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Questions

• Is the California State University using systematic planning? At the campus or system level?

• If so, is it helping campuses adapt given the current context?
What are the “coming” changes? (Keller 2008)

• “Massification” and 4 tiers of institutions
  – R1, small liberal arts, AASCU, 2 year
• Accommodate adult learners
• Rethink departments and disciplines
• Revise cost structures
The California State University

- Largest system in country
- 23 campuses
- 412,000 students per year
- 43,000 faculty and staff
- AASCU institution, largely training for workforce, not graduate school or research
- Current context like many other state institutions
Declining revenue and enrollment instability

[Graph showing State Allocation and Enrollment for The California State University from 1999-00 to 2011-12. The graph includes two lines: one for Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and another for CSU State Allocation (in billions). The note at the bottom of the graph states: "FTES in 2010-11 is budgeted enrollment rather than actual." ]
### Remediation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Freshmen</th>
<th>Number Proficient in English and Math</th>
<th>% Proficient in English and Math</th>
<th>Number Proficient in English Only</th>
<th>% Proficient in English Only</th>
<th>Number Proficient in Mathemat ics Only</th>
<th>% Proficient in Mathemat ics Only</th>
<th>Number Proficient in Neither</th>
<th>% Proficient in Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>12,711</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Latino</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Latino</td>
<td>16,554</td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,137</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,462</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Persistence and Graduation (2010 report)

**First-Time Freshmen Rates**
- 1-Yr Continuation: 81.9% (CSU), 72.2% (Peers)
- 6-Yr Graduation: 46.1% (CSU), 43.2% (Peers)

**CC Transfers**
- 1-Yr Continuation: 82.0% (CSU), 78.8% (Peers)
- 6-Yr Graduation: 69.0% (CSU), 65.9% (Peers)
For-profits have more FTES than CSU, UC, non-profits

- For-profits: 379,192 (19%)
- Non-profits: 144,970 (7%)
- UC: 180,412 (9%)
- CSU: 332,165 (17%)
- CCC: 970,780 (48%)
For-profits a major completions contributor in California

- UC: 46,138 (15%)
- CSU: 77,085 (24%)
- CCC: 102,408 (33%)
- Non-profits: 36,387 (12%)
- For-profits: 51,242 (16%)
Context calls for “Strategy”

- Declining state revenues and unstable enrollment
- Increased desire for accountability
  - 60% fully qualified and need remediation
  - Graduation rates 46%/ 6 system wide
- Increasing competition from private for profits
Traditional Planning

1. Mission/vision/values
2. SWOT
3. Strategic Goals
4. Implementation steps
5. Benchmarks developed
6. Progress monitored
# Traditional Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional steps</th>
<th>CSU Sacramento 2007-2010</th>
<th>CSU System wide 2008-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission/ vision</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plans</td>
<td>Stalled...</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarks developed</td>
<td>Stalled...</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress monitored</td>
<td>No monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Breakdowns in process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional steps</th>
<th>CSU Sacramento 2007-2010</th>
<th>CSU System wide 2008-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission/ vision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plans</td>
<td>Goals too broad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of incentive to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent leadership support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarks developed</td>
<td>Lack of consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress monitored</td>
<td>Priorities shifted</td>
<td>Leadership change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causes of Breakdowns

- Plans too broad, not supported by leadership, not flexible enough
- 2009-2010 brought large budget changes followed by big enrollment reductions
- Short term external factors driving priorities
- Default to number 1 priority; manage enrollment.
A Different Planning Approach

How can public organizations balance “business” decisions with broad public policy goals in a more timely fashion?

Need a way to make better decisions in short term that are strategic in long term.
Planning is Not (Keller 1983)

- It is not the production of a blueprint.
- It is not a set of platitudes.
- It is not the personal vision of the president or board of trustees.
- It is not a collection of departmental plans, compiled and edited.
- Strategic decision making is not done by planners.
- It is not a substitution of numbers for important tangibles.
- It is not a form of surrender to market conditions and trends.
- Strategic planning is not something done at an annual retreat.
- It is not a way of eliminating risks.
- It is not an attempt to read tea leaves and outwit the future
Better Planning Process (Keller 2008)

- Active vs. passive
- Outward looking
- Competitive
- Focus on decisions (not plans or goals)
- Blends rational, economic, political, personal
- Long term fate of institution is focus
Academic Strategy must

• Be true to values and history of institution
• Identify academic and financial strengths
• Tap abilities and priorities of leaders
• Understand context and market
• Understand competitive environment
Two Successful Efforts

Humboldt State University

- The task force is charged with: a) defining academic programs; b) developing the process for prioritizing programs; c) developing the criteria, as well as their weightings, for program prioritization by which programs will be recommended for increased support, level support, decreased support, reorganization or elimination; and d) ensuring that these criteria fit Humboldt State University’s mission, strategic plan and educational outcomes.
- Nov 2007-Feb 2009
- Closed several programs, recommended changes to others. Saved $600,000 of needed $1.3 million goal.

San Francisco State University

- Team charge: Solicit, review, evaluate proposals for budget savings in academic affairs; re-envision the University, provide advise on imminent budget matters.
- December 2009-now.
- Referendum on campus to consider major re-structuring. President considering results. Attempting to save $32 million. Likely to reduce from 8 to 6 colleges and then restructure further within new colleges.
Components of Decisions

• Content
  – Short term fiscal focus
  – Keeping long term organization in perspective
  – Addressing both structures and costs

• Process
  – Manageable group of people (25)
  – Data rich and transparent
  – Time limited
  – Broad consultation on framed choices
Implications for Traditional Planning

• Can be too slow and inflexible for large public organizations
• Public organizations don’t control resources or policy decisions
• Important tools embedded in traditional planning but need to be adapted to public sector (data, environmental scanning, monitoring)
• Balancing short term and long term in key decisions
Questions for Public Administration

• How to update “strategic” planning for public organizations?
• How to facilitate better use of data in decision making?
• What types of decision making structures facilitate both speed and transparency?
• How to balance the “business” and public policy responsibilities of public organizations?