

THE EFFECTS OF EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
STRATEGIC PLANNING

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
University of South Alabama  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Doctorate

in

Educational Leadership

by

Rosalie A. Carpenter

B. S., Stetson University, 1998

M.Ed., University of South Carolina, 2000

M.S., Case Western Reserve University, 2014

May 2019

ProQuest Number: 13856820

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13856820

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I am very thankful for this opportunity and would like to acknowledge several individuals for their incredible support. First, to Dr. Tracey Childs, I'd like to thank you for encouraging me to apply to this program. You are a cheerleader, taskmaster, sounding board, and wonderful friend all rolled into one. I am eternally grateful for your nudge.

To my committee chair, Dr. Ronald A. Styron, Jr., I am indebted to you for your unwavering support, words of encouragement, and incredible way of breaking down what I was struggling with in a way that enabled me to push through. You are a masterful chair, professor, and mentor. To my entire committee, Dr. Raymond Barclay, Dr. Angela Coleman, and Dr. Gurupreet Khalsa, your willingness to accept this responsibility on top of already full plates was humbling, but your enthusiasm, feedback, and support of this work is overwhelming. Thank you for your efforts to bring out my best. I'd also like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Jason Draper, who was instrumental in working with me locally on data analysis. You helped make the data come alive.

To my cohort members, I owe my sincere gratitude, especially after I moved 1,000 miles away in the middle of the program. You were patient with my technology needs and are some of the best education professionals I have ever met. Our industry is stronger because you all are in it. I'd be remiss if I did not especially acknowledge two cohort members, Kristin Odom and Melissa Webb, for being my eyes and ears in

Alabama. Your friendship and support means the world to me, along with the extra chargers you brought to class on my behalf.

To one of my previous bosses, turned mentor and best friend, Dr. Christopher Kandus-Fisher, thank you for believing in me from the very beginning. I cherish our friendship and strive to make you proud every day. Thank you for showing me the way.

To my sister, Amy Dedes, thank you for doing the heavy lifting with our family these past few years while I completed this endeavor. Thank you for sending me photos of the kids, cheering me on, and believing I could do anything because I was your big sister.

And to my husband, Todd Carpenter, words cannot express my sincere gratitude and appreciation for the sacrifices you make for me. You always know when to provide the spark, the crying shoulder, or the comic relief when I need it most. You are the best thing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                              | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| LIST OF TABLES .....                                         | vii  |
| ABSTRACT .....                                               | viii |
| CHAPTER I – OVERVIEW OF STUDY .....                          | 1    |
| Introduction .....                                           | 1    |
| Problem Statement .....                                      | 4    |
| Purpose of Study .....                                       | 5    |
| Rational and Significance .....                              | 6    |
| Role of the Researcher .....                                 | 7    |
| Research Questions .....                                     | 8    |
| Assumptions .....                                            | 8    |
| Delimitations .....                                          | 9    |
| Definition of Terms .....                                    | 9    |
| CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....                      | 11   |
| Introduction.....                                            | 11   |
| Theoretical Framework.....                                   | 11   |
| Relevant Literature.....                                     | 16   |
| History of Strategic Planning.....                           | 16   |
| The Concept of Strategy .....                                | 18   |
| Strategic Planning Models .....                              | 20   |
| Contemporary Models .....                                    | 23   |
| Challenges of Strategic Planning.....                        | 26   |
| Benefits of Strategic Planning .....                         | 29   |
| Roles of Leaders within the Strategic Planning Process.....  | 30   |
| Preparing for Change and the Strategic Planning Process..... | 32   |
| Financial Considerations Related to Strategic Planning.....  | 36   |
| The Global Landscape of Strategic Planning.....              | 41   |
| CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY .....                              | 53   |
| Introduction.....                                            | 53   |

|                                                                |         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Research Questions .....                                       | 53      |
| Research Design.....                                           | 54      |
| Participants.....                                              | 55      |
| Setting .....                                                  | 57      |
| Leader Profiles .....                                          | 58      |
| Instrumentation .....                                          | 59      |
| Procedures.....                                                | 62      |
| Interviews.....                                                | 62      |
| Questionnaires.....                                            | 62      |
| Data Analysis .....                                            | 63      |
| Qualitative.....                                               | 63      |
| Quantitative.....                                              | 64      |
| <br>CHAPTER IV – PRESENTATION OF DATA.....                     | <br>68  |
| Introduction.....                                              | 68      |
| Coding.....                                                    | 68      |
| Findings.....                                                  | 69      |
| Research Question One.....                                     | 70      |
| Research Question Two .....                                    | 80      |
| Research Question Three .....                                  | 84      |
| Research Question Four.....                                    | 90      |
| <br>CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....               | <br>98  |
| Introduction.....                                              | 98      |
| Conclusions and Discussion .....                               | 98      |
| Related Conclusions.....                                       | 112     |
| Limitations .....                                              | 113     |
| Recommendations for Future Research .....                      | 113     |
| <br>CHAPTER VI – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE ..... | <br>115 |
| Introduction.....                                              | 115     |
| Problem Restated .....                                         | 115     |
| Solution .....                                                 | 116     |
| Leadership Platform.....                                       | 117     |
| Leadership.....                                                | 118     |
| Beliefs .....                                                  | 118     |
| Values .....                                                   | 119     |
| Implementation Strategy .....                                  | 121     |
| Sustaining the Solution .....                                  | 129     |
| Overarching Considerations.....                                | 130     |
| Financial.....                                                 | 130     |
| Integrating Diversity and Inclusion Efforts in Planning .....  | 133     |

|                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Leading Change in a Political Environment .....      | 133 |
| REFERENCES .....                                     | 137 |
| APPENDICES .....                                     | 151 |
| Appendix A Interview Protocol for Leader .....       | 151 |
| Appendix B Interview Protocol for Colleague .....    | 153 |
| Appendix C Survey Instrument (LOI-SELF) .....        | 155 |
| Appendix D Survey Instrument (LOI-OTHER) .....       | 160 |
| Appendix E Permission to Use Instrument .....        | 165 |
| Appendix F IRB Approval Letter .....                 | 166 |
| Appendix G Consent form for Questionnaire .....      | 167 |
| Appendix H Consent form for Interview Subjects ..... | 168 |
| BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....                            | 169 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                  | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Demographics of Respondents .....                                                   | 57   |
| 2. Institutional Demographics .....                                                    | 58   |
| 3. Qualitative Research Questions and Corresponding Interview Questions .....          | 60   |
| 4. Quantitative Research Questions and Corresponding Instrument Questions .....        | 61   |
| 5. Reliability of Survey Questions Related to Frame Sequence .....                     | 66   |
| 6. Criteria for Coding.....                                                            | 69   |
| 7. Identification of the Source of Data by Research Question.....                      | 70   |
| 8. Leadership Orientation Frame Scores of Leaders.....                                 | 71   |
| 9. Quantification of Leadership Frames from Interviews with the Leaders .....          | 72   |
| 10. Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Style for LOI-Other .....                    | 77   |
| 11. Perceptions of Effectiveness as Indicated by LOI-Other.....                        | 79   |
| 12. Leadership Profiles as Determined by LOI-Other .....                               | 80   |
| 13. Rank Order Comparison of Mean Frame Scores .....                                   | 91   |
| 14. Comparison Analysis of Frame Perceptions Using One-Sample <i>t</i> -tests.....     | 92   |
| 15. Comparison Analysis of Effectiveness Scores Using One-Sample <i>t</i> -tests ..... | 96   |
| 16. Abridged Leadership Profiles .....                                                 | 101  |
| 17. Eight-Step Implementation Plan .....                                               | 122  |

## **ABSTRACT**

Carpenter, Rosalie A., Ed.D., University of South Alabama, May 2019. The Effects of Executive Leadership on Higher Education Strategic Planning. Chair of Committee: Ronald A. Styron, Jr., Ed.D.

