. 125) has defined strategic planning as "the continuous process of making present entrepreneurial (risk-taking) decisions systematically and with the greatest knowledge of their futurity; organizing the efforts needed to carry out these decisions; and measuring the results of the decisions against the expectations through organized, systematic feedback."

Applying the concepts of strategic planning to higher education, Keller (1983, pp. 140-142) has stated that strategic planning is not: (1) the production of a blueprint, (2) a set of platitudes, (3) the personal vision of the president or board of trustees, (4) a collection of departmental plans, compiled and edited, (5) a process done by planners, (6) a substitution of numbers for important intangibles, (7) a form of surrender to market conditions and trends, (8) something done on an annual retreat, (9) a way of eliminating risks, or (10) an attempt to read tea leaves and outwit the future. On the affirmative side, Keller
has advocated strategic planning as an active decision-making process through which the participants could identify and shape the destiny of the institution based on its current character and its projected identity in a changing competitive environment. At its best, the strategic planning process was highly tolerant of controversy; focused on the fate of the institution as a whole; and was continuous, pervasive, and indigenous within the culture of the institution.

From his experience using strategic planning in colleges and universities, Robert Cope (1987, p. 3) developed a further definition of strategic planning:

Strategic planning is an open systems approach to steering an enterprise over time through uncertain environmental waters. It is a proactive, problem-solving behavior directed externally at conditions in the environment and a means to find a favorable competitive position in the continual competition for resources. Its primary purpose is to achieve success with mission while linking the institution's future to anticipated changes in the environment in such a way that the acquisition of resources (money, personnel, students, good will) is faster than the depletion of resources.

Cope's definition differed from Keller's in its emphasis on the institution's resources and on the implementation of its strategy. The implementation of strategy is the shaping of the enterprise, including the allocation of resources; arrangement of structure and organization; and development of staff, faculty, and students within the campus culture (p. 6).

While long-range planning most commonly had a ten-year time frame, strategic planning has focused on short and medium time frames. Within a rapidly changing environment, institutional administrators
have had to concentrate on more immediate strategies. Consequently, strategic planning has emphasized two- to five-year plans. If needs changed within that time frame, administrators adjusted their plan and updated it.

Several assumptions were necessary before strategic planning was begun. First, the process should be completed at each level in the governance hierarchy. The university president and vice-presidents initiated the process by looking at the direction and big picture of the institution. From there, the deans and directors fit the strategies for their college or unit within the umbrella of the university's plan. The strategic planning process was sequential, with the goals and broad assumptions going from the top down, and the detailed plans coming from the bottom up. For the resulting strategies to be generally accepted and successfully implemented, participation in the planning process had to be widespread. Powers and Powers (1984) have called this management style "consultative" since upper administrators initiated the process and then involved all constituencies in strategy formulation.

Kotler and Murphy (1981) listed six stages which were essential in the strategic planning process. The first step was analyzing the environment. The "environment" included the social, economic, political, and technological realms within which the institution must operate. The major questions to be considered were: 1) What are the dominant trends in the environment? 2) What are the implications of these trends for the organization? 3) What are the most significant opportunities and threats? The purpose of this step was "to produce a documented picture of the most significant environmental developments
around which the organization must formulate its future goals, strategies, structures and systems" (p. 473). Opportunities were those areas where the institution had a competitive advantage. Threats were challenges which could lead to the stagnation, decline, or demise of the institution or of an academic program if remedial action was not taken. An example of a challenge was a sudden decline in new student applications or enrollment.

The second step was analyzing resources. At this point administrators or a planning team analyzed the institution's strengths and weaknesses in relation to people, finances, and facilities. Strong and weak programs were also identified. The aim in this phase was to select and develop those resources which could create a positive advantage for the institution. These programs were then targeted for additional strengthening, and weak programs were reduced or eliminated.

The third step was examining and refining basic institutional objectives and goals. Ernest Boyer (1987, p. 3) cited confusion about institutional mission, goals, and curriculum as one of the tensions prevalent in colleges across the country. It was important for boards and presidents to review and assess the basic mission, objectives, and goals periodically, because the environment was constantly changing. The important questions to ask in formulating a mission statement were: "What is our business? Who is the customer? What is our value to the customer? What will our business be? What should our business be?" (Kotler and Murphy, 1981, p. 479). To avoid conflicts between research and teaching, between liberal arts and career preparation, administrators should have publicized the mission and obtained faculty
support. Faculty should have been involved in the development of objectives and goals so they would know where the institution was headed and have developed a stake in implementing the plan.

The fourth step was determining strategies to help the institution achieve its goals. Techniques included developing an academic portfolio strategy and a product/market opportunity strategy. It was important to examine academic programs for quality and relevance to the mission. Concurrently, new programs which have student appeal and institutional support, should be developed in order to increase student enrollment. Therefore, marketing and recruitment strategies should be identified.

The fifth and last step was designing or improving the organizational structure and support systems responsible for implementing the strategies. Personnel needs, computer files, advertising budgets, and staff retraining needed to be considered. In this phase, the college or university president was challenged to inspire the faculty and staff so that all were working toward the institutional mission. It was important for administrators to emphasize primary institutional symbols, such as the university motto, in creating organizational change. If the element of organizational culture was ignored, the whole planning process was less successful.

Because the library must be viewed within the political framework of the university, the strategic planning process of the parent institution and that of the library should be linked (Jacob, 1990, p. 25). The library must have ensured that its vision, mission, values, and goals were consistent with those of the university. Ideally, the university's planning effort should have included the library, whose unit
plan should have been developed in tandem with the institutional plan. If the university plan preceded the library's, then the library used this plan as a base for its own plan. Conversely, if the university had no formal plan, the library took the initiative and developed a plan by documenting its assumptions about the university and the academic units. An advisory group such as the faculty senate library committee served a role by validating and clarifying these assumptions and sharing in the linkage process. To be successful, however, the library must have been part of the information and decision-making processes within the university.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. Which land-grant universities and their libraries have implemented strategic planning?

2. Why have land-grant university libraries initiated the strategic planning process?

3. What processes and steps have been used by land-grant university library administrators in their planning effort?

4. What problems have land-grant university library administrators encountered in the planning process?

5. What results and/or benefits have land-grant university libraries received from their planning effort?
6. Is there a difference in the implementation of strategic planning and management between the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant university libraries?

Limitations

Data were collected by mail survey and telephone response and were self-reported by one or more library administrators.

The scope of this study was limited by the willingness or ability of land-grant university librarians to respond at all or in a timely manner.

Not all institutions had the same years or similar experience with strategic planning. The number of respondents answering specific questions on the survey instruments varied, and some items had no responses.

Delimitations

This study focused only on libraries and universities defined by the United States Department of Agriculture and listed by the National Agricultural Library as 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions. The land-grant institutions excluded were those in American Samoa, Guam, Micronesia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The time frame for the strategic planning processes examined was the decade 1981 to 1991.
Assumptions

The assumptions underlying this study were:

1. The experiences of the directors of land-grant university libraries offered the most reliable source of information concerning the procedures and processes of strategic planning in their libraries and of the relationship of the library to the institution.

2. The experiences of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries with strategic planning reflected a spectrum of institutional sizes within a discrete population.

3. Information resulting from this study would be helpful to other libraries and universities considering strategic planning.

Research Design

This study used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to gather data about the implementation of strategic planning in land-grant universities and their libraries. The director or a designated representative in each of the 69 land-grant university libraries was contacted by mail and/or telephone to determine whether the library had initiated strategic planning. This initial research phase also included several questions about the relationship of the library's planning process to the university's (see Appendix I). The information obtained in this stage addressed research question 1.

The second phase of the study involved the distribution of two longer survey instruments to those library administrators who stated that they were or had been involved in strategic planning. One of these
instruments was intended to validate whether the administrator completing the form was familiar with strategic planning concepts from the literature, and whether the library was doing bona fide strategic planning in accordance with the statements listed (see Appendix I). The second instrument contained detailed possible responses to questions about why the library began strategic planning, what procedures were used, what problems were encountered, and what results or benefits were realized (see Appendix I). These responses were intended to address research questions 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Demographic information about the land-grant university libraries was compiled from the American Library Directory 1991-1992, 44th edition. Included in this data were the sizes of professional and support staff, materials budgets, and collections. This information was identified for the purpose of comparing the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries, and was intended as part of the analysis required for research question 6. For the same reasons, a geographical distribution of the land-grant university libraries was created using the 1990 United States census categories.

The final part of the data collection was obtaining library strategic plans. The planning documents were requested in the cover letter which accompanied the initial survey instrument.

Organization of the Study
Chapter One introduces the study and defines the problem statement. The questions which the study addresses were proposed,
along with the definition of terms, the reasons that the research was warranted, the limitations and delimitations, the assumptions, and the research design.

Chapter Two provides a documented review of the pertinent literature of strategic planning. The following aspects of planning are discussed: the nature of the strategic planning literature, the origin of strategic planning in higher education, strategic planning in relation to long-range planning, problems with the planning process, why land-grant institutions should use strategic planning, strategic planning in academic libraries, and planning issues for land-grant university libraries.

Chapter Three includes a discussion of the population selection and methods for data collection, along with the procedures for analyzing the data.

Chapter Four summarizes the data collected with the three survey instruments. Chapter Five interpretes the data as it answers the research questions which were stated in Chapter One. Chapter Six concludes the research with conclusions, implications, a critique of the research methodology, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to present a critical review of research and professional literature on the implementation of strategic planning in higher education and academic libraries. Even though the university plan incorporated the library, it seldom did so with any depth. Likewise, the library plan was presented within the context of the university, but without the breadth. Both parts were necessary to understand how the library as a single unit planned within the framework of the larger institution.

The Nature of Strategic Planning Literature

The literature on strategic planning in higher education and academic libraries has been evolving. At this point in the development of the literature, the emphasis has been on practice and experience. Prescriptive articles and how-to manuals predominated during the period of the mid-1970s to the early 1980s (Cope, 1978; Kotler and Murphy, 1981; Riggs, 1984). After this period, case studies about individual institutions became plentiful (Brown, Cyert, Foote, Morrill,
Roach, and Swain, 1988). Likewise, the case study approach has been prevalent as a means for academic librarians to share their strategic planning experiences (Ostler, 1985; Ensor, et al., 1988; Abegg and Goldberg, Cline and Meringolo, Dewey, Eaton, Mulhare, Shapiro, 1991; Gratch and Wood, 1991). While still sparse, surveys distributed to academic libraries (Anderson, 1985; Biddle, 1989) as well as to colleges and universities (Petrello, 1986; Meredith, 1985, 1987) have provided the rudimentary beginnings of empirical studies on strategic planning.

The initial challenge in approaching the planning literature for higher education and libraries was dealing with inconsistent terminology. While planning has generally been accepted as one of the basic management tasks, no single definition has seemed adequate. Consequently the term "planning" usually has been qualified by another word which indicates a specific methodology. Management literature has been replete with terms such as "formal planning," "master planning," "contingency planning," "long-range planning," and now "strategic planning." Many writers have used the terms interchangeably, thus blurring the distinctions between individual models.

The lack of understanding of the differences between long-range planning and strategic planning has marred recent studies. Petrello (1986) surveyed 100 randomly selected public and private colleges in 50 states and determined that 96% of the respondents used some form of long-range, strategic, or systematic planning process. Neither Petrello nor the respondents defined long-range, strategic or systematic.
Consequently, the results only confirmed that formal planning systems
were being used and did not provide meaningful data about strategic
planning per se.

Meredith (1985, 1987) confirmed the terminology problem after
assessing the results of two surveys. Subsequently he conducted a
follow-up survey with those institutions which had reported that they
were using strategic planning. The results of his questionnaire—which
listed practices and values of both long-range and strategic planning--
revealed that only one third of those who had originally thought they
were doing strategic planning were actually doing it. Meredith's
experience indicated that the issue of terminology must be resolved in
order for any study about the extent of strategic planning to be reliable.

Surveys of planning efforts in academic libraries have been
equally ambiguous. Anderson (1985) did not distinguish between long-
range and strategic planning when he surveyed 164 academic libraries
to determine their administrators' involvement in planning. Biddle's
study of the 101 university library members of the Association of
Research Libraries indicated that 57% of the 83 respondents had either
developed a long-range plan or were in the process of doing so. But
while attempting to focus on strategic planning, Biddle found that
library administrators had not distinguished between strategic and long-
range planning in their documentation. Thus Biddle's results did not
provide a reliable indication of the extent of strategic planning in
research libraries.
Dissertations on Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Doctoral dissertations on strategic planning and higher education completed during the 1980's focused primarily on strategic planning models and methodology. Small private institutions required a model tailored to their resources and environment (Copeland, 1985; Costello, 1986; Elia, 1981; Jaggers, 1985; Johns, 1989; Siren, 1982). Similarly, case studies of specific community colleges indicated how strategic planning was used to address operational problems (Charnley and Hungar, 1982) and how academic division heads perceived the process (Milton, 1985). Keinath (1985) tested Chaffee's (1984) strategy models, and Moore (1983) investigated how strategic and operational planning were integrated in resource allocation. Hesse (1985) developed a planning guide for a large public university because no examples or models for guides could be found. Hesse's dissertation was one of the few which focused on the strategic planning process in an institution the size of most 1862 land-grant universities.

Related to the methodological studies were a small group of dissertations which focused on institutional management information systems. Computer-based information systems (Behan, 1985) and institutional data (Green Hall, 1985) were demonstrated to be useful as planning aids. Larger institutions which had computer resources and research/institutional analysis staff were more likely to employ these techniques.

A few studies examined how institutions used strategic planning for specific purposes. Waddell (1984) looked at the strategic planning process as a way to build alliances between community colleges and
community employers. Gonzalez-Pose (1990) examined the use of a specific strategic financial planning system in a private university.

While the methodologies for these doctoral studies ranged from a case study of a single institution (Charnley and Hungar, 1982) to a mailout questionnaire sent to 590 institutions (Lane, 1983), the conclusions were strikingly similar. First, strategic planning principles have been demonstrated to be appropriate for higher education. Second, successful implementation of the strategic planning process was dependent upon two primary elements: 1) committed, dynamic executive leadership (i.e., the president), and 2) systematic and widespread involvement of campus constituents. According to Lane (1983), factors which were not significant in assessing pitfalls or successes included the institution's size, and its public or private status.

The Origin of Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Even though formal planning and, later, long-range and master planning systems had been used extensively in business and the military since World War II (Winstead and Ruff, 1986), administrators in higher education had not used them consistently. For example, Johnson (1956) visited 50 colleges and universities in 20 states to find out what was being done to prepare for the large number of students who would be applying for admission during the subsequent years. Even though educational administrators knew that college enrollments would double between 1956 and 1971, they were doing little to plan for it. The prevailing attitude was that "it simply is not necessary" (p. 134). In the
late 1960s, higher education administrators and scholars began to consider formal planning seriously. At that time, forecasters predicted that higher education during the last decades of the century would be affected negatively by the declining population of traditional college-age students, by increasing competition for fiscal resources, and by wavering public confidence in the value of higher education (Mortimer and Tierney, 1979). Having had to stretch budgets and facilities to cope with the rapid influx of students during the sixties, administrators saw that the combination of inflation and changing demographic trends could easily threaten the vitality and even the survival of their campuses. At this point they began to reconsider the merits of formal planning and management in order to minimize the impact of anticipated changes (Lahti, 1973, p. 2). In 1977, Shuck commented that planning had become the new "religion" of higher education (p. 594). By the end of the 1960s, "almost every institution, system and state government had some instrument or series of instruments that could be labeled a 'master plan'" (Glenny, 1976, p. 81).

During the late 1960s and the 1970s, a number of additional planning models were in vogue. The most notable among these were planning, programming, and budgeting systems (PPBS), management by objectives (MBO), project evaluation and review technique (PERT), and zero-based budgeting (ZBB) (Winstead and Ruff, 1986; Baldridge, 1983). Baldridge (1983) went so far as to call the succession of planning models "fads with catchy acronyms" (p. 167). With each of these planning systems, a new body of literature developed, along with
conference presentations and workshops targeted toward college and university presidents and upper level administrators.

Winstead and Ruff (1986) theorized that the turnover in planning systems was a process of historical evolution. In progression, each planning model added new concepts which made planning more formalized, more structured, and more sophisticated. Strategic planning, the latest in the evolutionary chain, has already evolved into strategic management for business and into linear, adaptive, and interpretative subtypes of strategy for higher education (Chaffee, 1985).

Strategic Planning Versus Long-Range Planning

As the discussion on terminology indicated, the two planning models used most extensively in the 1980s were strategic planning and long-range planning. The primary reason that institutions chose strategic planning over long-range planning was the challenge of operating in a rapidly changing environment. Fixed five- to ten-year plans became obsolete in a very short time. Strategic planning has been based on the assumption that the environment is dynamic. It emphasized change rather than stability and external factors rather than internal ones (Cope, 1981).

Long-range planning assumed a closed system in which five- and ten-year plans could be developed with some certainty. Budget projections were based upon formulas and incremental changes. Likewise, long-range planning used quantitative models for allocating
resources and focused on internal analysis. The planning document represented the culmination of the planning effort.

Strategic planning is based on open systems theory and assumes change in a turbulent environment. It focuses on the external environment, on qualitative information and intuitive decisions regarding resources, and on campus-wide involvement. The emphasis is on the process rather than on a written planning document. Strategic planning pays attention to organizational values, politics, and changing circumstances.

Steiner (1979, p. 13-15) highlighted two other conditions which are necessary for successful strategic planning. Key administrators must have the dedication to act on their vision of the future. They must have determination to plan constantly and systematically as an integral part of management. In short, there must be an attitude that strategic planning is a way of life. Further, there must be a structure for planning and implementation. This requires a network of mutually dependent plans, both long term and short term, tactical and operational.