College presidents and leadership teams have repeatedly engaged in strategic planning processes over the past several decades, with the intention of creating frameworks that would ensure sustainability and create competitive advantages for their institutions in the marketplace. However, even with decades of these initiatives underway, pressure is mounting on higher education, due to rising costs and transparent reporting of the relationship of these costs to student success and post-graduation outcomes (Billups, 2015; Blumenstyk, 2015). As institutions work to address rapidly changing demographics, student needs, and technology, they are faced with reductions in public funding and dwindling endowments. Additionally, for many small, private universities, strategic planning processes are used as a tool to respond to financial crises (Carey, 2014). Many small, private colleges are highly dependent on tuition revenues, have been historically operating on low margins, and have few financial reserves available (Carey, 2014). Therefore, higher education leaders should better understand how to implement effective strategic planning processes across their institutions to combat the critical issues they face (Blumenstyk, 2015; Scott, 2013).

This mixed methods study used the leadership framework created by Bolman and Deal (2013) to create a leadership profile for three leaders of strategic planning efforts at small, private institutions. Data collection methods included conducting semi-structured interviews with the leaders and two employees at each institution, as well as administering the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Bolman & Deal, 1990) to the leaders, as well as a number of individuals who worked closely with the leaders, during the planning process.

Data analysis showed each of the three leaders had a different primary frame, with some commonality in their secondary frame. Leaders with higher congruence with their colleagues were perceived to be more effective as leaders, and the leader with the lowest congruence was scored highest in the political frame. Study findings led to the creation of a leadership profile for each of the three leaders. The profile further revealed key actions the leaders took and barriers they faced when leading strategic planning processes. Additionally, statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style, as compared to the perceptions of their colleagues.

The findings led to the development of an implementation plan that infused design thinking with Kotter's (1996) eight steps of successful large-scale change and Bolman and Deal's (2013) leadership framing theory. The implementation plan was written for use by a president of a small, private institution prior to beginning the strategic planning process and is in alignment with the dissertation in practice model.

# **CHAPTER I**

## **OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY**

### **Introduction**

Strategic planning has become a pervasive practice over the past several decades in higher education. There are many possible explanations for this increased usage, including that it is often a requirement by accrediting bodies and donors, that there are normative pressures because strategic planning is seen as a sign of professional practice and a necessity for creating legitimacy, and that institutions believe they need to copy what everyone else is doing (Bryson, 2010). Additionally, for many small, private universities, strategic planning is born of necessity to respond to financial crises (Carey, 2014).

Leadership plays a key role in the development, implementation, and ongoing management of the strategic planning process. Typically, leaders of strategic planning processes take one of two approaches: fixing what is wrong or focusing on what the organization is doing well and building a future around those practices (Leitzel, Corvey, & Hiley, 2004). Institutions often begin their efforts with the intention of producing a guiding document that will enable all stakeholders to work together seamlessly toward a shared vision. However, many institutions are left with a cumbersome document that is placed on a website and rarely referenced again, and leaders of strategic planning processes are left wondering where the process went wrong (Billups, 2015).

In 1965, a professional organization comprised of 300 members with physical planning backgrounds was established and named the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP). It was not until the mid-1980s, when higher education began to experience economic and technological challenges coupled with costs outpacing inflation, that there was a shift toward strategic planning (Dooris, 2002). The shift has been marked by Keller's (1983) highly regarded book, *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Keller highlighted the stagnant method higher education used regarding planning, and he did not believe the approach senior leadership teams were taking would keep pace with the rapidly changing environment. Interestingly, the key issues Keller noted that needed a shift in approach were not very different from the issues higher education faced 32 years later, as reported by Blumenstyk (2015): shifting student clientele, attack on the liberal arts, new competition, constricting finances, budget reductions, outside influence minimizing autonomy, and rapid changes in the academic and demographic arenas. To respond to these issues, Keller (1983) recommended a new approach called the "Joint Big Decisions Committee" (p. 61). The concept was designed to bring together a small number of key administrators, senior faculty, junior faculty, and perhaps a student or trustee, depending on the institution. The role of the Committee was to engage in a strategic planning process and serve in an advisory capacity to the president of the institution.

Decision-makers in higher education began to adopt strategic planning at increased rates, with the intent to solve pressing issues and create competitive advantages in the marketplace. As quickly as the process began to take off, there were early criticisms of strategic planning. Critiques were typically rooted in concerns that the plans

were too linear, relied too heavily on available data, were not aligned with budgets, were too formalized and structured, ignored organizational context and culture, and discouraged creativity and positive change (Birnbaum, 2000; Mintzberg, 1994; Peters, 1994; Paulsen, & Smart, 2001). In more recent literature, organizational learning, understanding organizational culture, creativity, and enhancing fiscal sustainability have become central aspects of strategic planning as leaders seek the right balance to create change in fast-paced environments (Antheil & Spinelli, 2011; Carey, 2014; DeJong & Elfring, 2010; Latham, 2013).

The Age of Disruption in higher education is described as the recurrent changes catalyzed by new technologies which threaten institutions (Norris, Brodnick, Lefrere, Gilmour, & Baer, 2013). To effectively function in such an environment, colleges should develop a capacity for resilience through strategic planning (Dziuban, Moskal, Cavanagh, & Watts, 2012). Auld (2010) asserted that the challenges associated with strategic planning in higher education are well documented, but the author noted that there is little information regarding leadership and how to develop effective strategies in the current disruptive environment.

According to Dr. Kate Canales, “an industry is ready to be disrupted when one of three things happens: it outgrows its business model; its offer is no longer appealing to its customer base; or technology has pushed it out of relevance. All three of those things are happening in higher ed right now” (Lorenzo, 2016, p. 4). The time is ripe for university leaders to reconsider the central design of higher education. Design thinking, sometimes called human-centered design, is primed to make a substantial impact on higher education, should leaders use it as a tool to guide problem-solving and strategic planning.

Leadership plays a key role in how a plan is developed, implemented, and managed. Leaders determine who participates, what information is communicated, and how feedback is included. Frequently, stakeholders look to college presidents to provide the charge and lead planning efforts (Auld, 2010). With that in mind, it is concerning that the tenure of college presidents has decreased almost 20%, from an average of 8.5 years in 2006 to 7.1 years in 2011 (American Council on Education, 2017). Additional indications of concern regarding the changing demographics of the presidency include the following: only 25% of college presidents have previously been presidents, 58% of college presidents are over the age of 60, and 15% of college presidents came from outside of higher education (American Council of Education, 2017). These nontraditional presidents often have steep learning curves when it comes to running complex educational organizations. Accordingly, the role of the executive leadership team has become paramount to the effectiveness and overall vitality of the college (Soliday & Mann, 2013). The executive leadership team, especially at small, private institutions, is often heavily involved in the day-to-day operation of the institution, with little time allocated to long-term planning.

### **Problem Statement**

The problem addressed in this study deals with the lack of research-proven strategic planning practices used by higher education leaders at small, private institutions. Pressure is mounting on higher education as the industry continues to face intense criticism for rising costs and underperformance. Leaders should better understand how to implement effective strategic planning processes across their institutions to combat the critical issues they face, such as decreasing federal and state funding, increasing demand,

changing demographics of customers, compelling new models for the delivery of education, increasing demands for accountability from the federal government, and continually being asked to do more with less (Blumenstyk, 2015; Scott, 2013). College presidents and leadership teams have engaged repeatedly in strategic planning processes over the past several decades with the intention that they would create a framework to achieve desired success and value propositions that form competitive advantages. However, even with decades of these initiatives underway, higher education remains in crisis with tangible threats to the traditional college experience (Billups, 2015).

Many small, private colleges are highly dependent on tuition revenues, have been historically operating on slim margins, and have few reserves available (Carey, 2014). Increasing the capacity for higher education to be fiscally and socially responsible is an issue of concern, not only to the students, faculty, and staff in direct contact with the institution, but also to society as a whole, due to the impact higher education has on community wellbeing (Arnove, Torres, & Franz, 2013). The benefit of assessing leadership styles and understanding key characteristics is to enable leaders involved in all phases of strategic planning processes to advance positive change. Furthermore, a leader who does not evaluate their own performance, merits, and deficiencies is less likely to be effective, as well as a much less astute critic of the institution (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions. Higher education is an increasingly complex, 24-hour business straddling the demands to critically think at a high-level regarding how to position the institution to ensure sustainability in five, 10,

and 20 years. A desired outcome of this study was to provide insight for university presidents and executive leadership teams on how to increase institutional effectiveness using strategic planning at small, private institutions. This study aimed to generate research to better understand the profile of leaders of strategic plans, identify key aspects that advanced the strategic planning process and barriers to the process. Through the emergence of themes from interviews and data from a questionnaire, the researcher developed informed recommendations to impact how higher education leaders plan, approach, and operationalize strategic planning as a means for change.

### **Rationale and Significance**

This study was significant because it illuminated processes and practices that could lead to more effective strategic planning at small, private colleges and universities. The researcher chose this demographic of institutions because the current business models of many small, private colleges are not sustainable, as they often are highly dependent on tuition revenue with little reserves available (Rivard, 2013). This fragile financial foundation has led leaders to conclude that major changes will be necessary to respond to the education crisis to combat further closings and mergers (Carlson, 2013; Jones, 2011; Taylor, 2010).

Presidents are often on the defense, communicating with a wide variety of constituents to whom they are accountable, including trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, donors, athletic boosters, community leaders, accrediting bodies, and college rankings. Effective strategic plans should provide relief for presidents and executive leadership, act as a unifying tool for their community, and offer a compelling vision to share consistently across all constituents. The researcher believes that institutions

embark on strategic planning with positive intentions, but often institutions do not produce transformational results. Therefore, the researcher sought to uncover factors that contribute to the success of strategic plans, as well as reveal leadership strategies to overcome common barriers leaders face during the strategic planning process.

### **Role of the Researcher**

The researcher is a full-time senior administrator who provides leadership and strategic direction to the co-curricular aspects of the student experience, has been employed in higher education for over 18 years, and is a doctoral student. The researcher has served on strategic planning steering committees six times at different institutions of employment and has experienced strategic planning processes that have been both effective and ineffective in creating desired transformational change for the institutions. These experiences—coupled with interactions with faculty, administration, and trustees—have guided the development of the research topic as a problem of practice.

The dissertation in practice for a professional practice doctorate (Ed.D.) is different from a traditional Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.). The purpose of a dissertation in practice (DIP) is to describe a current problem of practice and conduct research that generates appropriate and contextualized solutions to relevant issues in higher education. The emphasis of Ph.D. programs is to prepare graduates to become academic scholars, while Ed.D. programs prepare graduates to become practitioners capable of conducting and applying research to solve complex problems. Therefore, this research study was a dissertation in practice, in which the researcher analyzed potential solutions to a problem and offered solutions grounded in both change theory and leadership theory.

## **Research Questions**

Strategic planning occurs in very high numbers at institutions throughout the world. While it often begins with honorable intentions, strategic plans frequently result in a long-range planning document that either goes on a shelf or lacks compelling strategy to overcome critical issues facing higher education. Therefore, the researcher sought to answer the following research questions:

RQ #1: Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is the leadership profile of leaders of strategic plans?

RQ #2: What are the key aspects (steps, decisions, actions, activities and/or strategies) that leaders of plans do that can be attributed to the development of the plan?

RQ #3: What barriers exist, perceived or otherwise, that inhibit individuals and/or institutions from developing and implementing strategic plans?

RQ#4: What kind of relationship is there between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style and the perceptions of their colleagues?

## **Assumptions**

Assumptions are statements relevant to the study and assumed to be true. The researcher assumed that the majority of the personnel at higher education institutions view strategic the planning process as a tool that can lead to positive change and increased institutional effectiveness. The researcher assumed that the leader of the strategic planning process has the greatest ability to impact the facilitation of the planning process. Therefore, it was also assumed that the leader would have a strong desire to lead

the process effectively and to the best of their ability. Regarding the participants of the study, the following assumptions were made:

- Leaders would answer interview questions honestly.
- Participants would answer the survey questions honestly.
- The researcher would protect the anonymity of leaders and participants.
- Participants would be able to discontinue participation in the survey at any point they wished.

### **Delimitations**

Delimitations are the boundaries established for the study by the researcher. The researcher limited this study to three small, private colleges in the United States. Participants did not exceed 30 per institution. Furthermore, the interviews were conducted during the fall 2018 semester.

### **Definition of Terms**

*Change implementation:* Change implementation is defined as actions taken by leaders in order to support new strategies and maintain outstanding performance in a dynamic environment (Spector, 2013).

*Leadership:* Leadership is defined as the ability to support and enable a group of people to accomplish a common task (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

*Organizational development:* According to Spector (2013), organizational development is a field that “views organizations as open systems, sees alignment and responsiveness as necessary components of outstanding performance, and emphasizes potential for collaborative effort, individual contributions, and growth” (p. vii).

*Practical significance:* Practical significance refers to the importance or usefulness of the results in some real-world context (Ellis, 2010; Kirk, 1996).

*Strategic management:* Strategic management deals with the major intended and emergent initiatives undertaken by leaders that involve the utilization of resources to enhance performance in their external environments (Nag, Hambrick, & Chen, 2007).

*Strategic planning:* According to Bryson (2010), strategic planning is defined as “a deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is, what it does, and why it does it” (p. 256).

*Transformational change:* Transformational change is a type of change that alters organizational structures, affects organizational assumptions and ideologies, and is a collective, institution-wide undertaking with connection to institutional effectiveness (Eckel & Kezar, 2003).

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

College presidents and leadership teams have made strategic planning a pervasive process over the past several decades. Strategic planning is designed to create frameworks for colleges to achieve desired success and form a competitive advantage in the marketplace. However, even after decades of strategic planning, higher education remains in crisis with tangible threats to the traditional college experience (Blumenstyk, 2015). Therefore, understanding the implications of the leadership of the process should be critically examined.

This chapter includes a review of current literature pertaining to strategic planning initiatives in higher education and is organized into the following sections: theoretical framework, history, strategic planning models, challenges, benefits, roles of leaders, preparing for change and the strategic planning process, financial considerations related to the strategic planning process, and the global landscape for strategic planning in higher education.

#### **Theoretical Framework**

Leadership plays a key role in the development, implementation, and ongoing management of the strategic planning process. Leadership styles vary by the person and

the situation or the task that needs to be accomplished. Bolman and Deal (2013) developed four perspectives, referred to as frames, for understanding leadership style. A frame defined as “a mental model—a set of ideas and assumptions—that you carry in your head to help you understand and negotiate a particular territory” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 10). The frames in Bolman and Deal’s (2013) four-frame leadership theory are structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

- The *structural frame* emphasizes goals and efficiency. It assumes that leaders operate by defining clear, established goals. Leaders organize people into specific roles and coordinate diverse activities through policies, rules, and chain of command. Structural leaders value analysis and data, keep their eye on the bottom line, set clear directions, hold people accountable for results, and try to solve organizational problems with either new policies or rules through restructuring.
- The *human resource frame* focuses attention on human needs and assumes that organizations that meet basic needs will work better than those that do not. Human resource leaders value relationships and feelings and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment. They tend to define problems in individual or interpersonal terms and look for ways to adjust the organization to fit the people.
- The *political frame* assumes that organizations are coalitions composed of individuals and interest groups competing for scarce resources. Conflict is seen as a normal byproduct of collective action, since there are enduring differences in the values and beliefs of groups and individuals. Political leaders spend much of

their time networking, creating coalitions, building a power base, bargaining, and negotiating compromises.

- The *symbolic frame* sees a chaotic world in which meaning and predictability are social creations and facts are interpretative rather than objective. Organizations develop symbols and cultures that shape human behavior unobtrusively and provide a shared sense of mission and identity. Symbols are created to reduce confusion, while myths, rituals, ceremonies, and sagas help people to find meaning from their experiences. Symbolic leaders instill a sense of enthusiasm and commitment through charisma and drama. They pay diligent attention to myths, ceremonies, stories, and other symbolic forms.