Cope (1981, p. 1) and Baldridge (1983, pp. 175-177) identified key distinctions between conventional long-range planning and strategic planning: 1) Strategic planning focused on "big" issues which affected the organization's destiny. Although both long-range and strategic planning examined the university's purpose and mission, long-range planning was more operationally oriented. Because strategic planning aimed to ensure the institution's vitality and survivability, it was concerned with the environment, market-share, and interactions with
other institutions. 2) Because power and authority are required to make these major decisions, strategic planning was usually the responsibility of the top administration. Cope's view was that educational institutions were more democratic and professional and that strategic planning should have broad institutional participation. 3) Strategic planning has a short- to medium-range time frame. The five-year and ten-year plans created in long-range planning were often not used because the environment changed too fast. The emphasis in strategic planning was on rapid assessment and decision-making that dealt with short-term and medium-term issues. 4) Strategic planning was extremely sensitive to the external environment. Long-range planning assumed a steady state or closed model. With the current turbulent environment, planners must develop a range of alternative scenarios and contingencies in anticipation of change. Whereas the long-range planner looked inward, the strategic planner looked outward. 5) Strategic planning was more of an art than a science. Growing out of management science, long-range planning tried to be rational and quantitative. Strategic planning was more subtle and dynamic, and drew upon intuitive judgments, hunches, assessments, and experiments. 6) Strategic planning emphasized process over product. The long-range planning document was viewed as a blueprint for the organization. Strategic planning, in contrast, worked toward a "stream of decisions that move the organization into the future" (Baldrige, p. 177).
Table 1

Comparison of Strategic Planning and Conventional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Conventional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Planning</td>
<td>Organization's Destiny Market</td>
<td>Wider Range of Issues, Nonroutine and Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Plans</td>
<td>Top-Level Officials</td>
<td>Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Orientation</td>
<td>Medium/Short Range</td>
<td>Long Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Perspective</td>
<td>External, Environmental</td>
<td>Internal, Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Perspective</td>
<td>Open System</td>
<td>Closed System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Data</td>
<td>Both Quantitative and Qualitative</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Process</td>
<td>Complex Art Form</td>
<td>Exact Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Stream of Critical Decisions</td>
<td>Plan, Blueprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems with the Planning Process

One explanation given for the failure of various planning models in higher education was a conflict in philosophy. Higher education administrators have been generally skeptical about using formal planning models. Many faculty and administrators have believed that such approaches were basically inconsistent with traditional academic values and behaviors (Eble, 1979). Whenever the mandate to plan came from an external body such as the legislature or regents, both administrators and faculty were suspicious and the planning process flawed. The resulting planning document was often shelved and its recommendations ignored (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1988-89). By not being fully convinced of the value of the planning process, administrators guaranteed that it would not work.

In cases where college and university officials believed in the value of planning and tried to apply the recommended planning models, many found that they did not have sufficient time and resources (Wiseman, 1979; Tack and Pesau, 1982). For example, many of the quantitatively based models were relatively complex and could be used only on campuses with extensive computer resources and expertise. In some institutions, administrators encountered skepticism and resistance from various campus constituencies. The degree of goal consensus and hierarchical authority needed to use effectively structured approaches such as management by objectives was lacking on many campuses. Frequently, even when planning documents were completed and apparently accepted by key campus constituencies, they became "shelf" documents that were used mainly for presentations to external agencies.
rather than guides for campus decisions and actions (Ringle and Savickes, 1983).

Part of the skepticism from administrators has been based on the fact that the models used in higher education have been borrowed from business and the military. In her review of strategic planning literature, Chaffee (1985, p. 133) called the transfer of business practices to higher education a "touchy topic." She also summarized the migration process:

No matter how such a system comes into use—intuitively or logically—it will, nonetheless, tend to follow a set pattern. First the system will be widely acclaimed in the higher education literature; institutions will eagerly ask how best to implement it. Next, the publication of a number of case studies will appear, coupled with testimonials to the system's effectiveness. Finally, both the term and the system will gradually disappear from view. (p. 133)

One of the major issues in the 1970s and 1980s, then, was whether models appropriate for the business environment were suitable for higher education. The literature was divided on this question. Some authors (Doyle and Lynch, 1976; Schendel and Hatten, 1972) advocated using business methods in general, but did not provide empirical evidence to support their claim. The implication was that strategic planning should be used in higher education because it had proven successful as a planning model for business, and higher education institutions should be run more like businesses. Other authors (Wood and Wood, 1981) listed similarities between businesses and universities, such as concern with the external environment, internal
effects of demographic change, and some degree of external control from government, politics, consumers, unionism, and tenure.

Of course many writers took the opposite view. Chaffee (1985, pp. 136-137) listed a number of reasons for distinguishing the administration of higher education planning from that of business. First, higher education organizations had multiple, often conflicting goals. Many important higher education outcomes were intangible and could not be measured by quantitative standards. Leadership charisma tended to be important because there were fewer measures of effectiveness in education than in business.

Second, the organizational structure and support systems of higher education differed greatly from those in corporations. Chief executives (including presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs) lacked positional power. Faculty were more committed to their profession than to the organization. Resource providers tended to intrude into organizational functioning. There were restraints on the reward and punishment options. Open debate, broad participation, and approval from representatives were expected.

Finally, strategic options were constrained in higher education. The influence of clients (students) on some higher education institutions was weak. Higher education lacked opportunity to achieve economies of scale. Geographic location was a significant factor in determining whether an institution could be competitive or successful. Many administrative functions tended to be integrated and could not be separated.
The planning approaches that many institutions used in the late 1960s and the 1970s were generally based on bureaucratic notions about organizational function, including the following: (1) organizational goals exist and can be specific; (2) alternative courses of action can be identified and evaluated with respect to their potential for furthering goal achievement; (3) decisions as to which courses of action to follow can be reached using logic and analytic procedures; and (4) the implementation of decisions made through planning activities is feasible and likely to occur (Peterson, 1980; Hudson, 1983; Mahoney, 1983; Schmidtlein, 1983).

Now, however, organizational behavior within academic institutions has been widely viewed as reflecting a varying mixture of political, structural, environmental, and psychological dynamics that is far more complex than the bureaucratic model implied (Cohen and March, 1974; Baldridge, et al., 1978). Higher education literature has described American colleges and universities as loosely coupled, open systems with multiple and poorly defined goals, unclear links between means and ends, political decision-making processes, and relatively autonomous, professionally staffed subunits that often cannot or will not carry out the activities suggested, or even mandated, by institutional-level administrators (Cohen and March, 1974; Weick, 1976; Baldridge, et al., 1978).

Many writers have agreed that colleges and universities should use planning approaches that reflect their unique organizational characteristics (Peterson, 1980; Cope, 1981, Schmidtlein, 1983; Copa, 1983; Strohm, 1983; Haas, 1980). In reality, many campuses have tried
to use planning processes derived from corporate and government models with little consideration of conditions that may affect their applicability to academe. Schmidtlein and Milton (1988-89, pp. 1-2) concluded that "the difficulties American higher education institutions have experienced with planning result from incongruities and inconsistencies between the assumptions underlying recommended planning approaches and the operational realities of academic institutions."

**Why Should Land-Grant Institutions Use Strategic Planning?**

In 1981, the University of Maryland, with funding from the Carnegie Corporation, commissioned Malcolm Moos to examine the future role of the land-grant university. The study was designed to help the University of Maryland "devis[e] strategies that would enable it to achieve new economies and great productivity for the hard times ahead, yet reorient and redesign the University to enable it to advance in quality and service" (Moos, 1982, p. 30). Out of his work, Moos recommended strategic planning as the best method for land-grant universities to reassess their mission and identify strengths and opportunities.

During their existence, the land-grant universities have changed American education. Moos (pp. 32-33) cited three ways that the Morrill Act created a symbolically American system of education. First, it established "the liberal and practical education" of students in "the several pursuits and professions of life." As a result, the land-grant
institutions developed new programs in agriculture, forestry, home economics, education, engineering, business, architecture, journalism, applied and military science. Second, the Morrill Act created the need for new methods of instruction to teach these new subjects. Consequently, there was a migration from deductive to inductive methods, and the growth of laboratories, experiments, and field trips. Third, opportunities for higher education were opened to the industrial classes, women, and blacks, regardless of religious affiliation. The land-grant institutions have been a major force in reducing class discrimination in the United States.

The heritage of land-grant universities has also included a special relationship with the citizens, industries, and governments of their states and regions. As research institutions, the land-grants have fulfilled a public purpose in developing new knowledge in areas such as agriculture, engineering, business, horticulture, fisheries management, education, and journalism. In examining the future of the public research university in what he called the "post-land-grant era," Moos (p. 35) recommended that land-grant institutions continue their historically strong emphases: studying agriculture to address the world's food supply; developing engineering and applied science to continue technological innovation; promoting education for work; providing instruction which emphasizes the acquisition of learning skills; creating educational opportunities for talented people regardless of social or economic background. Some land-grant emphases which have faltered should be revived: serving the state, its agencies and organizations; closely interacting with the schools; examining the military's function in
contemporary America. Finally, Moos outlined new emphases for the post-land-grant university: defining the multi-campus organization for networking and meeting the needs of citizens; paying attention to quality of life issues, such as environment, health, social services, cultural life; emphasizing adult and continuing education; increasing training in skills for maintaining international world peace and the economic development of a global society.

The historical emphases listed above were also noted by Milton Eisenhower in a 1952 address to the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. At that time he challenged the administrators of the land-grant institutions to consider:

What, then, are our new responsibilities to the people of the United States as they struggle to remain free at home and to carry the mantle of leadership in this world? What are our greatest potentialities for effective service? What, if any, changes do we face in our programs? (p. 272)

The land-grant colleges and universities responded to the post World War II challenges by educating record numbers of students, aided in part by the G. I. Bill. Research flourished, with university scientists making scientific and technological discoveries. Saxon and Milne (1985) affirmed Moos' assessment and stated that the challenges facing land-grant universities for the future include building on the technological achievements of the past, maintaining a steady base of financial support, encouraging research and scholarship in all disciplines "as an essential way of improving human life," and educating people for
a future pervaded by technology, but with an emphasis still on liberal learning.

During the commemoration of the 125th anniversary of the 1862 Morrill Act, Mooney (1987) identified several more issues that the land-grant administrators had wrestled with. Critics of the modern land-grant university have stated that the scope of these institutions was too narrow to deal with an increasingly global economy. The agricultural interests of the individual states varied greatly, and the universities had to address the specific needs of the citizens of the state. In some states there was still a need for a strong agricultural presence. However, competition was stiff for limited federal funds for extension programs that directly benefitted farmers. In other states, the emphasis should change to sharing university expertise with business and the urban community interests. The public expected that land-grant institutions would give a higher priority to research which served the common good than to more lucrative grant-funded research for purely commercial interests. As land-grant institutions try to meet the demands for increasingly diverse research, instruction, and service, their future success will depend upon how well they reflect and adapt to change.

The challenges facing the 1890 land-grant institutions seemed to be even greater than those of the 1862 land-grants. Nelson (1985) and Jaschik (1987) repeated the themes of technological change, global interdependence, increasing emphasis on research, and greater competition for state and federal funds. The traditionally black schools have encountered political challenges in their home states. Some
legislators have considered these schools anachronisms and advocated that they merge with the white land-grants. Other critics have claimed a waste of resources when the two schools are geographically close but duplicate programs. Advocates for retaining the black land-grants have claimed that these schools have a historical identity in serving minorities and the poor. With increasing numbers of minority college age students and the demand for greater cultural diversity in curricula, the black land-grant universities have new opportunities for service.

Since the mid-1960s, the black land-grant institutions have re-evaluated their missions, developed new strategies for recruiting students, and attempted to forge new relationships with white colleges and state legislatures. They have had difficulties attracting black students to study agriculture. Because they have not been able to compete on the scale of the larger land-grant universities, researchers at the 1890 schools have had to identify different foci for their work. Because the 1890 schools did not even receive federal research funds until 1967, research has been one particularly difficult issue. Even then, Congress did not require the states to provide matching funds. Without active research programs, these schools have been unable to attract additional grant funds.

In considering the future of these institutions, Nelson (1985) stated that these universities must establish governance structures that will rely heavily on modern management techniques, including planning and evaluation (p. 134). The tough questions that administrators of the 1890 schools must consider include the following (p. 129): 1) What public policies should be financed and supported to insure the viability
of the historically black public colleges? 2) What new internal institutional policies should these colleges and universities promote and develop? 3) To what extent can these colleges and universities realistically plan for the future? 3) What contingency planning should these institutions undertake? 4) What can they do best in their research, teaching, and extension programs? 5) What are the advantages and disadvantages of these institutions as they compare themselves to their competition, clientele, and such? 6) What is threatened that is worth preserving, and what is new and worth developing for this particular set of institutions? Certainly these questions fit into the framework of strategic planning, although that terminology did not appear in the literature about the black institutions.

Strategic Planning in Academic Libraries

Librarians began formal planning activities in the late 1960s, and the literature on library planning grew steadily in the 1970s (Eaton and Jacob, 1988, p. 33-4). The incremental approach to planning, especially in relation to budgeting, was used most widely during this period (Molz, 1990, p. 53). However, environmental changes during the late 1970s and early 1980s created the need to be accountable and to justify costs. The scarcity of public funds, competition for foundation grants, high inflation, reduced enrollments due to demographic changes, and deteriorating physical plants and research facilities made planning more important as a means of justifying programs and documenting needs for institutional administration (Eaton and Jacob, 1988, p. 34).
Recognizing that many administrators did not know how to create a formal planning document, a number of organizations created training workshops and promoted and encouraged library planning efforts. In some cases, plans were required before a library could apply for special project funding. Some of the groups which were instrumental in emphasizing planning were: the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA); the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS); the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and two of the American Library Association (ALA) divisions, the Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

One in-depth study of six university libraries (Booz, Allen and Hamilton, 1970) assessed how well these libraries were being managed. The areas investigated were: planning, objectives and requirements, operations, organization, staffing, facilities, financing, and interinstitutional arrangements. A basic conclusion of the resulting report, Problems in University Library Management, was that most university libraries had not adjusted to their new roles in higher education or society. While coping with the rapid growth of the 1960s, they had not matured as organizations and had not developed the management systems required to cope with new demands. The investigators found an absence of plans, an absence of planning systems, and a lack of the management and information systems from which plans might be produced. They found that there was poor planning at the university level and there were ineffective systems for relating university planning to library planning (Booz, Allen and Hamilton,
One recommendation was that comprehensive long-range planning play a larger role in the management of university libraries. Another recommendation of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton study was that the Association of Research Libraries and the American Council on Education assume a leadership role in bringing about change in the way university libraries were managed. Structured organizational self-study programs such as the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP) of the Association of Research Libraries, as well as the Academic Library Development Program funded by the Council on Library Resources, were created and in the 1970s, constituted notable formal planning efforts by academic libraries (Webster, 1979, p. 94). These general management review programs were designed to help various sizes of libraries assess operations, services, management practices, facilities, and changing technological needs. Biddle (1989, p. 180) found that, between 1972 and 1979, 25 institutions had undertaken major comprehensive assisted self-studies under the MRAP and that the reports that were created became the foundation for later long-range and strategic planning efforts.

As colleges and universities began adopting strategic planning in the 1980s, their libraries participated as academic support units. Case studies documenting strategic planning in academic libraries have offered the following lessons and recommendations. Strategic planning can be a dynamic planning tool, but it will definitely change library management operating systems, such as budgeting, organizational structure, and staff configurations (Gratch and Wood, 1991, p. 15). It is important for the library to be integrated into the campus planning
process (Eaton, 1991; Davis and Helm, 1991; Mitchell and Witthus, 1991) or else the library is placed in a reactive position (Shapiro, 1991). The implementation of strategies works better if planning is tied to existing decision-making and budgeting processes (Davis and Helm, 1991; Dewey, 1991). The library's planning document should be understandable to campus administrators and faculty and should be used as a tool for promoting the library's needs and services (Davis and Helm, 1991). The involvement of library staff in the planning process improves morale during lean times and gives a feeling of empowerment (Shapiro, 1991). Because formal planning is time-consuming, library administrators must support the process of staff involvement and encourage risk-taking (Shank, 1991; Cain and Louden, 1991). The most important product of the strategic planning process was not the document produced, but the shared vision that was developed (Watson, 1991, p. 145).

The question of whether strategic planning is appropriate for libraries was posed by Vincent (1988), who criticized the linear procedures of strategic planning as inflexible and simplistic. She also argued that the model is not a good match for libraries because they are particularly vulnerable to budget cuts and have relatively little power within the parent institution. According to Vincent, a preferred planning model would be one which includes even more predictions and contingencies, greater flexibility, and promotes a planning mentality within the organization.
Planning Issues in Land-Grant University Libraries

In the late 1920s, the U.S. Office of Education conducted an analysis of university libraries as part of a larger study of land-grant colleges and universities. The survey participants included 63 libraries, of which 49 were from the 1862 land-grant institutions and 14 were from the 1890 land-grant institutions. The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the institutions met the following five requirements for good library service: 1) adequate book collections, 2) suitable buildings and equipment, 3) satisfactory relationships of the library to the institutional administration and to the faculty, 4) competent and sufficient library personnel, and 5) adequate financial support (p. 616). According to Biddle (1989, pp. 79-82), this Office of Education study was important because it created substantial information about academic libraries, their resources and services, and established requirements for good service. The final report provided information about each institution, which was useful for comparing libraries and which could help in planning improvements.

The five areas identified in the Office of Education study are fundamental to any academic library and often define the structure of a typical planning document. That study also specified five functions of the library in land-grant institutions (p. 613):

1. The library in relation to effective teaching: to aid directly in the instruction of students, both graduate and undergraduate, by supplying reading material, with suitable facilities for its use;
2. The library in relation to research: to provide for aid research by making available the necessary source material;
3. The library in relation to intellectual development
of the individual instructors: to aid faculty members to
familiarize themselves with current developments in their
respective fields;

4. The library in relation to general reading of the
students: to make possible and to encourage general reading
by faculty and students; and

5. The library in relation to the State at large: to aid in
the extension of service of the institution by supplying printed
material and information to persons beyond the campus.