The frames were developed to capture differences of worldviews, experiences and perspectives (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Although there are numerous organizational theories, this model of leadership is applicable for this dissertation study because it can help generate a more comprehensive profile of each leader by rank ordering the use of all four frames, which reveals if they approach situations from leadership-oriented frames or management-oriented frames. By utilizing this framework, leaders can also get a baseline analysis of their frame usage, which they can leverage to further develop their approach to strategic planning using multiple frames. Past research conducted on leadership frame usage in relation to leadership effectiveness by Bolman and Deal (1991) showed that managers often use only one or two frames, but effective leaders use three or more frames (multi-frames). Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) suggested that the ability to use several frames and switch from one to another may reflect a higher level

of cognitive ability. This model has proven how leaders' thinking relates to leadership effectiveness and that a multi-frame orientation yields the most effective leaders.

Goleman (2000) emphasized that leaders cannot rely on just one or two leadership styles but should become proficient in as many as they can. The most effective leaders switch flexibly among their leadership styles. Bolman and Deal's (2013) framework shows similarity to Bensimon et al.'s (1989) and Goleman's (2000) studies. Successful leaders may need to operate within most or all of these frameworks depending on circumstances. An effective leader should utilize multiple frames and have the wisdom to appropriately match frames to situations. The ability to use multiple frames is required where leaders adapt their styles to the context in which they are operating.

Since the scope of this dissertation study was to identify the most effective leadership frame(s) for leading positive change, it was appropriate to also use Kotter's (1996) seminal work on change management and strategy implementation, *Leading Change*, as part of the theoretical framework. Kotter's eight-step change model indicates that establishing a sense of urgency is the first step in the eight-stage process of creating change. Without this crucial step, employees will remain comfortable, often in mediocrity, resisting change rather than identifying opportunities that can propel the organization forward. Steps two through eight in creating change are: build the guiding team, get the vision right, communicate for buy-in, empower action, create short-term wins, don't let up, and make change stick. This framework is supported by the beliefs that change is a process that happens over time rather than being a one-time event, that there is value in working through each step, and that leaders who skip steps and try to

force change more quickly will lead to decisions that do not produce the desired outcomes.

There are two other theories that are especially applicable to resolving the problems higher education is experiencing when implementing strategic planning. Appreciative inquiry (AI) is the first of these theories (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Appreciative inquiry is an organizational change approach that challenges traditional change models designed to look for problems, evaluate the problems, and determine a solution for the problems. The authors suggest that when people approach change by looking for problems and focus on what is wrong or broken, they are limiting their ability to create possibilities pertaining to what could exist. The basic tenet of appreciative inquiry is that an organization will grow in whichever direction people in the organization focus their attention. By paying attention to problems, people emphasize problems. Appreciative inquiry suggests that people should instead look for what works in an organization and create a future around those strengths.

A second theory relevant to strategic planning is systems theory, which allows the observer to be a participant in the whole system while resisting the urge to compartmentalize the problem, forcing the observer to consider the impact on the entire organization and not just one area (Batra, Kaushik & Kalia, 2010). Systems theory is designed to help people understand the system's problems and find solutions to those problems by examining the root causes and considering all of them as a collective. By examining the links and connections of the whole system, patterns and theories emerge which may offer insights and new meanings and unleash creativity (Capelo, Lopes, & Mata, 2015). Additionally, using AI and systems theory together could create a robust

platform to generate ideas and then review for impact on the whole. Using systems theory as a framework to review the data collected during the appreciative inquiry process would be a substantial improvement from colleges determining potential solutions in silos. This approach would eliminate operating from a limited purview and enhance the learning process across the institution.

## **Relevant Literature**

### **History of Strategic Planning**

While many people assume that strategic planning originated in the corporate sector, the history of strategic planning actually began with military operations. The origin of the word *strategy* comes from the Greek work *strategos*, which means ‘army’ and ‘to lead’ (Bracker, 1980). The United States Army focused on setting aside a finite amount of time to discuss various options, determine a best course of action, document it, and then distribute that plan (Mintzberg, 1994). After World War II, the need for a concept of strategy related to business became greater, as business moved from a relatively stable environment into a more rapidly changing and competitive environment (Bracker, 1980). Some of the first modern writers to relate the concept of strategy to business were Von Neumann and Morgenstern in 1947 (Bracker, 1980). Building on the military concept, the corporate sector began to adopt strategic planning as a business development process in the 1950s, and it became more popular and widespread in the 1960s and 1970s; it was temporarily cast aside in favor of Total Quality Management (TQM) and picked up again in the 1990s (Lerner, 1999).

Higher education experienced a boom in the 1960s and 1970s when planning consisted primarily of expansion and the creation of new facilities to meet the demand

(Dooris, 2002). In 1965, a professional organization comprised of 300 members with physical planning backgrounds was established and called the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP). It was not until the mid-1980s, when higher education began to experience economic and technological challenges and costs outpacing inflation, that there was a shift toward strategic planning (Dooris, 2002).

It is important to note that while higher education professionals were critical of the process early on, they ultimately supported the role and purpose of strategic planning, and by the mid-1990s strategic planning gained popularity in higher education (Mintzberg, 1994; Peters, 1994). It then began to be incorporated into some regional accreditation processes, and, in 1998, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation's (CHEA) Recognition Standards began recommending "evidence of policies and procedures that stress planning and implementing strategies for change" (Dooris, 2002, p. 28).

In more recent literature, organizational learning, understanding organizational culture, design-thinking, innovation, and creativity have become central aspects of strategic planning, with leaders trying to find the right approach to create change in an ever-changing environment (Antheil & Spinelli, 2011; DeJong & Elfring, 2010; Kolko, 2018; Latham, 2013). Additionally, especially for small, private institutions planning efforts tend to be more directly focused on finances than they did over the past 10-20 years (Seltzer, 2018). They tend to be less aspirational and more broad-based. Effective leadership is not only knowing what to change, but how to change it. Transformation is about getting people to think differently and change mindsets, as much as it is about improving processes and realigning budgets. Change should not be thought of as an

isolated phenomenon, but rather as a mechanism for continual improvement (Eckel & Kezar, 2003).

### **The Concept of Strategy**

In order to better understand various strategic planning models, it is important to understand the evolution of the concept of strategy. Researchers began assessing strategy in the 1960s, but quickly realized there was not a shared definition of the construct (Chaffee, 1985). It was suggested that this divergence existed because strategy is multidimensional and situational, and thus would vary by industry (Hambrick, 2017).

Three distinct thought models emerged: linear strategy, adaptive strategy, and interpretive strategy. An aspect on which all three models converge is that there is an “inseparability of organization and environment” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 89). They share the belief that strategic decisions are related to the environment and affect the overall welfare of the organization. Additionally, there is agreement that strategy includes both conceptual and analytical exercises.

Linear strategy frequently refers to the first model that was widely adopted. The term speaks to the methodological, directed, sequential action involved in planning. According to Chaffee (1985), “the linear view strategy consists of integrated decisions, actions or plans that will set and achieve viable organizational goals, with top managers having considerable capacity to change the organization” (p. 90). The environment is thought of as what exists externally, but is comprised in a limited way by mostly competitors. Since this model was developed primarily for for-profit organizations, the matrix for results are profit and productivity. An assumption that exists with this view is that while decisions may be made today, they may not be implemented until months or

years from now. Therefore, a foundational element of this view is that the environment is relatively predictable or that the organization is not influenced by the environment.

The adaptive view of strategy incorporates the relationship between the organization and the environment. This model is “concerned with the ability to create a match between the opportunities and risks present in the external environment and the organization’s capabilities and resources for exploiting these opportunities” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 91). The view supports a continuous review of the environment with the intention of making adjustments to strategy along the way to increase the likelihood of success. An assumption made by the adaptive view is that the organization and the environment are more open to each other than the linear model, and that the organization should change, or adapt, to the environment rather than exist separate from it.

The interpretive view of strategy integrates the importance of corporate culture and symbolic management. This view is a distinct departure from the adaptive view as it is more like a social construct than a living organism (Chaffee, 1985). It brings the role of the people and their relationships to the forefront, and positions organizational culture as a valuable way to influence change. Furthermore, this view asserts that strategy is not just a thought-process for senior leaders but should happen organization-wide, and that employee motivation is a critical factor in achieving adequate strategic behavior.

Each of these views provides a deeper understanding of the aspects of organizational functioning to which this strategy can be applied. As a concept, strategy has layers of complexity that may benefit from implementation of one or more of these views at any given time. Building upon these views, the next section provides an overview of several strategic planning models that have been used over time.

## Strategic Planning Models

**Traditional models.** The value of having a strategic planning model is that it serves as a roadmap for the process. Models are tools that can provide clarity and keep the group focused on the planning process (Trainer, 2004). In some cases, the models below are evolutions of each other, like the three different views on strategy, with some models focusing on linear outcomes and others on cultural transformation. McNamara (2017) outlined the following types of strategic plans:

- Conventional Model is the most common type of strategic planning model. It is ideal for highly functioning organizations that are in good financial standing, in stable external environments, and do not have crises or problems to remedy. This model often results in a strategic plan and an operational plan.
- Issues-Based Model works best for organizations with limited resources, major issues to address, little buy-in from constituents, and no history of success with achieving bold goals. This model often results in the identification of the five to seven most pressing issues and developing action plans to address those issues over six to 12 months. If that action plan is successfully implemented and issues begin to stabilize, the organization may pursue the Conventional Model to continue to advance progress.
- Organic Model is often implemented by organizations that are in dynamic environments and find strategic plans to be rigid. In this model, members of the organization work toward their vision in their own way. This model often results in a large group conversation concerning the long-term vision and values, and then each member identifies a vision-related action in a certain time frame.

- Real-Time Model is similar to the organic model, as it is typically used by organizations who change so rapidly that strategic plans become obsolete very quickly. This typically results in a conversation about vision and values, followed by a core group of researchers consistently conducting environmental scans and generating recommendations to remain relevant. Another group then evaluates the internal organization and offers recommendations as well. This assessment and recommendation process repeats every six months to a year.
- Alignment Model is designed to foster an alignment between internal operations and achievement of an overall goal. This model often results in confirmation of the goal for alignment, analysis of internal operations most directly aligned with achieving that goal, and creation of goals and tactics.
- Inspirational Model is often used when there is little tie to create a plan, or the sense of urgency in creating a plan quickly. This model often results in getting key leaders together to create an ideal vision for the organization, creating stretch goals to more effectively serve customers and clients, and then include them in the strategic plan. This model tends to be highly engaging and empowering but is often unrealistic.

As use of strategic planning began to increase, researchers began to note the distinctions between the business model for strategic planning, and the higher education model for strategic planning (Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1997). Non-business institutions, particularly colleges and universities, had not had particularly positive results from their trials with strategic planning the way business counterparts were experiencing (Rowley et al., 1997). A signature element of businesses is that they are started by

individuals who typically possess a set of unique talents or products that have value in the marketplace. Through the strategic planning process, they look to develop their uniqueness, expand their reach, and be ahead of their competition. While this seems similar to what higher education also desires, the difference is that it is harder for universities to manipulate their environments or control their niche in the market the way private businesses do (Rowley et al., 1997). Public colleges sometimes serve certain populations by legislative mandate, or private colleges may be constrained by a faith-based mission that limits their ability to take advantage of shifts in demand and changes in the external marketplace and environment. These distinctive elements are relevant for institutions to incorporate into their decision-making process for selecting the model to use.

Once the model is identified, there are several tools leaders can use to actualize any model they choose. Busy institutional leaders often oversimplify strategic analysis, relying on only one or a few tools to conduct an environmental scan (Trainer, 2004). With origins dating back to 1965, the name SWOT analysis is based on the first letter each of the four categories of performance measurement: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (Valentin, 2005). A SWOT analysis is designed to assess both internal and external organizational factors, encouraging the organization to develop strategies to turn weaknesses into strengths and threats into opportunities. The SWOT analysis has become a frequently used tool both in business and higher education, and has faced criticism for being a biased instrument since it is primarily comprised of internally generated data (Hill & Westbrook, 1997; Valentin, 2005). Additionally, it is often viewed as simplistic in nature and slow-paced (Mitchell & Maldonado, 2015). Using this

tool as a basis for strategic planning may begin the process with a limited framework, further limiting the ability of the organization to generate a robust and innovative strategic plan.

### **Contemporary Models**

**Design thinking.** Some see design thinking as a new tool to approach problem-solving in higher education. The origin of design thinking is rooted in business and focused on new product development. That focus has now expanded to include a human-centered approach for sustained learning, problem-solving, innovation and competitiveness (Buhring & Liedtka, 2018; Gardner, 2017; Lorenzo, 2016). Organizations that have a design-centric culture have moved beyond seeing design as a role a few people in the organization have, in exchange for a way of proceeding that includes people bringing ideas to life (Koklo, 2018).

The five stages of the design thinking model from the Hasso-Plattner Institute of Design at Stanford University, known as the d.school, are: empathize, define (the problem), ideate (potential solutions), prototype, and test (Dam & Siang, 2018). The five stages are not always sequential or linear, and can occur in tandem and be repeated as needed. In design thinking, the expert is the end user, with empathy being a distinctive element in gaining an understanding of the problem you are trying to solve. There is an emphasis on inclusivity in the design process, along with collaboration, finding resiliency in failure, and being comfortable in grey areas (Lorenzo, 2016).

Some of the foundational underpinnings of design thinking can be challenging to personnel in higher education, such as that notions that experts are the end users, emotion can overrule expertise, and failure is welcomed (Gardner, 2017). Tradition is a long-

standing core element of higher education, and for centuries higher education has thrived by replicating past successes. Thus, typical problem-solving techniques employed in higher education can encourage mediocrity and discourage true innovation.

Dual transformation design strategy provides an approach aimed to address both the traditional markets and emerging markets in separate but connected plans (Gilbert, Crow, & Anderson, 2018). Transformation A is intended to develop strategies that optimize the core mission of the organization to become more responsive, while Transformation B is intended to implement innovations that respond to emerging opportunities or social demands to provide a basis for future growth. Transformation A is a typical approach most universities take when it comes to problem-solving or planning, whereas Transformation B could be treated as a distinct opportunity to create something completely new, either for new markets or a new mode of delivery for current ones.

An example of a Transformation A approach was taken by Arizona State University (ASU), which wanted to increase their position as a premiere research institution. Since the arrival of a new President in 2002, the university intentionally increased their research budget by 400% (Gilbert et al., 2018). They chose to focus research efforts in fields that were relevant to Arizona, Phoenix, and the surrounding metro areas, emphasizing issues such as water scarcity, solar and thermal energy technologies, and sustainable urban development. Then they merged academic programs and departments to create new interdisciplinary focuses, such as combining geology and astronomy into a School of Earth and Space Exploration. They also earned industry sponsorship for projects, such as ASU LightWorks, to develop innovations around solar

energy and sustainable fuels. This disciplined strategy in their core mission of research allowed ASU to differentiate themselves from their peers, carving their position and purpose in use-inspired research (Gilbert et al., 2018).

An example of a Transformation B approach was taken by Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU). Due to the increasing numbers of college attendees over the age of 25, SNHU set out to capture that population recognizing that many of these students have different needs and priorities than traditional-aged undergraduates. They reorganized themselves around online education and expanded their market worldwide. Within six years of the program launching in 1995, it included students from 23 different time zones (Gilbert et al., 2018). In 2018, the SNHU Online program enrolled approximately 85,000 students. Based on that success, SNHU launched the College for America, which is a non-profit institution offering nontraditional students degrees in competency-based tracks, where they can demonstrate their knowledge through application-based projects, rather than traditional means of exams and research papers. SNHU Online was a separate organization created to meet the demands of the emerging market, but remained wisely connected to the university for quality assurance and oversight. The creation of a separate organization is not unique to SNHU, but rather a consistent factor in several outstanding online programs including Pennsylvania State University's World Campus, Brigham Young University's Pathway program, and ASU's Global Freshman Academy (Gilbert et al., 2018).