Nearly seventy years after the Department of Education report,
Kennedy-Olson of Cornell University (1990) reviewed trends affecting
the management of land-grant university libraries. These libraries have
continued to fulfill the unique responsibility given to them by the
Morrill Acts by supporting instruction, anti-elitism, and research. In
particular, they have organized and provided free access to materials
and information about agriculture and related sciences for ordinary
citizens (p. 351). Strategic planning for land-grant universities should
have taken into account the following four trends. 1) Information has
been increasingly available only through computers, and libraries must
serve patrons with new information technologies. 2) A crisis in
publishing has produced escalating costs, and the purchasing power of
libraries has been reduced. Information is increasingly being produced
in electronic form, much of which is inaccessible due to the lack of a
federal policy and to the privacy of files created by researchers. 3)
Many original source materials in the agricultural science literature
have begun disintegrating and require physical preservation. 4) With
the changes in technology, the library must actively be a teaching
agency for information literacy.
Summary

Land-grant universities and their libraries have had a noble mission and face numerous challenges in the present environment of societal, economic, and technological change. The literature of both higher education and library planning has offered guidelines and case studies for strategic planning. Many authors have noted that the process of planning was more important than the end-product documents. An essential element in a university's planning process was the involvement and linkage of academic units, including the library. Likewise, successful implementation of the library's strategic plan was dependent upon the budgetary and administrative support of the institution.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND COLLECTION OF DATA

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine whether land-grant universities and their libraries have actually adopted and implemented strategic planning. The study also sought to identify the procedures, problems, and benefits of strategic planning and whether there was a difference between the planning efforts of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries. The study used descriptive survey research, and the data collected was analyzed and classified to answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1.

Population Selection

Since the first research question focused on which land-grant universities and their libraries were doing strategic planning, it was necessary to identify and select the land-grant institutions which would be surveyed and to determine a contact for each one. An address list of the directors of land-grant university libraries, including the McIntire-Stennis Forestry Schools, was obtained from the National Agricultural
Library. From this list were selected the 69 land-grant institutions funded through the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Second Morrill Act of 1890. The land-grant libraries excluded for the purpose of this study were those in American Samoa, Guam, Micronesia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. All instruments were coded for the variables of 1862 or 1890 land-grant institution (see Appendix III for the complete list of land-grant university libraries surveyed).

Selection of the Survey Instruments

In preparation for this study, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) database was searched to identify previous studies that used a survey instrument which could be adapted to assess the strategic planning efforts at land-grant university libraries. Two survey instruments developed by Meredith (1985) were found. Permission was obtained from Meredith to modify and use the surveys for this study. For his research, Meredith had distributed an initial three-question form to the chief executives at 340 postsecondary institutions. The following revisions were made to adapt Meredith's survey form for this study: questions about the umbrella institution were made instead about the library, closed-end questions about why the institution was not doing planning were changed to open-ended questions, and five questions were added to obtain responses about the institution's planning process and its relation to the library's.

The second survey form developed by Meredith (1985) offered a structure for obtaining information which addressed the research
questions about the strategic planning process, its problems and benefits. Again, the researcher made changes to the questions to focus on the library and its relationship to the parent institution.

Further research conducted by Meredith, Cope, and Lenning (1987) revealed a complication in the definition of strategic planning used by Meredith in his 1985 study. They addressed this problem by developing and using a strategic planning questionnaire to distinguish bona fide strategic planning from other forms of planning. Because the literature indicated frequent confusion between long-range and strategic planning, the inclusion of this questionnaire was considered pertinent for this study. The "bona fide" survey form was modified by the researcher who changed the term institution to library wherever it was appropriate for the context of the statement. In addition, the possible responses were changed to "Yes/Agree," "No/Disagree," and "Do Not Know." The original responses had been "Strongly Disagree," "Somewhat Disagree," "Somewhat Agree," and "Strongly Agree." But it was found that not all these terms were mutually exclusive; revisions were necessary to eliminate possible overlap between the "Somewhat Disagree" and "Somewhat Agree" responses. For the purpose of this study, the instrument was called a validation survey because its function was to verify that the administrator answering the accompanying detailed survey was familiar with the concepts of strategic planning as differentiated from long-range planning.
Involvement of Strategic Planning Advisors

Since this study used survey instruments originally developed by Mark Meredith, he was invited to serve as an advisor. The researcher consulted with him at his office at the University of Colorado on July 25, 1991. During this meeting he critiqued the modifications made to his original surveys and provided advice regarding the distribution of the survey instruments. He also gave constructive comments on the researcher's collection of additional demographic data based on his experience in institutional analysis at the University of Colorado. He used electronic mail to answer one follow-up question about the best definition of strategic planning to use on the initial survey.

Three other individuals were asked to serve as advisors on strategic planning. Patrick Borunda, a strategic planning consultant in Portland, Oregon, had experience with strategic planning and management in both the for-profit and non-profit sectors. Mr. Borunda recently completed an assignment with the Spokane (Washington) Public Library in which he oversaw its strategic planning process.

Dr. Stanton Biddle was asked because he had completed a research study of strategic planning in the Association of Research Libraries as part of his doctoral dissertation at Berkeley (1989). At the time of the study he was the Head Librarian at Baruch College in New York City.

Jeanne Somers, Director of Library Services at Kent State University Library in Kent, Ohio was contacted because she was directing the strategic planning process at her library.
Each of the advisors was sent copies of the revised survey instruments for comment and suggestions regarding their content validity. The instruments were subsequently revised further, incorporating the comments of the experts, before being distributed to the land-grant university libraries.

Data Collection

The survey instruments were sent out in two phases, beginning with the initial inquiry (see Appendix I). On August 28, 1991, the library directors identified by the National Agricultural Library were sent a cover letter describing the purpose of the study along with the initial survey form, which included a definition of strategic planning. The purpose of the first instrument was to identify the number of land-grant university libraries which had experience with strategic planning, by using the perceptions of the chief administrators concerning their own libraries. If the response was yes, the director was asked to provide the name of the library staff member most knowledgeable about the strategic planning process who could be contacted for further information. If the response was no, the director was asked if such a process had been considered and, if so, why it was not attempted. The form also asked whether the parent institution had a regular or systematic planning process and, if so, what the planning system was called. A subsequent question asked about the relationship of the library's planning process to the university's planning process. The form provided space for the respondent to make comments regarding
planning for land-grant university libraries. The final question inquired about the percentage of the institution's budget allocated to the library from the instructional budget and/or the general/educational budget. Those directors who did not return the completed form by the end of September, 1991, were contacted by telephone and given a brief explanation of the purpose of the study. The questions included on the initial form were then asked in an interview format. The process of follow-up telephone calls extended through the month of November, 1991.

In the second mailing, a brief form of 20 questions (see Appendix I) was sent only to the library directors (or their designees) who had previously reported that they had done strategic planning. The purpose of this survey was to validate whether the organization was actually doing strategic planning as opposed to long-range planning. The survey consisted of statements, based on the literature of strategic planning, which described activities proper and essential to strategic planning, as well as inaccurate approaches and views of strategic planning that have little to do with the concept. Respondents indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements and whether the planning at their respective libraries was consistent with the statements.

A third survey instrument (see Appendix I) was sent concurrently with the validation survey. This form included structured and open-ended questions about current methods, practices, problems, benefits, and successes in strategic planning. It specifically covered the major purposes and perceived importance for doing strategic planning at the institution, the strategic planning processes and steps used, the general
level of satisfaction with the process, the classification of persons who
developed the specific methods used, what results and benefits were
obtained, the resources needed for the process, the problems that were
encountered, and any final observations, suggestions, and
recommendations regarding strategic planning.

While the surveys were out, the researcher compiled selected
demographic information using a manual search of the American
Library Directory, 44th ed. (1992). Appendix II lists the data which
was selected as relevant to this study including budgets for materials and
salaries, the sizes of the professional and support staffs, the size of the
institutional faculty and student enrollment, and the size of the
collection. In cases where data about the library was missing, zeroes
were entered. Where information about the number of faculty and
student enrollment was missing in the American Library Directory, the
researcher recorded data found in Lovejoy's College Guide (1991), The

As the surveys were returned, each was manually coded by
geographical region according to the 1990 designations of the Bureau of
Census within the U.S. Department of Commerce (see Appendix II).
The designations include nine regions, each of which is made up of
three to nine states. The purpose of this process was to determine
whether the land-grant institutions doing strategic planning were
clustered in a particular part of the United States.
Data Description

The following data were coded and keyed into a file for processing on the computer. Each land-grant university library was assigned a control number and a code identifying it as either an 1862 or a 1980 institution. The subsequent codes indicated whether the library was doing strategic planning, whether the parent institution was doing formal planning, and what percentage of the institution's general education budget was allocated to library support. The following data about the library was entered: the number of professional staff, the number of nonprofessional staff, the total library income, the total expended for library materials, the total spent on salaries, and the number of library holdings. The raw scores for each statement from the validation survey were input, as was the total number of responses which matched an answer key developed by Meredith about the characteristics of strategic planning according to the literature. Finally, numeric responses from the third instrument were keyed and comments were categorized separately.

After searching for and recording data about the number of faculty and students at each of the land-grant institutions, the researcher did not include this information in the data input. Because no nationally recognized source included comparable data for the identical time period, the numbers identified could not be used for a comparison of the institutions. Related to this problem was a lack of specification in the sources as to how faculty (full-time, part-time) and student enrollment (head count, full-time equivalents) were counted.
Data Analysis

Because land-grant universities constitute a discrete population, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data collected. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 4.0), run on a Sun 3/280 computer, was used to process the data.

A list of land-grant universities and their libraries which have implemented strategic planning was created manually as the surveys were returned. Since confidentiality was guaranteed to the respondents, control numbers were used for data analysis. The states represented by institutions doing strategic planning were coded with the regional designations from the Bureau of the Census, and frequencies were determined.

General descriptive statistics were calculated for all data from the survey instruments. Since most of the information collected was nominal data, frequencies and percentages were determined. The responses of the 1862 institutions were compared with those of the 1890 institutions on all of the survey questions, and a chi-square was calculated for the responses of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant libraries on selected questions of the detailed survey instrument.

The Spearman's rho rank correlation coefficient at the .05 level of confidence was determined to identify possible relationships between the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries regarding the reasons for doing strategic planning, the extent to which various strategic planning processes were used and which ones were successful, the benefits of planning and the extent of success achieved, and the problems encountered and their extent. For each statistical treatment of
the data, the significant $t$ ratios and the significant $r$ correlation coefficients were analyzed. Comments provided by the respondents were summarized and reported where appropriate for answering the research questions.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented a description of the research methodology, the data collection techniques, and the statistical treatment of the data. A description of the data collected has been presented in chapter four. The results of data analysis and a discussion of the findings relevant to the six research questions have been presented in chapter five. In chapter six, assessment was made of the research study, and areas for further study were recommended.
CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTIVE DATA

The collection of data was divided into two phases. The purpose of the first phase, the initial survey, was to address research question one by collecting information that would identify which of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and their libraries had implemented strategic planning. The demographic data gathered was intended to augment this information. The second phase included the distribution of two survey instruments to those library administrators who responded that they were involved in strategic planning. The purpose of these two surveys was to validate each administrator's knowledge of strategic planning against standards in the literature and to gather additional information about the library's planning experience which would answer the research questions about the reasons, processes, benefits, and problems of the planning effort. The final research question about any differences between the strategic planning efforts of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries was addressed by all three survey instruments.
Initial Survey

Of the 69 questionnaire forms mailed to directors of land-grant university libraries, 43 were completed and returned by mail. An additional 23 responses were obtained through follow-up telephone interviews. Three libraries sent letters declining participation due to financial emergencies. Including these three institutions, the overall response rate for the first instrument was 100%.

Usable data was obtained from 66 libraries, and of these, 49 said that the library was involved in strategic planning. The total number of 1862 land-grant libraries in the study was 52. Of this group, 35 reported that they were doing strategic planning, thirteen stated that they were not doing strategic planning, one did not know whether the library was doing strategic planning, and three did not participate. The total number of 1890 land-grant university libraries in the study was seventeen, and of these, fourteen responded that they were doing strategic planning, two did not know whether the library had been doing strategic planning, and only one said it was not doing strategic planning. A summary of the responses of both the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant university libraries is presented in Table 2.

If a library was not involved in strategic planning, the respondent was asked to explain why. Ten participants answered the question. Of these, three directors were quite new to their positions and had not yet initiated a planning effort. One also mentioned that the provost was new as well and had not begun campus-wide planning. Two other responses appeared several times: "we are doing long-range planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Know</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Participation</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instead of strategic planning"; "we are reactive or in the middle of crisis management." The latter response was also associated with budget reductions and acute understaffing.

A subsequent question on the initial survey instrument asked whether the parent institution had a regular or systematic planning process. Again with 66 institutions responding, 48 said that the university was involved in strategic planning. Of this group, 32 represented 1862 land-grant institutions and sixteen came from the 1890 land-grant institutions. A total of eleven institutions were not involved in strategic planning, and the involvement of seven was not known.

Out of a total of 52 1862 land-grant universities, 32 reported that they were doing strategic planning, eleven stated that they were not doing strategic planning, six did not know whether their university was doing strategic planning, and three did not participate. Of the seventeen 1890 land-grant universities, sixteen responded that they were doing strategic planning. Only one was not doing strategic planning. Responses regarding the planning practices of the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant universities is presented in Table 3.

A note must be made here that the question did not ask whether the parent institution was doing strategic planning. This question differed in format from the previous question, which inquired whether the library was doing strategic planning. Since the question about institutional planning was more general, a follow-up question asked the name of the institution's planning system. A total of 48 responses were given. Of this total, strategic planning (or a variant, such as
Table 3

Land-Grant Universities Doing "Regular" Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Know</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Participation</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 52 17
Institutional Strategic Plan) was used in 43.7% of the cases. Long range plan was used in 12.5%, Five-Year Plan in 6.3%, and a Master Plan in 4.2% of the cases. The remaining labels were quite diverse and included the following: Program Review Committee, Evaluation Plan, Academic Development Plan, College Planning Advisory Group, Academic Programs Planning and Review, Budget Allocation Review, Interactive Planning, Biennial Planning Cycle, Twelve-Point Plan, and University Plan.

The subsequent narrative question on the initial survey asked about the relationship of the library's planning process to the university's planning process. This question was answered by 54 of the respondents. The comments provided ranged from proactive to reactive. On the positive end of the spectrum, 36 administrators said that the library's and the university's planning processes were integrated, or that the library's plan fed into or was part of the university's plan. One library reported that "we are also engaged in effectiveness measurement and will tie it into strategic planning process." Three respondents mentioned that the library's planning process was related to the university's budget allocation process. Nine participants stated that the director/dean of the library served on the university-wide planning group, but two other respondents pointed out that the library was not directly represented on the university committee. One commenter explained that there was statewide planning for all publicly supported universities in the state system, and the directors of the eight libraries met quarterly and have coordinated lobbying for library automation. Finally, one respondent said that "the
library is an equal and active partner in the university's planning process."

Other comments indicated a lack of institutional planning or an uncoordinated relationship between the library and the university. One respondent said that the library was part of the university plan but did not have its own plan. Furthermore, staff were working on automation and preparing for a new building and did't have time to do a plan. At another institution, "planning" was a dirty word and was related to the reallocation of funds. It had a negative and defensive connotation. Consequently the library was doing its planning autonomously. Several other comments had a similar tone: "The library did a long-range plan about five years ago, and we haven't looked at it in a year." "The university does not yet have a plan except in the most general terms. Nothing in the plan relates to the library." "Unfortunately one of our difficulties has been the fact that the University does not do any formalized planning, only for crisis management. Thus planning in a vacuum is an interesting experience." "We try to plan, but the university has not for ten years." "The library's process is a part of the university's process. No separate or independent planning is done by the library."

The above comments show that some land-grant libraries did planning when their parent institutions did not and that some universities made general plans without involving the library in their creation. Tables 4 and 5 indicate the relationship of planning in the 66 participating libraries to the planning of their parent institutions.
Table 4

Library Planning in Relation to Parent Institution Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Univ. has plan</th>
<th>Univ. does not have plan</th>
<th>Univ. plan unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library has SP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library does not have SP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library SP is unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 65

SP = Strategic plan

Source: Questions 1 and 4 in initial survey
Table 5

Comparison of 1862 and 1890 Libraries' and Universities' Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library has SP + Univ. has plan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library has SP + Univ. has no plan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library has SP + Univ. plan is unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library does not have SP + Univ. has plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library SP is unknown + Univ. has plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library does not have SP + Univ. plan is unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SP = Strategic plan

Source: Questions 1 and 4 in initial survey
The final question on the initial questionnaire solicited general comments regarding planning for land-grant university libraries. Only 26 respondents contributed their opinions. Selected comments reveal how library administrators felt about the planning process. "Five-year plans are not very practical. Changes occur so rapidly that plans can realistically be made in much shorter time spans." "It's incredibly time-consuming. The end-product is useful for communication to university administration and for budget requests." "It is very complex. Frequently, neither the Regents nor the universities consider the role of the library in developing educated graduates. The library must make constant efforts to reach out and ask to be included in general planning."

Several respondents addressed the land-grant university aspect of the question. Two of the 1862 librarians expressed the view that the planning process should be similar to that used by other traditional universities. The outcomes could be different, however, due to different missions. One 1862 librarian specified that his institution "emphasizes science, outreach to the state, and other components of the traditional land-grant university." One 1890 respondent stated that "for land-grant university libraries to adequately serve users in the land-grant community, they must know the mission, goals, planning and funding processes of the land-grant universities." Another 1890 respondent recommended that "more systematic planning for this group as a whole needs to be done. Individual planning is fine, but we seem to have no focus as a group."
Demographic Data

While recording the data about library staff size, collection size, and budgets, the researcher identified several problems which made the information invalid for the purpose of comparison. The American Library Directory, 44th ed. (1992) was the primary source of this information. Libraries have been responsible for reporting their statistics each year, but they have not been consistent in what they contributed. The total number of staff may include professional librarians, support staff, and student workers. The definition of "staff" should be "full-time equivalent," but this was not obvious from the numbers listed in the directory. Not all libraries reported the institutional information about size of faculty and student body, and again, it was not clear that a full-time equivalent was used for these numbers. Library materials budgets likewise included different categories of expenditures, such as books, journals, microforms, computer software, binding, and preservation. The dollar amount might be state-allocated funds, which is the standard used for most external reporting, or it might include grant or gift accounts in addition. The biggest problem was that the time frames for the financial information were not the same. Some land-grant libraries used financial information for 1990/91 and others used 1989/90. Similar problems were encountered in researching institutional statistics in Lovejoy's College Guide (1991), The College Blue Book (1989), and HEP 1991 Higher Education Directory.