While the above examples illustrate transformational change for those institutions, design thinking does not come without critics or drawbacks. One of the critiques of this approach is that while some see it as a tool for innovation, others see it as a commercial

fad taking up time and energy (Gardner, 2017). Additionally, the link between innovation and entrepreneurship, which is often connected to commerce, can be off-putting to faculty and staff that already believe there is too much corporate culture infiltrating academia. A final critique is rooted in the methodology of design thinking, which encourages groups to quickly move from identifying the problem, to solution, to prototype, to test, which critics counter does not provide the appropriate time for exploration of the problem to ensure the organization is solving a systemic issue, rather than a symptom of the actual problem.

### **Challenges of Strategic Planning**

**Perceptions.** When strategic planning began to gain momentum in higher education in the 1980s, there was a tendency for campuses to try to adopt textbook business strategic planning approaches, and most failed (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). This is not because the concept of strategic planning is faulty, but rather because strategy development and implementation is simply different in higher education than in the business industry. Thus, dissatisfaction and failure led to the perception that strategic planning is too time consuming, another task in an already busy day, a tactic for public relations, and a financial drain (Mintzberg, 1994; Soliday & Mann, 2013). Just the mention of strategic planning often elicits laughter, jeers, or expletives from personnel (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). Leaders have also grown weary of strategic planning, at times approaching it as a requirement to be met or an exhaustive wish list of all constituents' hopes and dreams (Seltzer, 2018).

Due to the lack of recorded successes with strategic planning, constituents enter into the process with varying degrees of readiness, wariness of the finances it may

require, and concern regarding how this new plan will affect their daily work. They are reluctant to embrace change and often fear inefficient processes, poor communication, lack of urgency, and lack of funds required to support an advanced level of operation (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Employees are less likely to be innovative if they believe there are financial limitations. This also includes an inability to see the strategic plan as a mechanism to increase revenue streams and balance the budget (Balzer, 2010).

Unfortunately, most strategic plans go on a shelf, safe from critical minds and eyes until the assessment or budgeting cycle comes along or when the process is repeated again. When institutions include too many priorities to ensure all constituents feel included, the result is often a diluted plan that does not advance the institution (Seltzer, 2018). Employees often go about their day-to-day activities with little thought or attention given to the plan within a few weeks of adoption (Boyce, 2003). When combined with lackluster results, the negative perception reinforces the ineffectiveness of the process.

**Realities.** The reality of strategic planning is that it is a complex process which takes substantial time and effort to execute at a high level. Higher education is a fast-paced, 24-hour business straddling the demands of increasingly complex day-to-day operations, and the demands to critically think at a high level about how to position the institution to ensure sustainability (Bryson, 2010). This is what makes the approach taken by higher education different from the approach taken by the military. In the military, the mission and goals for the situation they are working to address is made clear to each soldier in a systematic and disciplined manner. In higher education, there is often lack of clarity of rank and order beyond the president, resulting in communication issues

and competing priorities that leave constituents unclear, disenfranchised, and siloed. A second reality is that strategic planning in higher education has only seen moderate success with a few institutions achieving consequential transformational results (to be discussed in the example section below) and a few others making important changes in business operations. Rowley et al. (1997) described many institutions as “stumbling, dissolving into controversy, or losing their nerve” during their strategic planning processes (p. 58). That quotation summarizes over 30 years of strategic planning practice in higher education, as the industry is still facing similar critical issues of increased accountability, a decrease in federal and state funding, and an increase in customer expectations (Blumenstyk, 2015; Mintzberg, 1994). The difference is that 30 years ago, higher education could rest on the student enrollment and technology booms of the 1990s, but the landscape is drastically changing (Putnam, 2012).

A campus that is in serious trouble because of an eroding student base, little or no endowment, and lots of conflict between campus constituents may have no choice but to begin a strategic planning process in an effort to ignite change. However, the institution may find the change process is threatening to faculty and staff because the strategic management process seems so fraught with extreme difficulties. It is ironic that the institutions that are in the most serious trouble and require the greatest amount of change will often have the most difficulty changing. Their past inflexibility has created a self-destructive pattern (Rowley & Sherman, 2001).

An additional reality is that leaders often think the simple act of creating the plan should be all that is needed for employees to change their behavior. Since leaders view the plan as good for the organization, they believe the employees should too. Leaders

often gets frustrated with what they view as employee resistance to change. According to Spector (2013), employees do not naturally resist change but rather resist because of the way it is implemented. When individuals are involved in defining problems and solutions, they will be more motivated to achieve the desired outcomes (Kotter, 2007).

### **Benefits of Strategic Planning**

Why have so many institutions of higher education conducted strategic plans over the past 30 years? There are many possible explanations, including that it may be a requirement by accrediting bodies and donors, that there are normative pressures since strategic planning is seen as a sign of good professional practice and necessary to create legitimacy, and that they believe they need to copy what everyone else is doing (Bryson, 2010). Typically, strategic planning processes take one of two approaches: fixing what is wrong, or focusing on what the organization is doing well and building a future around those practices (Leitzel et al., 2004). According to Soliday & Mann (2013), a few of the benefits of strategic planning are that it creates a framework the college should take to achieve its desired success, enhances a proposition to achieve a competitive advantage, provides an opportunity for all college constituents to participate and collaborate, aims to align the college with its local, national and global environment, facilitates priority setting, and streamlines assessment and budget planning processes. It is also intended to enhance an organization's ability to think, act, and learn strategically (Bryson & Alston, 2011). When this occurs, organizations should see increases in effectiveness and efficiency, enhanced communication, and increased stakeholder support. Poorly executed plans represent missed opportunities for institutions to make choices can help catapult them toward an improved future.

## **Roles of Leaders within the Strategic Planning Process**

Leadership plays a key role in the development, implementation, and ongoing management of the strategic planning process. Frequently, stakeholders look to college presidents to provide the charge for and lead strategic planning efforts, and presidents often look to their executive leadership teams (Auld, 2010). At the core of a high-functioning executive leadership team is trust and an ability to work collaboratively. Higher levels of trust relate to higher levels of team performance and produce enormously positive effects on long-term teams versus short-term teams (DeJong & Elfring, 2010). Members of the Boards of Trustees or Governing Boards can be instrumental components to the strategic planning process as well. They are responsible for the oversight of the plan, and the continuity of the mission and vision during periods of change. Some presidents are concerned that trustees might try to exceed their authority, or attempt to advance the plan faster than is manageable for the team on the ground or without campus-wide buy-in. Conversely, a trustee may be able to quickly provide financial resources needed or lead fundraising efforts toward ideas about which they are excited. Trustees can also provide valuable insight to new committee members, by offering context to explain why a previous approach was not supported to divert the group from going down that path again (Seltzer, 2018).

In a 2017 survey of college presidents, 60.8% said the most important issue confronting them is that there is never enough money (American Council on Education, 2017). Presidents also indicated their most time-consuming activities are those that revolve around campus funding: financial planning and fundraising. According to Fain (2008), with a balanced budget, there should be three to five percent in the reserves

each year to reinvest in new programs, faculty and facilities. Institutions should be especially cautious when debt grows to over 50% of the operating revenue or when endowments are less than the annual budget, since at that point healthy planning practices are sacrificed to the requirements of panic mode (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Leadership is falling short in utilizing strategic plans and strategic management as a vehicle to drive fiscal health. Revenue should be generated not just by raising tuition and fees annually, but also by making cuts in the least impactful programs and services each year to reallocate funds to new and inventive initiatives. To change the history of this problem, leadership should emphasize that sometimes it is not fiscal resources that are needed but rather appropriate attention, focus, and effort spent on a strategic initiative (Soliday & Mann, 2013).