The geographical distribution of land-grant university libraries and their responses about strategic planning were compiled manually
Table 6
Geographical Distribution of Land-Grant University Libraries
Doing Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The category of "other" includes those who responded as "not sure" and those who declined to participate.
## Table 7

Regional Distribution of Land-Grant University Libraries Doing Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The category of other includes those who responded as not sure and those who declined to participate.*
using the four primary areas and the nine regional designations from
the 1990 Bureau of the Census within the U. S. Department of
Commerce. (See Appendix II for a list of states included in each
region.) As indicated in Tables 6 and 7, the land-grant university
libraries in the South were the most involved in strategic planning. The
land-grant university libraries in the Northeast were the least involved.
The percentage of land-grant university libraries doing strategic
planning in the North Central states and the West was fairly high.

Validation Survey

Research conducted by Meredith, Cope, and Lenning (1987)
indicated that many institutions thought that they were doing strategic
planning when they actually were not. Meredith developed a validation
instrument to identify those institutions which were doing bona fide
strategic planning. The premise stated by Meredith was "the higher the
number of strategic responses, the greater the extent to which an
institution is engaged in what can be considered bona fide strategic
planning, as opposed to some other form of planning (i.e., traditional,
long-range" (1987, p. 12). Meredith divided his respondents into three
groupings: "one-third scored 15-19 strategic responses; one-third 13 to
14; and one-third 5-12" (1987, p. 12).

Meredith's instrument was modified to relate more specifically to
the context of the library within the parent institution. The purpose of
the form was to determine whether the libraries reporting that they
were doing strategic planning really were familiar with strategic
planning principles. The validation instrument was sent to each of the library administrators listed in the initial survey as most knowledgeable about strategic planning at those institutions doing strategic planning. The form included twenty statements about planning methods and attitudes. The respondents were asked to indicate (if they could) whether these agreed or disagreed with the concept of strategic planning in general and with the planning methods at their own library in particular (see Table 8). Although 49 libraries reported that they were doing strategic planning, only 27 completed the second phase survey instruments, which included the validation instrument. This represented a 55% response rate. The purpose of the questionnaire was to qualify the responses obtained from the initial survey by validating that the libraries really were doing strategic planning. Thus it was also meant to contribute to answering research question one about which land-grant institutions were doing strategic planning.

Each of the 27 forms returned was graded against Meredith's key with the desired responses to the general statement. The scores of the responses to the validation survey divided into three groupings: ten respondents scored from 16 to 19, eight scored from 14 to 15, and nine scored from 10 to 13. None of the land-grant university library respondents scored lower than 10. The mean of the scores was 14.44, and the standard deviation was 2.309. Table 9 presents the frequency distribution of the scores, and Table 10 shows the distribution by type of land-grant university library.
Table 8
Land-Grant University Libraries' Responses to Validation Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>(A) Is It Characteristic of Strategic Planning?</th>
<th>(B) Is It Characteristic of Planning at Your Library?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The primary purpose of planning is to develop a blueprint for the institution's future.</td>
<td>yes 85.2%</td>
<td>yes 85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 11.1%</td>
<td>no 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK* 3.7%</td>
<td>DK 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Library mission is regularly reviewed and clarified in terms of &quot;What business we are in.&quot;</td>
<td>yes 92.6%</td>
<td>yes 69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 7.4%</td>
<td>no 26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
<td>DK 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;Doing things right&quot; is considered more important than &quot;doing the right things.&quot;</td>
<td>yes 7.4%</td>
<td>yes 18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 77.8%</td>
<td>no 70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 14.8%</td>
<td>DK 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The catalog statement of mission/purpose is considered more important for public relations than as a guide for the institution's future.</td>
<td>yes 7.4%</td>
<td>yes 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 92.6%</td>
<td>no 88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
<td>DK 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central to the planning process is a reasonably clear and articulated vision of what the library is to become.</td>
<td>yes 92.6%</td>
<td>yes 84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 7.4%</td>
<td>no 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
<td>DK 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is desired that the library be stable and relatively unchanging so it can withstand a turbulent environment.</td>
<td>yes 0.0%</td>
<td>yes 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 92.6%</td>
<td>no 92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 7.4%</td>
<td>DK 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the library is important, but not as important as regular assessment of opportunities and threats in the environment.</td>
<td>yes 50.0%</td>
<td>yes 46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 42.3%</td>
<td>no 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 7.7%</td>
<td>DK 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>Key: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Planning relies primarily on analysis of concrete, objective data, rather than on opinions, values, traditions, and aspirations.</td>
<td>yes 18.5%</td>
<td>yes 14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 70.4%</td>
<td>no 74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 11.1%</td>
<td>DK 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Environmental scanning is done regularly to assess trends and changes in social/demographic, technological, economic, and political influences.</td>
<td>yes 92.6%</td>
<td>yes 81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0.0%</td>
<td>no 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DK 7.4%</td>
<td>DK 7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>Key: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Annual budgets and/or the governing structure largely determine what the institution will be doing in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 33.3%</th>
<th>Yes 44.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>No 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: no

11. Extrapolation is used as a primary method to anticipate change in the external environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 29.6%</th>
<th>Yes 25.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>No 18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>DK 33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: no

12. Strengths of specific, competing, or peer institutions are assessed regularly (including services, systems, operations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 74.1%</th>
<th>Yes 81.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>No 18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

13. New program decisions are usually a reaction to outside influences, such as competition and government or grant-funded plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 14.8%</th>
<th>Yes 29.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>No 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>DK 3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: no

14. The library is opportunistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 74.1%</th>
<th>Yes 74.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>No 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>DK 3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: no

15. Ambiguity, when it occurs in planning, requires more study so that certainty can be improved before decisions are made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 33.3%</th>
<th>Yes 33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>No 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: no

16. Both department and campus strategic plans are developed and decided upon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 85.2%</th>
<th>Yes 66.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>No 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>DK 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

17. Strategic choices are consistently made that re-position the institution in more favorable niches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 81.5%</th>
<th>Yes 63.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>No 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>DK 14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

18. There are both formulation and implementation stages in the strategic process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 92.6%</th>
<th>Yes 81.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>No 14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>DK 3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

19. Following strategic decisions, resources are, in fact, directed/redirected to insure that decisions are implemented and followed through with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 96.2%</th>
<th>Yes 76.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>No 19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>DK 3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

20. Following implementation of strategic decisions, review and evaluation is carried out to insure that decisions and goals are met and are appropriate, with modification as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes 100%</th>
<th>Yes 77.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No 22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 27  Key: yes

*DK indicates Do Not Know*
Table 9
Strategic Planning Scores From Validation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99.9+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maximum possible score was 20.
+ Total does not equal 100%.
Table 10

Land-grant University Libraries Doing Bona Fide Strategic Planning
(Based on Scores From Validation Instrument)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Score (16-19)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Score (14-15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Score (10-13)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statement most misunderstood by the library administrators was the first one regarding the purpose of strategic planning. Strategic planning does not develop a blueprint but focuses on strategies. In nearly all cases, the administrators felt that the practice of strategic planning at their libraries fell short of meeting the ideals stated as concepts.

The final part of the validation instrument asked the respondents to provide several key words which describe the strategic planning process in their respective library. Twenty-three individuals listed a wide range of terms with very little duplication. Because these terms capture the essence of strategic planning, they are listed in Table 11.

**Main Survey Instrument**

The purpose of the primary survey instrument was to gather data which would answer the research questions about the reasons, practices, and benefits of strategic planning in land-grant university libraries. The instrument consisted of eleven questions or statements, some of which were divided into subunits (see Appendix I).

The first question on the main survey addressed the second research question, which asked, "Why have land-grant university libraries initiated the strategic planning process?" Ten reasons were listed, which respondents were asked to rank from one to ten, with one being the most important. None of the respondents wrote in additional
Table 11
Aspects of Strategic Planning
For Land-Grant University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guiding</td>
<td>time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>consultation with department heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative</td>
<td>difficult to write out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>periodically helpful as review and predictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review</td>
<td>broad-based participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visionary</td>
<td>consensus-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evolutionary</td>
<td>review and update at regular intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>guidelines rather than &quot;blueprint&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultative</td>
<td>resource and facilities plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forward-looking</td>
<td>providing alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>somewhat sporadic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue</td>
<td>user population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>mission-goals-objectives-implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vital</td>
<td>staff resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>services necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>subject collection development/enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values-oriented</td>
<td>priorities established which guide resource allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reasons, although space was provided for them to do so. The rankings of the ten reasons that land-grant universities and their libraries did strategic planning are indicated in Table 12.

Based on the assumption that a lower mean indicated greater importance, the data revealed that the three top reasons a land-grant university library did strategic planning were: 1) to improve the quality of programs, 2) to help meet and adapt to needed change, and 3) to improve overall management capabilities. The three least important reasons, according to respondents, were: 1) to cut back programs or resources; 2) to sustain or increase enrollments; or 3) to improve reputation.

Questions two through six in the main survey instrument addressed the third research question, which asked: "What processes and steps have been used by land-grant university library administrators in their planning effort?" Thirteen strategic planning processes or steps were listed, and respondents were asked to determine whether the extent of their library's participation in each of the steps was high, moderate, low, or none at all. None of the administrators answering the survey added additional steps in the space provided for that purpose. The responses are summarized in Table 13.

The three processes which were used the most during the strategic planning effort were, in order, 1) clarifying/redefining goals and objectives, 2) clarifying/redefining mission and purpose, and 3) formulating a library plan. The two processes which were used least
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>#1(^a)</th>
<th>#2(^b)</th>
<th>#3(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve financial position.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve quality of programs.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve reputation.</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustain or increase enrollments.</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cut back programs or resources.</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve overall management capabilities.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Help meet and adapt to needed change.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Better identify and provide client need.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More able to deal with uncertainty.</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mandate from governing body.</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of times ranked as the most important reason.
\(^b\) Number of times ranked as the second most important reason.
\(^c\) Number of times ranked as the third most important reason.
\(^d\) Some respondents did not complete the rankings.
were related to the external environment: 1) forecasting external
environment and 2) matching external opportunities/threats with
internal strengths and values. Lesser used steps also included clarifying
or redefining traditions, values, and aspirations and the review and
evaluation of strategic process results.

In addition to determining which strategic planning processes
were used, the main survey instrument sought to identify those
processes which were most successful. Respondents were asked to
determine whether their participation in the thirteen steps specified in
the previous question was highly successful, moderately successful, of
low success, or not successful at all. Table 14 summarizes the
responses.

Formulating a library plan and implementing the library strategic
plan shared honors as the most successful processes. Next were
clarifying/redefining mission and purpose and clarifying/redefining
goals and objectives. The least successful processes again related to the
external environment: forecasting external environment and matching
external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values.

Respondents were asked to determine how satisfied they were
with their overall strategic planning/management processes by
indicating whether they were highly satisfied, somewhat satisfied,
somewhat dissatisfied, or highly dissatisfied. Most respondents were
somewhat satisfied with their strategic planning processes, and there was
an equal division between those who were highly satisfied and those who
Table 13
Extent That Strategic Planning Processes Were Applied
By Land-Grant University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>High Extent</th>
<th>Moderate Extent</th>
<th>Low/None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessing the external environment.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identifying external opportunities &amp; threats.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Forecasting external environment.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluating programs &amp; resources.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessing internal strengths &amp; weaknesses.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths &amp; values.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Examining campus strategic plans.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formulating library plan.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementing library strategic plan.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Review &amp; evaluation of strategic process results.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Success of Strategic Planning Processes Applied in Land-Grant University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>High Success</th>
<th>Moderate Success</th>
<th>Low/No Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessing the external environment.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identifying external opportunities &amp; threats.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Forecasting external environment.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluating programs &amp; resources.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessing internal strengths &amp; weaknesses.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths &amp; values.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Examining campus strategic plans.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formulating library plan.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementing library strategic plan.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Review &amp; evaluation of strategic process results.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were somewhat dissatisfied. Table 15 shows the percentages in the four categories used.

The fifth question in the main survey sought to identify how the libraries developed specific methods for strategic planning. Four options were listed, with space for write-in comments. Of the 27 respondents, the majority used library staff either entirely or primarily for the development of the planning process. Fewer than one third indicated that they had designed their process primarily with campus assistance. The write-in comments represented by "other" included the library's management group, the management team with staff input, and senior administration and staff. The percentages of responses are displayed in Table 16.

In another question regarding strategic planning processes, respondents were asked to report whether they had used consultants, courses/seminars, books, materials, or other resources in developing the planning procedures. They were also supposed to estimate the usefulness of these resources. Respondents could also make comments about particular resources they had used which were not included on the survey.

Of the 25 respondents answering the question, more than half had used consultants. Only eleven respondents assessed the usefulness of the consultants. Four expressed the view that they were not useful, two said they were of low usefulness, three said they were of moderate usefulness, and only two said they were highly useful.
Table 15
Land-Grant University Libraries' Satisfaction with the Strategic Planning Process

\( n = 26 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Highly Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16
Development of Strategic Planning Methods
In Land-Grant University Libraries

\[ n = 27 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally by Library Staff</th>
<th>Primarily by Library Staff</th>
<th>Primarily with Campus Assistance</th>
<th>Other Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-six respondents had attended courses and seminars. However, 23 said that they were not useful and three said that they were of low usefulness. Nobody found courses or workshops to be of moderate or high usefulness.

Twenty-three respondents had used books and materials as resources for developing their strategic planning processes, and nearly all of the respondents evaluated their usefulness. Of these, eight found books and materials to be highly useful, thirteen found them to be moderately useful, and one said that they were of low usefulness.

Fourteen of the respondents provided additional comments on resources that they had used. Four of these had used planning documents from other libraries, and two had used campus planning documents. Two specifically mentioned the help of the Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Services, and one listed the MIT School of Management. Several books and articles were listed: Keller (1983), ARL Spec Kit #108 (1984), Riggs (1984), and Moran (1985). One remark recommended hiring someone with planning experience.

Question nine in the main survey also related to processes and asked what organizational requirements or conditions were required for doing strategic planning. Respondents were expected to fill in the specific amount of time, the estimated number of faculty/staff directly involved, any organizational changes needed, and technical requirements for the strategic planning process. In addition, the respondents were asked to assess how each of these requirements met their expectations.
Seventeen respondents provided an evaluation of the time involved, with half stating that the time required was about as much as they had expected. The others were evenly divided about whether the time required was somewhat more than they had expected or was much more than they had expected. The length of time needed to devise the methods for planning varied greatly—from a three-hour meeting to one year. However, most of the respondents needed one to three months for the planning-to-plan phase.

The length of time actually required to complete the strategic planning process also varied. One respondent completed the process in two weeks, but half of the respondents needed twelve to eighteen months for planning. Some stated that the process was ongoing or not yet completed, and one reported that the library was in its third four-year planning period.

Likewise, the number of years that strategic planning had been used differed from library to library. Two libraries were still in their first year of planning, and one had passed the ten-year mark.

As for how many faculty and staff were directly involved in planning, thirteen respondents considered the number to be about as many as they expected, and two thought that their planning required somewhat more staff. The actual number of faculty involved in the planning process ranged from 1 to 75. Four respondents replied that all of the library faculty, staff, and administrators participated in the process. In one of these cases, that totalled 241 full-time equivalent employees. The number of staff participating varied from 1 to 140, although two libraries reported none. The number of administrators
involved ranged from 1 to 25, but one director noted that the administrators were included under the faculty category. The libraries with the largest numbers of personnel involved in the planning process belonged to 1862 institutions. The libraries with the fewest staff involved belonged to both 1862 and 1890 institutions.

Eighteen respondents provided an assessment of the amount of organizational structuring required for decision processes. Of these, 66.7% said that it was about what they had expected, 27.8% considered it to be somewhat more than they had expected, and 5.6% thought that it was much more than originally expected. None of the respondents said that strategic planning took less organizational structuring.

The technical skills required for strategic planning included information gathering and processing, group skills, and communication methods. Twenty-one respondents evaluated each of these areas. For additional information gathering and processing, 4.8% said that it was less expected; 47.6% said it was about what they had expected; 33.3% said that it was somewhat more than they had expected; and 14.3% said that it required much more than they had expected. In the area of additional group skills, 38.1% said that it took about what they had expected; 47.6% said that it took somewhat more than they had expected; and 14.3% said that it took much more than they had expected. For the last area of additional communication methods, 33.3% said that it required about what they had expected; 57.1% said that it required somewhat more than they had expected; and 9.5% said that it required much more than they had expected.
The final part of question nine asked about the direct and indirect costs of the strategic planning process. Only eleven respondents provided an assessment of their actual costs compared to their expected costs. Of these, eight said that the costs were about what they had expected, and three said that the costs were somewhat higher than they had expected. Some respondents added the comment that cost figures were not available or were unknown. Three respondents commented that costs were part of the normal operating budget or were carried out by faculty and staff on salary; additional costs were limited, and university faculty served as consultants without charging. Only three respondents provided dollar amounts in any of the categories, and two of these were approximations. Of the latter, one estimated about $20,000 in time and effort over two years for indirect start-up costs and $3,000 for direct and indirect annual ongoing costs. The other estimated $10,000 for indirect start-up costs and $2,000 for indirect ongoing annual costs. Only one library reported exact numbers: $8,000 for direct start-up costs, $208 for indirect start-up costs, $104 for direct ongoing annual costs, and $104 for indirect ongoing costs. No note was made about what the costs were for.

Research question five, which asked what results and/or benefits land-grant university libraries have had from their planning, was addressed by questions seven and eight on the main survey instrument. In question seven, respondents were asked to estimate the actual success the library had had in twelve areas of potential results or benefits. The areas given were quite similar to the reasons for doing strategic planning listed in the first question on the main survey instrument. The
extent of success to be specified was high, moderate, low, or none at all. One of the respondents who did not answer this question added a comment: "Too soon to tell; it is our first year with this process."

None of the respondents wrote in other benefits or results of strategic planning. Table 17 summarizes the responses.

The eighth question in the main survey instrument asked for the respondent's level of satisfaction with the overall results or benefits of strategic planning at the library. The options offered for response were: highly satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, and highly dissatisfied. Of the 26 respondents who answered this question, three were highly satisfied and nineteen reported being somewhat satisfied. Only four were somewhat dissatisfied, and none of the respondents was highly dissatisfied.

Respondents were also asked to list those planning consequences with which they were most satisfied and those with which they were most dissatisfied. Twenty respondents commented on the consequences which yielded the most satisfaction. The phrases "improved communications" and "staff participation" occurred several times. Other comments included: "process made us think more about the future locally and enabled objective review of the past"; "produced results in reallocation of resources from university"; "leads to logical conclusions based upon strategic decision-making"; "links fiscal resources to planning"; and "recognition by the University of the Library being a priority."
Table 17

Results and Benefits of Strategic Planning
For Land-Grant University Libraries

n = 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>High Success</th>
<th>Moderate Success</th>
<th>Low Success</th>
<th>No Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improved financial position.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved quality of programs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improved reputation.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustained or increased enrollments.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cutbacks in programs or resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improved overall management capabilities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Met or adapted to needed change.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Better identified and provided client needs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Became more proactive and less reactive.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Became more competitive.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. More able to deal with uncertainty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Improved internal communication.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some respondents did not answer all of the parts.
Nineteen respondents listed consequences with which they were the most dissatisfied. The time involved and committee activities were listed the most. Other complications included a disagreement on the wording of the final plan, the generation of too many reports, significant internal resistance to change, and not involving enough staff in the process. Four commented on an insufficient implementation largely due to the lack of resources or the reallocation of funds. One felt that the university administration had not taken enough notice of the plan, and one said that it was difficult to make the plan meaningful in terms of the library's ongoing activities, which would always compose most of the effort.

Research question four about the problems encountered during the strategic planning process was addressed by question ten on the main survey instrument. This section included twenty descriptions of problems that could occur during the strategic planning process, and respondents were asked to evaluate the extent of the problems that they encountered from "high" to "none at all." Table 18 summarizes the responses.

The final question of the main survey comprised nine sections, each of which opened with a leading statement about strategic planning to which the respondents could add comments or concluding remarks. Many of the respondents completed parts of this question with evaluative statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Problems Encountered in Establishing the Strategic Planning Process in Land-Grant University Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SP not interwoven into entire management process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>University administration not personally committed to SP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Library administration not committed to SP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Purposes of SP not clearly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SP system not simple, flexible, well-designed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>No balance between analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Failure to identify/evaluate planning assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Insufficient managerial conceptual skills, understanding and use of analytical tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Line managers not accepting and being involved in SP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>low</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (continued)

Problems Encountered in Establishing the Strategic Planning Process in Land-Grant University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>low</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Insufficient focus on both SP and current operations.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Insufficient attention to implementation of SP.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Insufficient link between capital allocation and SP.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Insufficient management reward system for doing SP.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Too much of SP delegated to a planner or planning office.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Failure to develop suitable goals and objectives.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Too much faculty/staff resistance to SP.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Failure to evaluate both campus-level &amp; library plans.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Insufficient resources available for SP.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Insufficient expertise available to do SP.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first statement focused on the most important value of strategic planning. Twenty-two respondents provided comments, with about one-third of these using the key concepts of "vision" or "future." As one respondent phrased it, "it forces the members of the organization to think and communicate about the future and, at its best, allows them to 'shape' the future." Two-fifths of the respondents mentioned establishing mission or goals/objectives or priorities as important outcomes. Group processes associated with the mission, goals, and objectives include actions such as articulating, rethinking, clarifying, agreeing, sharing, and communicating. One comment highlighted bringing "librarians and classified staff together to be involved in the planning process." Another value of strategic planning listed by three respondents was linking the budget with stated priorities, by "putting scarce resources to most productive initiatives."

The second section asked what was the most difficult thing about strategic planning. Twenty-two respondents provided comments. Of these, more than one-third remarked about the amount of time required for the planning process. In relation to this, one said that there was a tendency to spend too much time with the process--beyond what was really needed. It was hard to determine in advance how long the process would take, and the time needed for planning meetings could handicap daily operations. The second major area of difficulty pointed out by respondents was the role of the staff in the process. Two said that the main was difficulty was selling the concept to the staff because of their lack of conviction that the outcome would be worth the investment. Another said that it was getting the majority of the staff
and librarians to buy into the final outcome; and yet another said it was having the staff agree on priorities. When large numbers of staff were involved in the process, it was difficult to coordinate efforts. The staff were responsible also for carrying out the primary service functions which had to continue during the planning initiative. It was difficult to "keep business as usual without resources from [the] parent [institution] to fund initiative." The last cluster of difficulties pertained to integrating the implementation of the strategic plan into operations. Comments included such challenges as translating the plan into an action agenda, integrating new management concepts into overall operations, and reviewing the plan as an ongoing activity.

The third section provided a place for respondents to list what strategic planners should actually do to plan. Twenty-one respondents provided comments. About one-fourth said that all levels of the staff, or as many as possible, should be involved. Communication with the staff was another key. More than one-fourth of the respondents commented on the importance of such actions as sharing with the staff the fact that strategic planning was going to be done, including them in an initial discussion of the process, and indicating to them how they could help. Everyone, librarians and staff, gained by reaching consensus, listening, and articulating expectations and outcomes clearly. Some comments focused on getting administrative support, both within the library and from the university. Other comments included acknowledging the need to change the process if it doesn't work, allowing plenty of time for planning aside from regular duties, doing
extensive homework for laying the groundwork carefully, and producing enough achievable goals to show some success.

The following section was intended for respondents to list what planners should not do during strategic planning. Eighteen respondents made comments. One-third of them recommended that planners not leave out people or departments or have the director or the "front office" write the plan with no input from the librarians or staff. Others said not to underestimate the complexity of the process and the indifference of many of the staff. Other recommendations were varied and included: do not get too hung up on details, do not expect instant acceptance internally, do not make decisions prior to the process, do not plan in a vacuum, do not move too fast or drag out the process too long, do not forget that this is not a one-time thing, do not expect funding, do not fail to distinguish the "where" we are going from the "how" we are going to do it, and do not plan unrealistically.

In the subsequent section, fourteen respondents listed "things to watch out for." Some warned of unrealistic expectations about immediate benefits, especially personnel, equipment, or financial increases. Others said that the environment could change while the process was under way and assumptions not previously communicated by the university administration could come to light and affect the results. Other pitfalls could be: staff indifference, too much ambition, a narrow focus on personal or unit concerns, antithetical traditions and organizational culture, people who liked to dominate meetings and the process, unrealistic timetables, and lag time between stages. Two
respondents said to watch out for a lack of review, analysis, and explicit assumptions and to provide sufficient time to do a good job.

Twelve respondents suggested ways to save time in the strategic planning process. Half of the comments pertained to the use of committees and managing meetings. One respondent advised having one library leader coordinate, but dividing responsibility among the committees. Two recommended having small committees of two or three individuals write a draft which top managers could review. Another suggested having existing organizational groups participate in the decision making processes. One recommended joint or overlapping committees to perform tasks in their divisions. For running effective meetings, the respondents advised setting agendas and/or goals for each meeting, keeping good records of meetings, and doing one's homework. Other suggestions included using electronic mail for communication, looking at other library plans so mistakes would not be repeated, writing directly, and being collegial but also decisive.

Seventeen respondents supplied their secrets for successful strategic planning. The themes of the comments were leadership, communication, and the involvement of as many people as possible. Individual recommendations included streamlining the process, keeping the real plan in one's head, getting every manager to ask "is this strategic?", and being flexible and persistent.

The only quantitative part of question 11 asked respondents to assess whether strategic planning became easier with time and experience. The choices ranged from "easier" to "more difficult," to "cannot tell." Of the twenty-four respondents answering the question,
54.2% said that strategic planning became easier, 8.3% said that it stayed the same, 12.5% said that it became more difficult, and 25% said that they cannot tell.

The final portion of question 11 provided space for respondents to add any other advice, comments, or suggestions. Some respondents wrote the following remarks: 1) it was hard not to get cynical about the planning process when the plan was not followed through at higher levels; 2) it has been a rewarding process but I wish I had done strategic planning in earlier positions. There is a tremendous amount of satisfaction in the finished product. We are about to repeat the basic process after three years of updates and revisions; 3) strategic planning on our campus was dictated by the institution and was not planned by the library personnel.

Correlation Between 1862 and 1890 Institutions

Chi-squares were created to identify possible differences between the strategic planning experiences of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries. The number of cases of 1890 land-grant university libraries was too small, however, for valid interpretations. Subsequently, the Spearman's rho rank difference correlation coefficient was selected because it has a lower error rate than the Pearson r when the cases are relatively small (less than 30) and when the measurement has only the power of an ordinal scale (Williams, 1986, p. 138-9). The purpose of the Spearman's rho was to identify possible relationships between the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university
libraries regarding the reasons for doing strategic planning, the extent to which various strategic planning processes were used and which were successful, the benefits of planning and the extent of success achieved, and the extent that certain problems were encountered in planning and implementation. The Spearman's rho correlation test was run on the responses of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries to main survey questions 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10.

Two reasons, among the ten provided for doing strategic planning, indicated a significant relationship between the 1862 and the 1890 institutions. "Help meet and adapt to needed change" was ranked most important by the 1862 land-grant university libraries. Although the 1890 land-grant university libraries ranked this reason slightly lower, there was a positive relationship between the two on this reason for doing strategic planning (r = .45). Likewise, both types of libraries tended to give equal weight to "more able to deal with uncertainty"; this reason was ranked seventh by four of the five 1890 libraries responding and by five of the fifteen 1862 libraries responding. Table 18 displays the responses.

The results indicated strong relationships in four of the strategic planning processes engaged in by the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries. A negative relationship was identified for the task of "clarifying and refining traditions" (r = -.35): the 1862 land-grant university libraries reported moderate to high involvement, but the 1890 land-grant university libraries reported little use of it. Positive relationships were revealed in the steps of "evaluating programs and
Table 19

Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries:
Reasons for Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve financial position.</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality of programs.</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-1.094</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve reputation.</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain or increase enrollments.</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut back programs or resources.</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve overall management capabilities.</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help meet and adapt to needed change.</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better identify and provide client need.</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-.745</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More able to deal with uncertainty.</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate from governing body.</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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resources" (r = .49), "assessing internal strengths and weaknesses" (r = .42), and "examining campus strategic plans" (r = .38). All of the 1890 land-grant university libraries engaged in each of these three steps to a high extent, and the majority of 1862 land-grant university libraries used them from a moderate to a high extent. Table 19 shows the Spearman's rho results.

A strong positive relationship in the extent of success in following specific strategic planning steps was indicated for only one process, "evaluating programs and resources" (r = .41): all of the 1890 land-grant university libraries reported high success, and the majority of the 1862 land-grant university libraries reported moderate to high success. See Table 21 for details. There were no significant correlations between the two types of libraries in the extent of benefits obtained from strategic planning. Table 22 displays the results. There were three significant correlations between the 1862 and 1890 libraries in the types of strategic planning problems encountered. Both the 1862 and the 1890 libraries experienced to a low or a moderate extent a lack of "balance between analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values" (r = .44). The 1890 libraries had moderate to high problems with "too much of strategic planning delegated to a planner or planning office," but this was not a problem for the majority of the 1862 libraries (r = .76). Finally, for both types of libraries there were "insufficient resources available for strategic planning" (r = .39). Table 23 shows the values obtained from the Spearman's rho correlation test.
Table 20

Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries: Extent of Using Strategic Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations.</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>-1.804</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessing the external environment.</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-1.169</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identifying external opportunities and threats.</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.754</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Forecasting external environment.</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluating programs and resources.</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessing internal strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>2.274</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Matching external opportunities/with internal strengths and values.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Examining campus strategic plans.</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>.057*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formulating library plan.</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementing library strategic plan.</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.573</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Review and evaluation of strategic process results.</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

+no relationship indicated
Table 21
Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries: Success with Strategic Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations.</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessing the external environment.</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>-.976</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identifying external opportunities and threats.</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-.849</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Forecasting external environment.</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.482</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluating programs and resources.</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>2.181</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessing internal strengths &amp; weaknesses.</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values.</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-1.336</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Examining campus strategic plans.</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formulating library plan.</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-1.009</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementing library strategic plan.</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-1.009</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Review and evaluation of strategic process results.</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.800</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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Table 22

Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries: Results/Benefits of Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improved financial position.</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-1.537</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved quality of programs.</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improved reputation.</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustained or increased enrollments.</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cutbacks in programs or resources.</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.508</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improved overall management capabilities.</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.591</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Met or adapted to needed change.</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.573</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Better identified and provided client needs.</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Became more proactive and less reactive.</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Became more competitive.</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. More able to deal with uncertainty.</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-1.277</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Improved internal communication.</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries: Strategic Planning Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SP not interwoven into entire management process.</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-1.077</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University administration not committed to SP.</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Library administration not committed to SP.</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Purposes of SP not clearly identified.</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SP system not simple, flexible, well-designed.</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No balance between analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values.</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>2.328</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Failure to identify/evaluate planning assumptions.</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Insufficient managerial conceptual skills, understanding and use of analytical tools.</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unrealistic appraisal of uncertainties.</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Line managers not accepting and being involved in SP.</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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Table 23 (continued)

Relationship Between 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant University Libraries: Strategic Planning Problems Encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Insufficient focus on both SP and current operations.</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Insufficient attention to implementation of SP.</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Insufficient link between capital allocation and SP.</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Insufficient management reward system for doing SP.</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Too much of SP delegated to a planner or planning office.</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>5.662</td>
<td>.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Failure to develop suitable goals and objectives.</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Too much faculty/staff resistance to SP.</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Failure to evaluate both campus-level and library plans.</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient resources available for SP.</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Insufficient expertise available to do SP.</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Summary

This chapter covered a description of the data collected in two phases. The purpose of the first phase, the initial survey, was to address research question one by collecting information that would identify which of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities and their libraries had implemented strategic planning. The demographic data gathered was intended to augment this information. In the second phase, two surveys, the validation form and the main instrument, were distributed to those library administrators who responded that they were involved in strategic planning. The purpose of these two surveys was to validate each administrator's knowledge of strategic planning against standards in the literature and to gather additional information about the library's planning experience which would answer the research questions about the reasons, processes, benefits, and problems of the planning effort. The final research question about any differences between the strategic planning efforts of the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries was addressed by all three survey instruments. An analysis of the data presented in chapter four has been presented in chapter five.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether and to what extent land-grant universities and their libraries have implemented strategic planning. Of the population of 69 land-grant university libraries, 49 (71%) reported that they were doing or had done strategic planning. In the corresponding population of land-grant universities, 48 (69%) had a regular or systematic planning process, which approximately one-third called "strategic planning." The responses indicated that the majority of land-grant university libraries had implemented strategic planning.

The relationship of library planning to university planning varied greatly. In slightly over half of the cases, the chief library administrator perceived that the library was doing strategic planning and the parent institution was doing strategic or other formal planning. In the remaining cases, different combinations existed: either a) the library was involved in strategic planning, and the institution was not doing any regular planning; b) the library was not doing strategic planning, but the university was doing regular planning; c) the library was not doing strategic planning, nor was the university doing regular...
planning; d) the library was doing strategic planning and did not report what the university was doing; e) the library was not sure what form of planning it was doing, and the university had a regular planning process; f) the library was doing strategic planning, but was not sure about the institution's planning process; or g) both the library and the university were in a state of financial crisis and declined to participate in the study. It is evident that, within the population of land-grant universities, strategic planning has not been universally adopted. Further, in about half of the institutions, library and university administrators are not working together to mesh the library's planning process with the institution's.

Research Question One

The first research question sought to identify which land-grant universities and their libraries had implemented strategic planning. Because the respondents were guaranteed confidentiality, an institution-level report was not created for publication. Instead, the information collected was organized by geographic region. Tables 6 and 7 list the responses of the land-grant university libraries in the four major and nine minor geographical regions of the United States. The data indicated that the land-grant university libraries doing strategic planning were primarily in the South Atlantic region, followed by the East North Central. The lowest frequency of strategic planning was in the New England and Middle Atlantic states. The 36 cases where the library was doing strategic planning and the university had a regular or
systematic planning process were primarily in the South (61%), with
twelve in the South Atlantic region and six in the East South Central
region. Again, the Northeast was the area with the least joint planning,
and New England was lowest, with only one institution.

These results differed in several regards from those in Meredith's
study (1985). Meredith had a sample size of 340 public and private
institutions, including two-year, four-year, four-plus year, and special.
His response rate on the initial survey was 57.6%. Of those responding,
87% said that they were engaged in strategic planning. The main
survey instrument was distributed to this group, and 55.8% responded.
Meredith found only negligible variation by type of institution and by
geographical region.

The high frequency of institutions that reported they were doing
strategic planning prompted Meredith's follow-up study about bona fide
strategic planning. Meredith, Cope, and Lenning developed a
questionnaire using factors which differentiate strategic planning from
traditional long-range planning. The survey was distributed to the 104
institutions which had reported in the 1985 study that they were doing
strategic planning. With a 92% response rate, the survey suggested that
perhaps only a third of the institutions were conducting bona fide
strategic planning (Meredith, 1987, p. 16).

The "bona fide" survey, slightly modified for library
applications, was distributed to the land-grant university libraries that
reported they were doing strategic planning. The purpose of using this
instrument was to validate that the land-grant university libraries were
actually doing strategic planning, at least within the same parameters as
Meredith's study. Only 27 land-grant university libraries returned the completed survey, and ten of these, or 37%, had high scores. These results are close to Meredith's results of one third actually doing strategic planning. (See Tables 8 and 9 for the full display of scores.) The response rate for the validation or bona fide survey was 55%, which may not be adequate to conclude that only a third of the land-grant university libraries are really doing strategic planning. If medium scores were included, then 18 libraries would be validated and the percentage would increase to 66% of those completing the survey or 36% of all of the land-grant university libraries who reported in the first phase that they were doing strategic planning. The validation survey results agreed with Meredith's results in that not all libraries which asserted that they were doing strategic planning were so engaged.

**Research Problem Two**

The second research problem sought to identify why land-grant university libraries had initiated the strategic planning process. Ranked by mean from most to least important, the ten reasons that land-grant university libraries gave for doing strategic planning were as follows:

1. Improve quality of programs. 2.64
2. Help meet and adapt to needed change. 3.04
3. Improve overall management capabilities. 3.87
4. Better identify and provide client need. 4.09
5. Improve financial position. 4.19
6. Be more able to deal with uncertainty. 5.95
7. Mandate from governing body. 5.96
8. Improve reputation. 7.22
9. Sustain or increase enrollments. 7.29
10. Cut back programs or resources. 7.41
The above list was similar to Meredith's (1985, p. 14) findings, ranked by mean from "extremely important" to "of some importance," regarding why academic institutions did strategic planning:

1. Help meet and adapt to needed change.
2. Become more proactive and less reactive.
3. Improve overall management capabilities.
4. Improve reputation and quality.
5. Improve financial position.
6. Better identify and provide client need.
7. Sustain or increase enrollments.
8. Be more able to deal with uncertainty.
9. Become more competitive.
10. Cut back programs or resources.