Presidents are at the forefront of strategic planning processes, expected to lead the effort to help their universities grow and respond to the challenges associated with change. This obligation creates enormous pressure on the president to lead change, while also preserving the mission and heritage of the institution. Leadership should not merely support the process, but should also serve to champion the cause and be its most outspoken supporter (Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010). The president should employ shared governance and create multiple opportunities for stakeholder engagement to cultivate ownership of the plan that they will ultimately need to implement.

Strategic leadership involves adaptation, and routinely higher education accepts the status quo. While leaders should have the patience to wait for the culture to change before embarking on transformational efforts, the role of the leader of this process is to understand the consequences of accepting mediocrity. If those consequences aren't fully

understood, the institution will be thrust in a cycle of periods of stagnation followed by sudden periods of crisis. Environmental change will eventually transpire, leaving institutions in its wake, wondering what happened. Leaders that can help their organizations see themselves in an entrepreneurial light can help members thrive and prosper. Furthermore, the personal attributes of the leader, including their motivations, perceptions, experiences, and skills are paramount to the success of the organization (Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010).

As the strategic plan is being shaped, the leader, in most cases the president, should strive to proactively prepare for, and respond to, each situation with appropriate flexibility and responsiveness to change with a multi-frame perspective. This dissertation study aimed to fill the gap found in the existing research on styles of effective leaders of strategic plans at small, private institutions.

### **Preparing for Change and the Strategic Planning Process**

Beyond the leader, senior leadership should focus on preparing and developing the staff that often become responsible for the implementation phase. Although many planning and institutional research staff are well versed in statistics and social science research methods, which can aid in the planning process, surprisingly few have formal training in strategic planning as a process (Trainer, 2004). To support the work of a strong leader, institutions could create significant learning experiences for faculty and staff that complement the strategic planning process.

In order to design effective learning experiences, institutions should seek to understand the perceptions their employees have regarding strategic planning prior to embarking on the process. A lack of urgency is especially concerning for institutions

looking to experience transformational change. According to Kotter (1996), establishing a sense of urgency is the first step in an eight-step process of creating change.

Employees will remain comfortable, often in mediocrity, resisting change rather than identifying opportunities that can propel the organization forward if this step is not utilized.

Additionally, even when plans are written, many become a matter of minimal concern until the assessment or budgeting cycles come along, or when the process is set to begin again (Mintzberg, 1994). According to Boyce (2003), employees too often go about their day-to-day activities with little thought or attention given to the plan within a few weeks of adoption. Ultimately, a strategic plan is meaningless if the employees of the company do not bring it to life. People are often recognized as the most important asset of any organization (Buller, 2015). These people should be trained, coached, and developed to produce their best work. Organizations should be transparent and clear in communicating their vision to empower employees to make meaningful connections. Additionally, even if employees are ready to embrace change, front-line employees receive dozens of high-priority messages, often competing, from executives, managers, and change leaders each day. These conflicting messages make it difficult for workers to know what tasks or metrics they should focus on during a given day to deliver a fully engaging customer experience.

General Electric (GE) provided a robust example of how an organization can train employees to lead change that transforms an organization. In 2006, GE faced international competition and a fragile global economy, so the company instituted a management training program for the first time in their 51-year history (Prokesch, 2009).

The specific purpose of the program was to support the priority of expanding current enterprises, while developing new ones. They brought their senior leadership together for a four-day Leadership, Innovation, and Growth (LIG) Summit. The success of this approach was profound, and this is attributed to a few main reasons: training intact management teams, encouraging participants to evaluate both the hard and soft organizational barriers to change, and creating a shared language to manage change. By training management teams together, employees were able to emerge with a consensus on opportunities and work together to develop a plan to capitalize on them. Teams participated in breakout sessions to discuss implications of the information shared, as well as how to best address it both through changed business practices and individual behaviors. They then delivered presentations on visions for growth, and, when the summit ended, each team crafted a one- to two-page document outlining their commitment to the concept and what it will entail moving forward. The creative ideas then became “seed” and GE created a “seed board” which charted the growth of new ideas, and then the company created a committee called the “growth board” that met monthly. This approach taken by GE illustrated that teaching change leadership is an ongoing, integrated processes.

Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning is an approach to teaching that is designed to push students beyond the sheer memorization of materials and impact how they live, think, act and work (Fink, 2013). In this example, GE was the teacher and the employees were the students. By centrally sharing information concerning the vision, competitive landscape, current practices, and leadership, GE built *foundational knowledge*, which is the first category of Fink’s taxonomy. GE progressed through the

taxonomy through the *application* and *integration* categories by having breakout teams work together and create a presentation that included the organization and cultural changes that team members needed to make to optimize growth. Conducting these activities in a group setting enhanced the employees' ability to learn about themselves and others while developing a rich sense of care for the organization and its future, thus progressing them through the categories of *human dimension* and *caring*, respectively. Prokesch (2009) wrote that a year later there was evidence that LIG made an impact and that managers had been effectively shifting how they approached their work and their teams in order to foster growth. They had more authentic conversation and were able to solve problems more quickly and effectively. This continued learning supports the last dimension of Fink's (2013) taxonomy of *learning how to learn*.

Another ripple effect of the GE approach was that they wanted to better train leaders so headquarters could remove themselves from daily operations and spend more time on creating future business prospects. The investment in on-going professional development seemed to be paying off for GE. The Power Gen team was the first unit to undergo LIG and a year later was still acting on their commitment letters. The team expanded under a compelling vision and tripled their annual sales (Prokesch, 2009). While LIG seemed to have created a significant learning experience that changed both the hard and soft elements of the organization, managers knew that this new philosophy should have been part of the fabric of their organization. Fink's (2013) taxonomy and the GE approach to use professional development as a technique to teach and lead effective strategic planning processes could merit exploration on college campuses.

## **Financial Considerations Related to Strategic Planning**

Since the recession in the mid-2000s, small private colleges have faced several challenges, including little or no return on endowments, reduction in philanthropic gifts, increases in operating expenses, families in need of additional financial aid, and growing public concern about the merits of higher education (Brown & Ballard, 2011; Selzer, 2018). Austin and Lee (1972) identified “invisible colleges” (p. 10) as “little known private colleges” (p. 1) which provide a four-year education, with enrollment below 2,500, and have smaller endowments. Many of these institutions are faith-based, and “invisible colleges” were identified by Austin and Lee as the type of institution most likely to close. At that time, those type of colleges represented more than half of the private colleges in the United States. It has been more than four decades since that study was conducted, and many of the institutions that have not closed or merged still remain in peril.

A campus that is in serious trouble because of an eroding student base, little or no endowment, and lots of conflict between campus constituents may have no choice but to begin a strategic planning process in an effort to ignite change. This is what happened at two small, private institutions referred to as Mission College and Athletic College (Carey, 2014). They were both headed toward closure but underwent successful turnarounds. Contributing factors that lead to the turnarounds at both institutions were the arrival of new presidents, the importance of the presidential leadership team promoting the uniqueness of the institution, clear communication regarding the vision for the turnaround plan, and implementation of the plan in a timely manner. The impact of fundraising was also a major factor at both institutions, helping to build momentum and providing a boost

to much needed resources. However, many institutions in peril find the change process to be threatening because it seems so fraught with extreme difficulties, so the attitude toward change becomes steeped in negativity. Often institutions that require the greatest amount of change have the most difficulty changing due to a sense of learned helplessness (Rowley & Sherman, 2001).

In a 2012 survey of college presidents, 49% said the most important issue confronting them is budget shortfall (American Council on Education, 2017). Many colleges are struggling to make their budgets work just to support existing education and research programs, let alone to fund new competitive advantages. According to Fain (2008), with a balanced budget there should be three to five percent in the reserves each year to reinvest in new programs, faculty and facilities. Institutions should be especially cautious when debt grows to over 50% of the operating revenue or when endowments are less than the annual budget, because then healthy planning practices are sacrificed to the requirements of panic mode (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Sound strategic planning can be a tool to drive key choices institutions can make during unpredictable times.