The two lists did not match exactly because two of Meredith's original statements were inadvertently deleted during the process of revising the survey instrument to make it more relevant to land-grant university libraries. Consequently the phrases "become more proactive and less reactive" and "become more competitive" did not appear on the library list. In both lists, however, there was agreement on two of the top three reasons, as well as the least important reason, for doing strategic planning. Further, "improve financial position" appeared fifth in both lists.

The commonalities of the lists were notable also given the lapse in time between the studies. Meredith's survey was conducted in 1985, and the land-grant university libraries were surveyed in 1991. In that six-year interval, the major reasons for doing strategic planning have held steady. The economic and political climate within which higher education administrators must operate has created the need to adapt to
change. Improving the quality of programs and management capabilities have continued to be national concerns.

A comparison of the two lists indicated that academic institutions and land-grant university libraries have done strategic planning as a proactive way to identify and create needed change. The most reactive reason, of preparing for cutbacks, was ranked last. Land-grant university libraries have initiated strategic planning when it was not mandated by a governing body. The statement "become more proactive and less reactive" should have been included on the library list, but the spirit of the top five reasons ranked by libraries was still proactive. As service organizations, libraries have traditionally focused on users' needs, and the statement "better identify and provide client need" was ranked slightly higher on the library list than on Meredith's list.

Research Problem Three

The third research problem sought to determine which processes and steps land-grant university library administrators had used in doing strategic planning. The three processes that were used the most during the strategic planning effort, in order of extent were: 1) "clarifying/redefining goals and objectives," 2) "clarifying/redefining mission and purpose," and 3) "formulating a library plan." The two processes which were used least were related to the external environment: 13) "forecasting external environment" and 12) "matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values." In addition, "clarifying or redefining traditions, values, and aspirations" and the "review and evaluation of strategic process results" were lesser used.
The following processes were ranked by means from the greatest extent to the least extent used by land-grant university libraries.

1. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives. 3.815
2. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose. 3.704
3. Formulating a library plan. 3.654
4. Assessing internal strengths and weaknesses. 3.462
5. Evaluating programs and resources. 3.370
6. Implementing library strategic plan. 3.346
7. Examining campus strategic plans. 3.308
8. Identifying external opportunities and threats. 3.296
9. Assessing the external environment. 3.111
10. Review and evaluation of strategic process results. 3.000
11. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations. 2.962
12. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values. 2.769
13. Forecasting external environment. 2.704

The reasons ranked by the respondents to Meredith's study (1985, p. 15) are listed here in order of the extent engaged in:

1. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.
2. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.
3. Formulating strategic campus plans.
4. Evaluating institutional programs and resources.
5. Assessing internal strengths and weaknesses.
6. Assessing the external environment.
7. Forecasting the external environment.
8. Formulating departmental plans.
9. Identifying external opportunities and threats.
10. Implementing campus and departmental strategic plans.
11. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths/values.
12. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, aspirations.
13. Assessing leadership abilities and priorities.

Meredith found that private institutions engaged in these processes to a greater extent than public institutions and that the size of institution was not a significant factor.
The top five responses by the land-grant university libraries were essentially the same as those made by Meredith's respondents. The statement "formulating strategic campus plans" was changed to "formulating a library plan" to customize the survey for library applications. Where the land-grant university libraries differed from the academic institutions in Meredith's study was in the steps associated with assessing and forecasting the external environment. Both studies found that the steps of "clarifying and refining traditions, values and aspirations" and "mating external opportunities and threats with the internal strengths and values" were engaged in to a lesser extent.

Meredith did not create a list of processes ranked by estimated success. However, he stated that the processes "rank order into approximately the same sequence as the processes/steps engaged in responses . . . [and] the high end of the range is slightly lower here in estimated success, compared to extent engaged in" (1985, p. 17).

For the land-grant university libraries, the most successful steps were "clarifying/redefining mission and purpose" and "clarifying/redefining goals and objectives." "Formulating a library plan" was equally as successful as "implementing the library strategic plan" based on allocation/reallocation of resources. The least successful processes again related to the external environment: "forecasting external environment" and "matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values." The extent of success with the strategic planning processes can be ranked by mean from highest to lowest based on estimates by the administrators of the land-grant university libraries:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Process Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose.</td>
<td>3.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Formulating a library plan.</td>
<td>3.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implementing library strategic plan.</td>
<td>3.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives.</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assessing internal strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>3.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assessing the external environment.</td>
<td>3.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evaluating programs and resources.</td>
<td>3.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review &amp; evaluation of strategic process results.</td>
<td>3.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations.</td>
<td>2.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Identifying external opportunities and threats.</td>
<td>2.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Examining campus strategic plans.</td>
<td>2.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths and values.</td>
<td>2.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forecasting external environment.</td>
<td>2.480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the top five successful processes also appeared as those processes practiced to the highest extent. Out of the thirteen processes listed under both extent and success, the only one ranked the same by the libraries was the last one, "forecasting external environment." The remaining processes on the success list differed in ranking from those on the extent list.

The land-grant university libraries tended to use library staff either entirely or primarily for the development of the planning process. Fewer than one third indicated that they had designed their process primarily with campus assistance. The write-in comments represented by "other" included the library's management group, the management team with staff input, and senior administration and staff.

In comparison, the respondents to Meredith's survey tended to develop their planning processes primarily within the institution. Meredith determined that the medium- to small-sized institutions showed "a slightly greater tendency to develop specific methods..."
'totally' within the institution" (1985, p. 17). Outside assistance was used more by the largest and smallest institutions.

The responses of the land-grant university libraries varied regarding the use of consultants, courses/seminars, books, materials, and other resources for developing the planning process. More than half of those responding to the main survey had used consultants, and the majority found them to be of "low" or "no" usefulness. Nearly all of the respondents who had attended courses and seminars reported that these, too, were of "low" or "no" usefulness. The most useful resources for developing local strategic planning processes were books and materials, and most of the library respondents evaluated them as "moderately" to "highly" useful. Specific materials determined useful included planning documents from other libraries, campus planning documents, and several books and articles.

The results from Meredith's study were likewise mixed. When the data were controlled by type of institution, special institutions showed lesser success with consultants, but more success with seminars and materials. Four-plus year institutions indicated the least success with seminars and materials. When the data were controlled by size of institution, small institutions showed the least success with consultants and the most success with seminars and materials. The large institutions indicated the least success with seminars and materials. The satisfied institutions were more positive about consultants, seminars and books; and the more dissatisfied institutions were below average on the usefulness of consultants and books (1985, p. 20).
The institutions which participated in Meredith's study averaged taking a little over a year to devise the strategic planning methods and a year and three-fourths to conduct a complete strategic planning process. Strategic planning had been in use an average of three years at the time of the study. Private, four-year, and small institutions required a somewhat longer time period. Large and public institutions needed less time. The average number of people involved in the planning process was 27 staff and 43 faculty. Public institutions averaged 21 staff compared to 37 staff for private institutions, but both involved an average of 42 faculty. Small institutions had an average of 12 staff and 18 faculty doing the planning, but large institutions averaged 86 staff and about 100 faculty. Universities reported that some organizational structuring was required for strategic planning decision processes, but the average of all institutions indicated that not a great deal was required (1985, p. 25).

For the land-grant university libraries, the length of time needed to devise the methods for planning varied greatly—from a three-hour meeting to one year. Most of the respondents needed one to three months for the planning-to-plan phase. Likewise, the length of time actually required to complete the strategic planning process also varied. One respondent completed the process in two weeks, but half of the respondents needed twelve to eighteen months for planning. Some stated that the process was ongoing or not yet completed, and one reported that the library was in its third four-year planning period.

The actual number of faculty involved in the planning process ranged from 1 to 75. Four respondents replied that all of the library
faculty, staff, and administrators participated in the process. In one of these cases, that totalled 241 full-time equivalent employees. The number of staff participating varied from 1 to 140, although two libraries reported none. The number of administrators involved ranged from 1 to 25, but one director noted that the administrators were included under the faculty category. The responses of the land-grant university libraries were not controlled for size because reliable data was not available for comparison.

The additional information gathering and processing involved with the strategic planning process was about what most of the land-grant university libraries had expected or somewhat more than they had expected. The library administrators declared the group skills needed for the process to be about what they had expected or somewhat more than they had expected. The majority of respondents also reported that strategic planning required "somewhat" to "much more" additional communication methods.

For the institutions in Meredith's study, the technical requirements for strategic planning ranged between "some additional" required and "much additional" required. The highest need was for additional information gathering and processing skills, with additional communication methods next, and additional group task skills lowest.

The overall average costs for the institutional strategic planning processes ranged from about $18,000 for indirect ongoing annual costs to $47,000 for direct start-up costs (Meredith, 1985, p. 27). Although the library administrators felt that the costs associated with strategic planning were about what they had expected, most did not have specific
cost figures. In general the costs were part of the normal operating budget or were carried out by faculty and staff on salary. Additional costs were limited, and university faculty served as consultants without charging.

In summary, the processes and steps which land-grant university library administrators had used in doing strategic planning were developed and carried out primarily by library staff. Generally, the processes that were used most extensively during the strategic planning effort were also the most successful. The libraries were able to clarify and redefine their goals and objectives, clarify and redefine their mission and purpose, formulate and implement a library plan. The processes which were used least and which were considered least successful related to forecasting the external environment and matching external opportunities and threats with internal strengths and values.

**Research Question Four**

The fourth research question sought to identify the problems that land-grant university library administrators encountered in the planning process. In rank order by mean, from highest to lowest extent, the strategic planning problems encountered by land-grant university libraries were:

1. Insufficient link between capital allocation and strategic planning. 2.800
2. Insufficient management reward system for doing strategic planning. 2.692
3. Line managers not accepting and being involved in strategic planning. 2.538
4. Insufficient focus on both strategic planning and
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current operations.  

5. Insufficient resources available for strategic planning.  

6. Insufficient attention to implementation of strategic planning.  

7. Insufficient managerial conceptual skills, understanding and use of analytical tools.  

8. Strategic planning not interwoven into entire management process.  

9. Insufficient expertise available to do strategic planning.  

10. Purposes of strategic planning not clearly identified.  

11. Unrealistic appraisal of uncertainties.  

12. Strategic planning system not simple, flexible, well-designed.  

13. No balance between analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values.  

14. Too much faculty/staff resistance to strategic planning.  

15. Failure to identify/evaluate planning assumptions.  

16. University administration not personally committed to strategic planning.  

17. Failure to evaluate both campus-level and library plans.  

18. Failure to develop suitable goals and objectives.  

19. Too much of strategic planning delegated to a planner or planning office.  

20. Library administration not committed to strategic planning.  

The greatest problem for the land-grant university libraries was an insufficient link between capital allocation and strategic planning. This problem was mentioned several times in the comments about the aspects of strategic planning that caused the most dissatisfaction. Another comment which appeared repeatedly was the amount of time required to go through the strategic planning process. The factor of
staff time necessary for planning related to the resource and reward problems which were ranked high in the list.

Using similar statements for his study of academic institutions, Meredith determined that none of the strategic planning problems was serious. In rank order by mean, from "somewhat of a problem" to "not a problem," is the following list of strategic planning problems from Meredith's study (1985, p. 31):

1. Strategic planning not interwoven into entire management process.
2. Insufficient managerial conceptual skills, understanding, and use of analytical tools.
3. Insufficient attention to implementation of strategic planning.
4. Insufficient management reward system.
5. Insufficient focus on both strategic planning and current operations.
6. Line managers not accepting and being involved in strategic planning.
7. Insufficient link between capital allocation and strategic planning.
8. Insufficient expertise available to do strategic planning.
10. Insufficient resources available for strategic planning.
11. Purposes of strategic planning not clearly identified.
12. Too much faculty-staff resistance to strategic planning.
13. Planning climate not congenial.
14. Strategic planning system not simple, flexible, well-designed.
15. Failure to identify/evaluate planning assumptions.
16. Failure to evaluate both campus level and departmental plans.
17. No balance between analytical processes and initiation, judgments, and values.
18. Too much of strategic planning delegated to a planner or planning office.
19. Failure to develop suitable goals and objectives.
20. Chief executive officer not personally committed to strategic planning.
Analyzing his results, Meredith found that the size of the institution was a factor in anticipating what strategic planning problems the institution might encounter. Two-year institutions rated their strategic planning problems greater than did four-plus year institutions. Private institutions, special institutions, and small institutions considered "strategic planning not interwoven into entire management process" to be a greater problem. Public, two-year, and small institutions put "insufficient managerial conceptual skills and understanding and use of analytical tools" as the next greatest problem.

Some of Meredith's original statements were modified by the present study to reflect more accurately the situation of the library within the academic institution. Therefore the two lists of problems were not worded identically. Of the top five strategic planning problems encountered by the academic institutions and by the land-grant university libraries, two statements appeared on both lists: "insufficient management reward system" and "insufficient focus on both strategic planning and current operations." Of the top ten problems, there was agreement on nine between the two lists. The least problem on both lists was likewise compatible, because the library administration and chief executive officer were considered equivalent for the purpose of the study. Four of the five least problems encountered appeared on both the library and institutional lists.

Considering that the lists of strategic planning problems were not worded identically, there was still remarkable similarity between the rankings of the land-grant university libraries from this study and those of the academic institutions included in Meredith's study. The problems
did not match item for item, but there was general agreement in the two categories of top ten and bottom ten.

In summary, the greatest strategic planning problems centered on not obtaining the budget required to implement the objectives stated in the plan. According to the comments, some library faculty and staff anticipated this problem and were not motivated to participate fully in developing their plan. The time required for planning detracted from the performance of primary library services, and administrators lacked the resources to overcome this problem. Library administration was committed to strategic planning and tried to involve library faculty and staff in the process.

**Research Question Five**

The fifth research question sought to identify the results and benefits that land-grant university libraries had gained from their planning effort. Ranked by mean, from the highest extent of success to the least, the following benefits were reported by the land-grant university libraries:

1. Became more proactive and less reactive. 3.167
2. Met or adapted to needed change. 3.125
3. Improved quality of programs. 3.08
4. Better identified and provided client needs. 2.960
5. Improved reputation. 2.958
6. Improved internal communication. 2.880
7. Improved overall management capabilities. 2.84
8. More able to deal with uncertainty. 2.739
9. Became more competitive. 2.571
10. Improved financial position. 2.52
11. Cutbacks in programs or resources. 2.174
12. Sustained or increased enrollments. 2.15
In Meredith's study, the results and benefits items were worded the same as the purposes for doing strategic planning. Two of the purpose statements were changed for the study of land-grant university libraries. However, there was some congruence between the reasons that land-grant university libraries did strategic planning and the benefits that they obtained. The top planning reason, "improve quality of programs," was third in the benefits category. The second planning reason, "help meet and adapt to needed change," was also second as a benefit. The fourth planning reason, "better identify and provide for client need," ranked fourth in the benefits list. The two least important reasons for planning were also the least successful outcomes.

Two of the top five planning reasons did not appear in similar positions in the benefits list. The third planning reason, "improve overall management capabilities," fell to seventh place. The fifth reason, "improve financial position," went to tenth place in the benefits list. This phenomenon matched the concern expressed in the problem section about not getting resources to implement the strategic plan.

The strategic planning results and benefits obtained by the academic institutions in Meredith's study were ranked by mean, from "moderate success" to "lower success" (p. 23):

1. Improve overall management capabilities.
2. Become more proactive and less reactive.
3. Help meet and adapt to needed change.
4. Be more able to deal with uncertainty.
5. Better identify and meet client needs.
6. Sustain or increase enrollments.
7. Improve reputation and quality.
8. Improve financial position.
9. Become more competitive.
10. Cutback programs or resources.

Meredith (1985, p. 23) determined that the private institutions were more successful than the public ones in meeting needed change, dealing with uncertainty, and becoming more competitive. Four-year institutions were highest in dealing with uncertainty, having improved enrollments, and improving financial position. Four-plus year institutions were highest in being proactive, meeting needed change, meeting client needs, and being more competitive.

The academic institutions had more success than the land-grant university libraries with improving overall management capabilities and dealing with uncertainty. Of the top five benefits listed by both the land-grant university libraries and the institutions, three benefits appear on both lists: "become more proactive and less reactive," "help meet and adapt to needed change," and "better identify and meet client needs." Both groups ranked "cutting back programs or resources" at or near the bottom of the list.

Overall, the institutions in Meredith's study tended to be "somewhat satisfied" with the results and benefits of strategic planning. The majority of land-grant university libraries also responded with "somewhat satisfied." The mean of the institutional responses was "slightly above 3.0" (1985, p. 23), and that of the land-grant university libraries was 2.96.

More than half of the library administrators reported that, over time, strategic planning gets easier. Meredith's results were the same, with 84% of the institutions responding that strategic planning gets easier.
The benefits obtained from strategic planning by the land-grant university libraries and by the academic institutions in Meredith's study were generally comparable. The differences between what the land-grant university libraries had hoped to achieve and the results actually obtained related to improving overall management and financial position. The importance of these differences may be related to the position of the library as a unit within the university. The benefits accrued by the parent institution as a result of strategic planning may not trickle down to the library, particularly in the allocation of resources.

Overall, the land-grant university library administrators were somewhat satisfied with strategic planning, which seemed to get easier over time. As a result of strategic planning, the libraries became more proactive and less reactive, met or adapted to needed change, improved the quality of their programs, better identified and provided their client needs, and improved their reputation.

**Research Question Six**

The final research question sought to determine whether there was a difference in the implementation of strategic planning between the 1862 and the 1890 land-grant university libraries. Responses to the initial survey instrument indicated that 82.4% of the 1890 libraries were doing strategic planning as opposed to 67.3% of the 1862 libraries. Further, 94.1% of the 1890 land-grant universities had a regular or systematic planning process compared to 61.5% of the 1862 institutions. The 1890 land-grant institutions represented 36% of the cases where
both the library had done strategic planning and the university had a regular planning process. The greater rate of planning reported by the 1890 institutions contributed to the high frequency of planning in the South, where most of these schools are located.

Although most of the 1890 libraries reported that they were doing strategic planning, the results of the validation instrument raised the question of whether they were doing bona fide strategic planning. The 1890 libraries tended to score lower than the 1862 libraries on this survey, and four out of six scored in the low range. With only six libraries participating in this phase of the study, however, there was not enough evidence to make a definitive conclusion about all 1890 libraries.

Since the low response rate invalidated the chi-square results, the research question could not be answered in terms of differences between the two types of libraries. The Spearman's rho results indicated that there were strong positive relationships between the 1862 and 1890 land-grant university libraries' reasons for doing strategic planning, as well as between their responses to three planning steps: "evaluating programs and resources," "assessing internal strengths and weaknesses," and "examining campus strategic plans." Positive relationships were also determined in two planning problems: "insufficient resources available for strategic planning" and "a lack of balance between the analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values."

A strong negative correlation between the two types of libraries concerned their responses to the planning step of "clarifying and refining traditions." The 1862 libraries had tended to go through this
procedure whereas the 1890 libraries had not. The 1890 libraries reported that too much strategic planning was delegated to a planner or planning office, but this was not a problem for the 1862 libraries. One of the 1890 respondents commented that "strategic planning on our campus was dictated by the institution and was not planning by the library personnel."

The majority of the 1890 respondents were "somewhat satisfied" with the results of their strategic planning. Frustrations, as voiced in comments, centered around the challenge of involving the library staff and the lack of funds for implementation.

According to the responses to the three surveys, the 1890 land-grant universities and their libraries were involved in planning to a greater extent than the 1862 institutions. It was questionable whether the planning being done by either type of institution conformed to the strategic planning concepts which were stated in the literature. There were several strong positive relationships between the 1862 and 1890 libraries in their planning reasons and procedures. For the most part the responses of the 1890 libraries matched those of the 1862 libraries.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the research problems and interpreted the data collected in the three survey instruments. Each of the research questions was addressed with the survey results. The results obtained in this study were compared to the results obtained by Meredith in his
1985 survey of higher education institutions and in his 1987 follow-up study on bona fide strategic planning.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine whether and to what extent land-grant universities and their libraries had implemented strategic planning. The responses to the initial survey indicated that the majority of land-grant university libraries had done strategic planning. According to the land-grant library administrators who had implemented strategic planning, the parent institutions had a regular or systematic planning process, which approximately one-third called "strategic planning." The relationship of library planning to university planning varied greatly, however. In just over half of the cases the library and university were doing similar planning.

The validation survey was used to determine whether the library administrators were knowledgeable about the concepts of strategic planning and therefore, presumably, were more likely to be doing bona fide strategic planning. About one third of those responding made high scores, thus indicating that they were more familiar than the others were with strategic planning. This result was comparable to that
obtained by Meredith (1987). Including the respondents who had scored in the medium range, the results indicate that about one third of all of the land-grant university libraries who reported in the first phase that they were doing strategic planning actually might have been. The validation survey results matched Meredith's in that not all libraries which asserted that they were doing strategic planning were so engaged.

The land-grant university libraries who reported doing strategic planning were primarily in the South Atlantic region, followed by the East North Central. The lowest frequencies of strategic planning were in the New England and Middle Atlantic states. The 36 cases where the library was doing strategic planning and the university had a regular or systematic planning process were primarily in the South, followed by the South Atlantic region and the East South Central region. The Northeast had the least joint planning, with New England being lowest.

The top three reasons that land-grant university libraries had initiated the strategic planning process were to "improve the quality of programs," "help meet and adapt to needed change," and "improve overall management capabilities." A "mandate from a governing body" was not a critical reason, and "cutting back programs or resources" was least important.

The processes and steps which land-grant university library administrators had used in doing strategic planning were developed and carried out primarily by library staff. In developing their planning process, the libraries had relied on books and other materials, such as planning documents from other institutions. Consultants were not considered to be especially useful, and courses and seminars were not
useful at all. Generally, the processes that were used most extensively during the strategic planning effort were also the most successful. The libraries were able to "clarify and redefine their goals and objectives," "clarify and redefine their mission and purpose," and "formulate and implement a library plan." The processes which were used least, and which were considered least successful, related to "forecasting the external environment" and "matching external opportunities and threats with internal strengths and values."

The majority of the land-grant university libraries were "somewhat satisfied" with their planning and reported that strategic planning became easier with time. Comments indicated that, although strategic planning was time-consuming, it produced improved communication and staff participation. Administrative support, both within the library and from the university, was also important.

The greatest problem for the land-grant university libraries was an insufficient link between capital allocation and strategic planning. This problem was mentioned several times in the comments about the aspects of strategic planning that caused the most dissatisfaction. Another comment which appeared repeatedly was the large amount of time required to go through the strategic planning process. The element of staff time was related to the resource and reward problems, which also ranked high in the list of problems encountered. The time required for planning detracted from the performance of primary library services, and administrators lacked the resources to overcome this problem. The costs associated with strategic planning were absorbed by the libraries' operating budgets and typically were not itemized.
Library administration was committed to strategic planning and tried to involve library faculty and staff in the process.

The 1890 land-grant universities and their libraries reported being involved in planning to a greater extent than did the 1862 institutions. However, the validation survey indicated it was questionable whether the planning done was bona fide strategic planning. There were several strong positive relationships between the 1862 and 1890 libraries in their planning reasons and procedures, the most significant of which was that the 1890 land-grant libraries felt that their planning was too controlled by the institution.

The results obtained from the validation survey and the main survey instrument were strikingly similar to those reported by Meredith (1985, 1987). In the six-year interval between the time of this study and Meredith's, the major reasons given for doing strategic planning remained constant. The economic and political climate within which higher education administrators must operate has created the need to adapt to change. Improving the quality of programs and management capabilities have continued to be national concerns.

Implications

The results of this study indicate that strategic planning has not been practiced universally by the land-grant universities. While more than half of these universities and their libraries have adopted strategic planning, a substantial number of them did not do "bona fide" strategic planning. Further, the remainder of the land-grant libraries were not
participating with their universities as active partners in the institutional planning process.

These findings indicated that the land-grant universities have encountered difficulties in implementing strategic planning. As a theoretical model, strategic planning has been a top-down process beginning with the university president and extending throughout the institution. Library directors should be involved at the dean's level in the creation of a campus plan and should be responsible for initiating and guiding the library plan. The linkage of library and university plans is critical, particularly in the budgeting cycle. The leadership required to make strategic planning happen in this fashion seems to be lacking in a number of institutions. The library and its parent institution should be doing the same type of planning, yet the study indicated that this had not been done in nearly half of the land-grant universities.

This situation prompts questions about the importance of the library as an academic support unit. How can a university improve the quality of its programs and its overall management capabilities without including the library? How can the library likewise improve the quality of its collections and services without the involvement of its constituents and the financial support of the university? Neither the university nor the library can successfully meet and adapt to needed change without mutual support, especially during periods of fiscal restraint.

As was indicated in the literature review, the library's options for preparing for changes in the external environment are limited. It was not surprising, then, that the strategic planning steps which related to
the external environment were the least used and the least successful. Factors such as the inflation of scholarly journal prices, rapid technological change, and budget cuts can be anticipated generally but are hard to build into a plan.

Communication was noted by many respondents as a key to successful planning. If communication between library and university administrators is inadequate, then the planning process is jeopardized. Likewise, communication with and involvement of all library staff is also necessary. The respondents who were most satisfied with their strategic planning had included the most staff in the process. The implication of this fact is that more communication is needed between library and university administration and between library administration and staff, not only during strategic planning but also in the implementation of the plan.

The specific land-grant issues addressed in the literature review were not mentioned by any of the respondents. A few comments indicated that the planning of land-grant libraries was similar to that of other university libraries. One 1890 library respondent commented that the 1890 schools should do more joint planning. It appeared that the land-grant university libraries did not capitalize on their historical identity and mission while developing their strategic plans. The critical issues stated in the literature have not been addressed and remain as challenges for these institutions.
Critique of Methodology

In the process of revising Meredith's (1985, 1987) survey instruments to make them more applicable to the library setting, the researcher made several inadvertent mistakes. On the initial survey, the terminology used for planning systems was inconsistent. Although the term "strategic planning" was used on the question about the library's planning system, the phrase "regular or systematic planning" was substituted for the question about the institution's planning system. As a result, the initial survey instrument lacked precision. It was necessary to rely upon the name of the university's planning process for an indication of whether it was strategic planning. Consequently, the results obtained are only a partial indication of the involvement of land-grant universities and their libraries with strategic planning.

Another problem occurred from revisions made on the survey instruments. On the main survey form the reasons for doing strategic planning do not exactly match those stated on Meredith's original survey. While this did not cause a problem with analyzing why the libraries did strategic planning, it did make it harder to compare the library results with Meredith's results from different types of academic institutions. For example, the phrases "become more proactive and less reactive" and "become more competitive" do not appear on the library list. It would have been preferable to retain Meredith's original reasons and to add a few which addressed issues more specific to libraries.

A third problem arose in trying to identify demographic data such as the size of the library staff and amount expended on materials. The information provided in the American Library Directory and
similar sources was from different years and therefore was not considered adequate for a reliable comparison of libraries. One alternative way to obtain such data would have been asking the respondents to supply the information or to include a copy of the latest report submitted to the U. S. Department of Education. However, some respondents did not complete all of the questions on the survey instruments and might not have been willing to give additional information. The response rate might also have declined if demographic information had been requested. The best way to obtain demographic information is still a problem which needs to be addressed.

Twelve of the 1862 land-grant university libraries contributed planning reports or documents with their survey responses. No attempt was made to analyze the contents of the plans or to compare them, because the research questions did not address the actual goals, objectives, or strategies of the plans.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The problem of defining strategic planning in relation to long range planning, formal planning, regular planning, or systematic planning still exists. The confusion in terminology on the survey instruments affected the results of this study, which confirmed that the problem is there. In reporting his bona fide study, Meredith (1987, p. 6) stated:

> Shortcomings of the common definition [of strategic planning] are that it is too general, and does not adequately discriminate between "bona fide" strategic planning and other kinds of
planning. This generality of definition may be responsible for the seemingly too-high proportion of institutions saying that they practice strategic planning. Thus, the definition derived from the literature is perhaps so broad that nearly anything an institution does in the way of planning can fit in somewhere.

Meredith (1987, p. 7) also stated that, "a better means of determining the extent to which institutions engage in strategic planning seemed to be needed. It would appear that institutional self-reporting is not a valid measure of such activity, even when refined definitions of strategic planning were used." Additional studies are needed which address the definitions of planning models, a more reliable measure of planning involvement, and even the problem of self-reported data.

This study did not cover the qualitative aspects of the strategic planning documents produced by the land-grant university libraries. One point made in the procedures section of the main survey was that plans from other libraries were an important and useful source of information. More research is needed which analyzes the contents of the strategic plans created by academic libraries.

Since this study partially replicated previous research, it did not include a number of relevant questions. The following questions for additional research or case studies relate to university planning as well as to library planning:

1. How has strategic planning been linked to external evaluation such as accreditation review?

2. How has strategic planning been integrated into the organizational structure?

3. How is the strategic planning process linked to the institutional budget preparation cycle?
4. What strategies have been successful to increase the percentage of university support allocated to the library?

5. How is the library represented in the university's planning process and the budget preparation process?

6. What methods are most effective for monitoring changes in the external environment?

7. What cooperative strategic planning ventures (with other state-supported institutions, local institutions, and land-grant universities) has the library and/or university been involved in?

8. How effective has strategic planning been for the support of collection development and library automation and networking?

9. Has the institution made the transition into strategic management, and if so, how did it take place?

Fifty-three percent of the 1862 land-grant university libraries are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), but none of the libraries of the 1890 land-grant institutions has qualified for membership. Membership in ARL is limited to research institutions which share common goals, interests, and needs. The parent institutions must have broad research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and support large, comprehensive library collections on a permanent basis (Association of Research Libraries, 1990?). Why is there such disparity between the land-grant university libraries which are ARL members and those which are not? Will any of the 1890 libraries reach this status? Does having the goal of joining ARL help a library gain budget support from the university? While not limited to strategic
planning, these questions could potentially add to the historical study of land-grant university libraries and the challenges facing them today.

Finally, one respondent commented that the 1890 land-grant institutions should do more joint planning. Academic libraries have a strong tradition of networking for resource sharing and automation projects. Have the 1890 libraries shared collection-building responsibilities in areas which support agriculture and technology? Could cooperative ventures improve the political standing of these historically black institutions? Additional studies could focus on the specific planning experiences of these institutions and their libraries as they address issues of mutual concern.
Appendix I

Survey Instruments
Cover Letter for Survey

Date

<Name of Library Director>
<Name of Library>
<Name of University>
<Street>
<City, State, ZIP>

Dear <Name of Library Director>

I am writing to ask your help in gathering data for a research project on the effectiveness of strategic planning in land-grant university libraries. The information obtained will be used for my doctoral dissertation in education administration at UNLV and for two articles.

Recognizing that you are frequently besieged with surveys, I request only ten minutes of your time to answer the questions on the enclosed form. Please use the enclosed envelope to return the form to me by September 16, 1991. If I have not heard from you by the end of September, I will be calling you for an interview by telephone.

I would also appreciate receiving a copy of your current or most recent planning document. A summary version would be adequate if you have one for distribution.

Thank you for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Laverna M. Saunders
A.U.L. for Technical Services

enc
STRATEGIC PLANNING/MANAGEMENT IN LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES: A SURVEY

I would appreciate your cooperation in responding to the few, short items below. The information is for my dissertation on the extent and usefulness of strategic planning in land-grant university libraries. Responses are strictly confidential and your specific responses will never be identified by name or institution.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please review the following brief definition of strategic planning, and then respond to the questions that follow.

Library strategic planning and management is the process of:
(1) setting goals which match institutional activities, competencies, and resources with the external environment's present and future opportunities, demands, and risks;
(2) formulating alternative courses of short-term and long-term action for achieving the goals;
(3) selecting and implementing a given (best) course of action, and directing and coordinating resources and activities to help assure successful performance; and
(4) evaluating results to insure that goals are met, monitoring the appropriateness of the courses of action and making modifications as necessary.

Institution:________________________________________________________________________
Respondent's name:________________________________________________________________
Telephone: _________________________________ Date: __________________________

1. Is your library currently, or has it recently, engaged in some form of strategic planning/management?
(Check one): 1. Yes 2. No 3. Not sure

2. If the answer to #1 is Yes, or Not Sure, please provide the name and address of the responsible/knowledgeable individual to whom a further query on this topic may be directed.
   Name: ____________________________________________________________
   Title: ______________________________________________________________
   Address: __________________________________________________________________________
   Telephone: ___________________ Fax: ____________________________
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3. If the answer to #1 is No, please explain why the library is not currently engaged in some form of strategic planning/management:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Does your institution have a regular or systematic planning process? Yes _____ No _____

5. If yes, what is the planning system called?

________________________________________________________________________

6. What is the relationship of the library’s planning process (long-range, etc.) to the university’s planning process?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. What comments would you make regarding planning for land-grant university libraries?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. What percentage of the institutional budget is allocated to the library?
   Instructional budget: ___________  General/educational budget: ___________

9. Who could I speak with if I have further questions? (please put name on page 1)

   THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

Please return survey in the enclosed envelope by September 20, 1991 to:
   Laverna M. Saunders, A.U.L. for Technical Services
   UNLV Library
   4505 Maryland Pkwy.
   Las Vegas, NV 89154-7001  (702) 739-3069 (8-5, PDST)
### STRATEGIC PLANNING/MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

**Institution**

**Responsible**

**Name**

**Telephone**

If you wish to clarify your response to any item, please do so immediately below the item statement or on the back of the page. Identification information will be used only to obtain follow-up clarification as needed. Data will be used only for research purposes and will be kept confidential.

Please respond to items 1-20 by indicating: (A) whether you agree that it is characteristic of strategic planning, and (B) whether it is characteristic of planning at your library. For each item, please circle your two responses, using the following code:

- **Yes/Agree** = 3
- **No/Disagree** = 2
- **Do Not Know** = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(A) Is It Characteristic of Strategic Planning?</th>
<th>(B) Is It Characteristic of Planning at Your Library?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The primary purpose of planning is to develop a blueprint for the library's future.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Library mission is regularly reviewed and clarified in terms of &quot;What business we are in.&quot;</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>&quot;Doing things right&quot; is considered more important than &quot;doing the right things.&quot;</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The statement of mission/purpose is considered more important for public relations than as a guide for the library's future.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Central to the planning process is a reasonably clear and articulated vision of what the library is to become.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It is desired that the library be stable and relatively unchanging so it can withstand a turbulent environment.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Assessment of strengths and weakness of the library is important, but not as important as regular assessment of opportunities and threats in the environment.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Planning relies primarily on analysis of concrete, objective data, rather than on opinions, values, traditions, and aspirations.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. Environmental scanning is done regularly to assess trends and changes in social/demographic, technological, economic, and political influences.

10. Annual budgets and/or the governing structure largely determine what the institution will be doing in the future.

11. Extrapolation is used as a primary method to anticipate change in the external environment.

12. Strengths of specific, competing or peer institutions are assessed regularly (including services, systems, operations).

13. New program decisions are usually a reaction to outside influences, such as competition and government or grant-funded plans.

14. The library is opportunistic.

15. Ambiguity, when it occurs in planning, requires more study so that certainty can be improved before decisions are made.

16. Library and campus strategic plans are developed in tandem.

17. Strategic choices are consistently made that re-position the library in more favorable niches.

18. There are both formulation and implementation stages in the strategic process.

19. Following strategic decisions, resources are, in fact, directed to insure that decisions are implemented and followed through with.

20. Following implementation of strategic decisions, review and evaluation is carried out to insure that decisions and goals are met and are appropriate, with modification as necessary.

21. Please provide a summary description of planning in your library in one or two sentences.
PRACTICES AND BENEFITS OF STRATEGIC PLANNING IN LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the sections, please circle the appropriate responses and/or fill in the information requested for each item. Responses are strictly confidential, and your specific responses will never be identified by name or institution. The survey asks for your best judgment, opinion, perceptions, and assessment of strategic planning (SP) at your institution and library. Please return this in the enclosed envelope by October 25, 1991.

1. WHAT ARE THE MAJOR REASONS FOR DOING STRATEGIC PLANNING AT YOUR INSTITUTION?
   Please rank with 1 being the most important, 2 being the next most important, etc.
   a. Improve financial position. ________
   b. Improve quality of programs. ________
   c. Improve reputation. ________
   d. Sustain or increase enrollments. ________
   e. Cut back programs or resources. ________
   f. Improve overall management capabilities. ________
   g. Help meet and adapt to needed change. ________
   h. Better identify and provide client need. ________
   i. More able to deal with uncertainty. ________
   j. Mandate from governing body. ________
   k. __________________________________ ________
   l. __________________________________ ________

2. WHICH STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESSES/STEPS HAS YOUR LIBRARY ENGAGED IN? (Circle a number for each purpose.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent Engaged In</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   b. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   c. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   d. Assessing the external environment. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   e. Identifying external opportunities & threats. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   f. Forecasting external environment (demography, economy, technology, political, social). | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
   g. Evaluating programs & resources. | 4    | 3        | 2   | 1  |
h. Assessing internal strengths & weaknesses. 4 3 2 1
i. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths & values. 4 3 2 1
j. Examining campus strategic plans (enrollments, finances, facilities, org., human resources, academic). 4 3 2 1
k. Formulating a library plan. 4 3 2 1
l. Implementing library strategic plan based on allocation/reallocation of resources. 4 3 2 1
m. Review & evaluation of strategic process results. 4 3 2 1

3. WHICH STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESSES/STEPS ARE/HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL AT YOUR LIBRARY? (Circle a number for each step listed.)

   Estimated Success
   High  Moderate  Low
   No

a. Clarifying/redefining mission and purpose. 4 3 2 1
b. Clarifying/redefining traditions, values, and aspirations. 4 3 2 1
c. Clarifying/redefining goals and objectives. 4 3 2 1
d. Assessing the external environment. 4 3 2 1
e. Identifying external opportunities & threats. 4 3 2 1
f. Forecasting external environment (demography, economy, technology, political, social). 4 3 2 1
g. Evaluating programs & resources. 4 3 2 1
h. Assessing internal strengths & weaknesses. 4 3 2 1
i. Matching external opportunities/threats with internal strengths & values. 4 3 2 1
j. Examining campus strategic plans (enrollments, finances, facilities, org., human resources, academic). 4 3 2 1
k. Formulating a library plan. 4 3 2 1
l. Implementing library strategic plan based on allocation/reallocation of resources. 4 3 2 1
m. Review & evaluation of strategic process results. 4 3 2 1

4. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE OVERALL STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESSES AT YOUR LIBRARY?

   a. Highly satisfied (4) _____  c. Somewhat dissatisfied (2) _____
   b. Somewhat satisfied (3) _____  d. Highly Dissatisfied (1) _____
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5. WERE SPECIFIC METHODS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AT THIS LIBRARY DEVELOPED:
   a. Totally by library staff (4) ____  b. Primarily with campus assistance (2) ____
   c. Primarily by library staff (3) ____  d. Other:___________________________ (1) ____

6. WHAT RESOURCES WERE USED IN DEVELOPING YOUR PLANNING PROCESS?
   Estimate of Usefulness:
   Yes No
   a. Consultants 1 2
   b. Courses, seminars 1 2
   c. Books, materials 1 2
   Resources that you found to be particularly helpful:
   (specify):____________________________________

7. WHAT INSTITUTIONAL RESULTS/BENEFITS HAVE BEEN REALIZED TO DATE FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING?
   (Circle a number for those which apply.)
   Extent of Success
   High Mod. Low None
   a. Improved financial position 4 3 2 1
   b. Improved quality of programs 4 3 2 1
   c. Improved reputation 4 3 2 1
   d. Sustained or increased enrollments 4 3 2 1
   e. Cutbacks in programs or resources 4 3 2 1
   f. Improved overall management capabilities 4 3 2 1
   g. Met or adapted to needed change 4 3 2 1
   h. Better identified and provided client needs 4 3 2 1
   i. Became more proactive and less reactive 4 3 2 1
   j. Became more competitive 4 3 2 1
   k. More able to deal with uncertainty 4 3 2 1
   l. Improved internal communication 4 3 2 1
   Other (specify):______________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
8. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE OVERALL RESULTS/BENEFITS OF STRATEGIC PLANNING AT YOUR LIBRARY?

a. Highly Satisfied (4) _____
b. Somewhat Satisfied (3) _____
c. Somewhat Dissatisfied (2) _____
d. Highly Dissatisfied (1) _____

What aspects were you most satisfied with? ________________________________

______________________________________________________________

What aspects were you most dissatisfied with: ____________________________

______________________________________________________________

9. WHAT ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS/CONDITIONS WERE REQUIRED FOR DOING STRATEGIC PLANNING?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual vs. Expected</th>
<th>Much More</th>
<th>Some More</th>
<th>About Exp'd</th>
<th>Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Amount of time involved:
   a.1. length of time to devise methods (specify) ____________
   a.2. length of time for complete process _________________
   a.3. number of years strategic planning has been used _____

b. Estimated number of faculty/staff directly involved in planning: ____________
   b.1. number of faculty _________
   b.2. number of staff _________
   b.3. number of administrators/other _______

c. Organizational structuring for decision processes: ____________

d. Technical requirements:
   d.1. additional information gathering & processing _______
   d.2. additional group skills _______
   d.3. additional communication methods _______
   d.4. other requirements (specify) __________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
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e. Estimated cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.1.</td>
<td>Direct start up costs $___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.2.</td>
<td>Indirect start up costs $__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.3.</td>
<td>Direct ongoing annual costs $________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.4.</td>
<td>Indirect ongoing annual costs $________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Other requirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f.1.</td>
<td>___________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.2.</td>
<td>___________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. WHAT PROBLEMS DID YOU ENCOUNTER IN ESTABLISHING YOUR STRATEGIC PLANNING (SP) PROCESS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Problem</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SP not interwoven into entire management process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. University administration not committed to SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Library administration not committed to SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Purposes of SP not clearly identified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. SP system not simple, flexible, well-designed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. No balance between analytical processes and intuition, judgments, and values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Failure to identify/evaluate planning assumptions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Insufficient managerial conceptual skills; understanding and use of analytical tools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Unrealistic appraisal of uncertainties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Line managers not accepting and being involved in SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Insufficient focus on both SP and current operations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Insufficient attention to implementation of SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Insufficient link between capital allocation and SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Insufficient management reward system for doing SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Too much of SP delegated to a planner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Failure to develop suitable goals and objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Too much faculty/staff resistance to SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Failure to evaluate both campus-level &amp; library plans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Insufficient resources available for SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Insufficient expertise available to do SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other problems (Specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. ___________________________________</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. ___________________________________</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. WHAT ADVICE WOULD YOU GIVE TO OTHER LIBRARIANS CONSIDERING STRATEGIC PLANNING?

a. Most important value of SP is: __________________________________________________________

b. Most difficult thing about SP is: _______________________________________________________

c. Be sure to DO the following: _________________________________________________________

d. Be sure that you DON'T do the following: ______________________________________________

e. Things to watch out for are: _________________________________________________________

f. Ways to save time: _________________________________________________________________

g. If there is a secret to successful SP, it could be: _______________________________________

h. With time & experience SP seems to get:
   h.1. easier (4) ___  h.2. more difficult (3) ___  h.3. stay the same (2) ___  h.4. cannot tell (1) ___

i. Other advice/comments/suggestions: __________________________________________________

Please check one: I would _____ would not _____ like to receive a summary of the survey results.

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
Appendix II

Demographic Data
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

AMERICAN LIBRARY DIRECTORY DATABASE

Library/Institution:

Staff Size:
  Professional Staff:
  Nonprofessional Staff:

Institution Size:
  Student Enrollment:

Faculty:

Financial Support:
  Total Library Income:

  Total Library Materials Expenditures:

  Total Salaries:

Library Holdings:

Date of Founding:
GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, 1990

Northeast
New England
  Maine
  Vermont
  New Hampshire
  Massachusetts
  Connecticut
  Rhode Island

Middle Atlantic
  New York
  New Jersey
  Pennsylvania

South
  South Atlantic
    Maryland
    Delaware
    West Virginia
    District of Columbia
    Virginia
    North Carolina
    South Carolina
    Georgia
    Florida

  East South Central
    Kentucky
    Tennessee
    Mississippi
    Alabama

  West South Central
    Oklahoma
    Arkansas
    Louisiana
    Texas
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North Central
   West North Central
      North Dakota
      South Dakota
      Nebraska
      Kansas
      Minnesota
      Iowa
      Missouri

   East North Central
      Wisconsin
      Michigan
      Illinois
      Ohio
      Indiana

West
   Mountain
      Montana
      Idaho
      Wyoming
      Colorado
      Utah
      Nevada
      Arizona
      New Mexico

Pacific
   Washington
   Oregon
   California
   Hawaii
   Alaska
Appendix III

Libraries Surveyed
1862 MORRILL ACT LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

ALABAMA
Dr. William C. Highfill
University Librarian
Auburn University Libraries
Auburn University, AL 36849-3501
(205) 844-4500

ALASKA
Mr. Paul McCarthy
Director of Libraries
Elmer E. Rasmuson Library
University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Fairbanks, AK 99775
(907) 474-7224

ARIZONA (ARL)
Carla Stoffle, Librarian
University Library
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
(602) 621-2101

ARKANSAS
Mr. John A. Harrison
Director of Libraries
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
(501) 575-4101

CALIFORNIA (ARL)
Mr. Joseph Rosenthal
University Librarian
University of California
245 Main Library
Berkeley, CA 94720
(415) 642-3773
COLORADO  (ARL)
Ms. Joan Chambers  
Director of Libraries  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80523  
(303) 491-1833

CONNECTICUT  (ARL)
Mr. Norman Stevens  
Director, University Library  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, CT 06268  
(203) 486-2219

DELAWARE  (ARL)
Ms. Susan Brynteson  
Director of Libraries  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19717-5267  
(302) 451-2231

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Mr. Albert J. Casciero  
Director, Learning Resources Division  
University of the District of Columbia  
4200 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C.  20008  
(202) 282-7536

FLORIDA  (ARL)
Mrs. Dale B. Canelas  
Director of Libraries  
University of Florida  
210 Library West  
Gainesville, FL 32611  
(904) 392-0342
GEORGIA (ARL)
Dr. William Gray Potter
Director of Libraries
Ilah Dunlap Little Memorial Library
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
(404) 542-0621

HAWAII (ARL)
Mr. John R. Haak
Librarian, University of Hawaii
2500 The Mall
Honolulu, HI 96822
(808) 948-7205

IDAHO
Mr. Ronald W. Force
Acting Dean of Library Services
University Library
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6534

ILLINOIS (ARL)
Mr. David F. Bishop
Urbana-Champaign 230 Library
University of Illinois
1408 W. Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-0790

INDIANA (ARL)
Dr. Emily Mobley
Director of Libraries
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
(317) 494-2900
IOWA (ARL)
Ms. Nancy L. Eaton
Dean of Library Services
Room 302 Parks Library
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-2140
(515) 294-1442

KANSAS
Dr. Brice Hobrock
Dean of Libraries
Kansas State University
Manhattan & Anderson Streets
Manhattan, KS 66506
(913) 532-6516

KENTUCKY (ARL)
Mr. Paul Willis
Director of Libraries
University of Kentucky
127 King Library North
Lexington, KY 40506-0039
(606) 257-3801

LOUISIANA (ARL)
Jennifer Cargill
Director, Troy H. Middleton Library
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
(504) 388-2217

MAINE
Ms. Elaine Albright
Director of Libraries
Raymond H. Fogler Library
University of Maine
Orono, MA 04469
(207) 581-1660
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MARYLAND (ARL)
Dr. H. Joanne Harrar
Director of Libraries
McKeldin Library
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454-3011

MASSACHUSETTS (ARL)
Mr. Richard J. Talbot
Director of Libraries
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003
(413) 545-0284

Jay K. Lucker (ARL)
Director of Libraries
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 253-5651

MICHIGAN (ARL)
Dr. Hiram L. Davis
Director of Libraries
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 355-2341

MINNESOTA
Dr. Thomas W. Shaughnessy
University Librarian
499 Wilson Library
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 624-4520
MISSISSIPPI
Dr. George R. Lewis
Director of Library Services
Mitchell Memorial Library
Mississippi State University
P.O. Box 5408
Mississippi State, MS 39762
(601) 325-3060

MISSOURI
Ms. Martha Alexander Bowman
Director of Libraries
University of Missouri—Columbia
Columbia, MO 65201
(314) 882-4701

MONTANA
Ms. Noreen S. Alldredge
Dean of Libraries
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717-0022
(406) 994-5309

NEBRASKA (ARL)
Mr. Kent Hendrickson
Dean of Libraries
The University Libraries
University of Nebraska--Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0410
(402) 472-2526

NEVADA
Mr. Harold G. Morehouse
Dean of Libraries
Noble H. Getchell Library
University of Nevada-Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0044
(702) 784-6533
NEW HAMPSHIRE
Ms. Ruth Katz
Librarian, Ezekiel W. Diamond Library
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-1541

NEW JERSEY (ARL)
Dr. Joanne Euster
University Librarian
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
(201) 932-7505

NEW MEXICO
Dean, Library
New Mexico State University
Box 30006, Dept. 3475
Las Cruces, NM 88003
(505) 646-1508

NEW YORK (ARL)
Ms. Jan Kennedy-Olsen
Director, Mann Library
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
(607) 255-2285

NORTH CAROLINA (ARL)
Ms. Susan K. Nutter
Director, D. H. Hill Library
North Carolina State University
Box 7111
Raleigh, NC 27695-7111
(919) 737-2595

NORTH DAKOTA
Mr. John Beecher
Director, Library
North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105
(701) 237-8352
OHIO
Mr. William J. Studer
Director of Libraries
Ohio State University
1858 Neil Avenue Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 422-4241

OKLAHOMA
Mr. Edward R. Johnson
Dean of Library Services
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078
(405) 624-6321

OREGON
Dr. Melvin R. George
Director of Libraries
William Jasper Kerr Library
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
(503) 737-3411

PENNSYLVANIA
Ms. Nancy Cline
Dean of University Libraries
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-0401

RHODE ISLAND
Dean of Libraries
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881
(401) 792-2666

SOUTH CAROLINA
Mr. Joseph F. Boykin Jr.
Director, R. M. Cooper Library
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-3001
(803) 656-3026
SOUTH DAKOTA
Dr. Leon Raney
Dean of Libraries
South Dakota State University
Box 2115
Brookings, South Dakota 57007-1098
(605) 688-5106

TENNESSEE
Ms. Paula Kaufman
Dean of Libraries
607 Hodges Library
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-1000
(615) 974-4127

TEXAS (ARL)
Dr. Irene Braden Hoadley
Director, Sterling C. Evans Library
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-8111

UTAH
Dr. Kenneth E. Marks
University Librarian
Milton R. Merrill Library & Learning Resource Program
Utah State University, UMC 30
Logan, UT 84322
(801) 750-2645

VERMONT
Director of Libraries
Bailey/Howe Memorial Library
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405
(802) 656-2020
VIRGINIA
Director, Carol M. Newman Library
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, VA 24060
(703) 231-5593

WASHINGTON (ARL)
Director of Libraries
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-5610
(509) 335-4557

WEST VIRGINIA
Dr. Ruth M. Jackson
Dean of Library Services
Wise Library
P.O. Box 6069
Morgantown, WV 26506-6069
(304) 293-4040

WISCONSIN (ARL)
Director, Memorial Library
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 262-2600

WYOMING
Mr. Keith M. Cottam
Director of Libraries
University of Wyoming
Box 3334, University Station
Laramie, WY 82071
(307) 766-2174
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ALABAMA
Dr. Birdie O. Weir
Director, Joseph F. Drake Memorial Learning Resource Center
Alabama A & M University
P.O. Box 489
Normal, AL 35762
(205) 851-5764

Mrs. Annie G. King
Director
Hollis Burke Frissell Library
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, AL 36088
(205) 727-8892

ARKANSAS
Mr. Edward J. Fontenette
Director
John Brown Watson Memorial Library
University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff
North University Drive
Pine Bluff, AR 71601
(501) 541-6825

DELAWARE
Dr. Richard Bradberry
Director, William C. Jason Library
Delaware State College
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 736-4000

FLORIDA
Dr. Nicholas Gaymon
Director of Libraries
Samuel H. Coleman Memorial Library
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, FL 32207
(904) 599-3370
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GEORGIA
Dr. Carole R. Taylor
Director, Henry Alexander Hunt Memorial Library
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, GA 31030
(912) 825-6342

KENTUCKY
Mrs. Karen McDaniel
Director, Blazer Library
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 227-6852

LOUISIANA
Mrs. Georgia W. Brown
Director, John B. Cade Library
Southern University
Southern Branch P.O.
Baton Route, LA 70813

MARYLAND
Mrs. Jessie C. Smith
Director, Frederick Douglass Library
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore
Princess Anne, MD 21853
(301) 651-2200, ext. 260

MISSISSIPPI
Dr. Epsy Yearby Hendricks
Director, Alcorn State University Library
Alcorn State University
Lorman, MS 39096
(601) 877-6350

MISSOURI
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Wilson
Director, Inman E. Page Library
Lincoln University
P.O. Box 29
Jefferson City, MO 65101
(314) 681-5501
NORTH CAROLINA
Mrs. Alene Young
Director, F. D. Bluford Library
North Carolina A & T State University
1601 E. Market St.
Greensboro, NC 27411
(919) 344-7782

OKLAHOMA
Dr. Alberta Mayberry
Director
General Lamar Harrison Library
Langston University
Langston, OK 73050
(405) 272-0431

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dr. Barbara Williams Jenkins
Dean of Library & Information Services
Miller F. Whitaker Library
South Carolina State College
P.O. Box 7491
Orangeburg, SC 29117-0001
(803) 536-7045

TENNESSEE
Mrs. Yildiz B. Binkley
Director, Libraries & Learning Resources
Brown-Daniel Library
Tennessee State University
3500 John A. Merritt Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37209-1561
(615) 320-3682

TEXAS
Dr. Dudley Yates
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