**National population trends.** Over the next 10-15 years, demographics will continue to change the landscape of higher education regionally, nationally, and internationally (Grawe, 2017). First, immigration patterns are holding steady in the United States, bringing almost 1.6 million people into the United States annually. Second, interstate migration is trending upward with people and children moving away from the northeast and Midwest, and moving to the south and west. Third, birthrates are on the decline across multiple racial and ethnic identities. Since 2007, the fertility rate has dropped a dramatic 12%, and institutions should brace for population constriction

beginning in 2026. Fourth, the number of high school graduates is on the decline, as much as 15% in the northeast. While growth will happen in the mountain and west south-central regions of the United States, institutions in regions where the birthrate is lower and people are migrating from will likely need to develop plans to attract potential students from the growth regions.

Institutions need to closely monitor these demographic trends but also reserve judgement prior to making sweeping changes at their institutions for two reasons. First, the data varies greatly by region. Some may benefit from the demographic change, while others will be negatively impacted by multiple factors. Second, these numbers only tell part of the story and are not predictive of who will look to attend college or the type of institution they would seek to attend. This data merits a closer look and is necessary to the development of a strategic recruitment plan suited for a specific institution.

**Enrollment trends.** A popular and reputable tool to gain insight to enrollment trends, the higher education index (HEDI), was created to forecast the demand for higher education in a way that can be tailored to specific institutions. The HEDI takes variables such as location and demographics of subgroups into account to forecast with greater accuracy and usability for enrollment managers. Several pieces of information are included in determining the probability for attendance including sex, race/ethnicity, census division and location of high school, parents' education levels, and family income (Grawe, 2017). To determine the number of 18-year-olds in the geographic area, factors such as birthrates, migration, and immigration are taken in to account.

The national forecast for the college-aged population is expected to remain relatively stable through the early 2020s before a short five percent increase until 2025,

when the HEDI predicts a dramatic population decline of approximately 650,000 (Grawe, 2017). Regions of the United States that will be negatively affected are the Pacific, west north central, mid-Atlantic, east north central, South-Atlantic, with the greatest decline of college-aged population predicted in New England. Only two regions are predicted to be positively affected, the mountain and west south-central regions of the United States. Unfortunately, the loss of population will outweigh the gain overall by a ratio of roughly three-to-one, and the regions in decline have the largest populations of college-going students and will face a substantial financial impact. The largest increases in college enrollment are projected to come from women, who will enroll at twice the rate of men, adult students between the ages of 25-34, and minority students (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Institutions that begin to innovate now around programs and services will be much better positioned in 10 years.

**Pricing and net tuition.** The National Association of College University and Business Officers (NACUBO) released a report in 2016 showing that tuition discount rates continue to climb for private institutions at all levels. Tuition discounting has steadily increased for four-year, private institutions from 38% in 2005 to 49.1% in 2016. While published tuition and fees for full-time, undergraduate students at four-year, private universities increased by 65% since 1996, net tuition has only increased by 19% from \$12,210 to \$14,530 in the same period.

The stabilization of net tuition is an indicator that students and families have grown more savvy, as colleges are leveraging tuition discounting practices to appear more competitive. Students who pay the full price of college and receive no financial aid have declined from nearly 20% in 2000 to 10.5% in 2014 (U.S. Department of Education,

2016). Higher tuition discount rates have led to slower growth in tuition revenue for private institutions (from 3.4% growth in 2013 to .4% growth in 2016). Institutions with endowment assets less than \$50 million have to draw larger percentages of their operating budgets to provide institutional aid for students. Compound this reality with the enrollment trends listed above, and small, private institutions with lower endowments will need to aggressively modify their business models to sustain good fiscal health.

**High-income families.** Higher education funding has transformed over the past 40 to 50 years. With increases to tuition and fees outpacing household income, many institutions have grown to rely on state and federal funding, fundraising, and external grant opportunities. As state support decreases, tuition and fees escalate again. High-income families play a considerable role in the changes to higher education financing. As their incomes and ability to pay for college increase, it allows colleges to offer higher aid to those students in greater need.

The national forecast for growth of full-pay students is flat or higher in the coming years, and the competition for them nationally will continue to increase (Grawe, 2017). Since full-pay students are more likely to travel for college, the regional impact for these students will be lessened. However, it is critical for institutions to understand that families that have the capacity to pay full price do not necessarily believe that they should. They are often shrewd negotiators who want the best “deal” for their high-achieving, well-prepared high school student. Positioning the institution in the marketplace to be viewed as a sound investment with high career and graduate school placement rates, and attractive amenities will enhance an institution’s competitiveness in this market.

**Endowment.** As noted in the pricing and net tuition section, high endowment values have the greatest capacity to fund larger portions of institutional grants and scholarships. Only four percent of all four-year institutions (public and nonprofit, private) hold 67.8% of all college endowment assets in the country (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). The majority of institutions (61%) have endowments that are valued at \$50 million or less, requiring these colleges and universities to rely more heavily on tuition dollars rather than on their endowments to fund overall operating budgets, including institutional scholarship support.

Estimating endowment returns over the next ten years will be highly unpredictable at best. The last decade reflected a great amount of volatility, with five years of double-digit returns, but also four years of negative or flat returns (Seltzer, 2018). Endowments are not intended to be checking accounts that institutions draw down over time. They need to be considered permanent investments generating earnings that can be put toward spending priorities. Universities who seek to thrive long-term often identify ways to consistently contribute to their endowments as part of annual financial plans.

### **The Global Landscape of Strategic Planning**

Review of practices and examples of higher education strategic planning processes from institutions across the world revealed interesting similarities and differences compared to those experienced in the United States. In today's highly competitive environment, higher education institutions across the globe are striving to distinguish themselves and create an advantage in a crowded marketplace. Achieving

excellence has become paramount for international counterparts, especially since the inception of the world ranking system.

The creation of the Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU) in 2003 by Shanghai Jiao Tong University was a catalyst for criticism, increased international competition, and jockeying among institutions for positions of status and reputation (Hazelkorn, 2014). College ranking systems have been popular in the United States since 1983 when *U.S. News and World Report* rankings debuted, but over the past fifteen years they have become an increasingly recognized way to compare higher education institutions worldwide. The ARWU sparked a global conversation regarding the role, value, and contribution of higher education, challenging perceptions of institutions not just locally, regionally, or nationally, but internationally as well (Rinne & Koivula, 2005).

**The influence of world rankings.** According to Hazelkorn (2014), the group that pays the most attention to university global rankings are young male students interested in postgraduate education overseas. However, this group is not the demographic most affected by these rankings. An increasing number of university leaders and national politicians use rankings to decide which courses, departments, and institutions to invest in. Some universities also seem to be duplicating the policies and practices of institutions at the top of these rankings, even when it may not be in the best interests of their students and staff, given the financial setting in which they operate (Wade, 2011). The impact of the world rankings on institutional governance and decision-making is on the rise.

The continued interest in the performance of the top 100 universities has led some political leaders to specify ambitions in terms of the number of 'world-class' universities they have or want. France, Germany, Russia, Spain, China, South Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia, Finland, India, Japan, Singapore, Vietnam, and Latvia have developed policies which encourage mergers between institutions in order to create a smaller number of universities to rival the Ivy League and climb in the rankings (Hazelkorn, 2014). In a European higher education context, this ambition has meant a move away from a traditional egalitarian approach that emphasized differentiation between elite research-intensive universities and mass recruiting teaching-intensive institutions to accommodate the mergers (Schofer & Meyer, 2005). It is also important to note that colleges and universities in European higher education are frequently referred to as higher education institutions (HEIs).

World rankings are used by governments and HEIs to strategically inform and guide policy and decision-making, identify and define national or institutional ambitions, and serve as a benchmarking or quality assurance (QA) tool. They seem to drive performance improvement at a national level and are also being used for resource allocation (Hazelkorn, 2011). Some governments have even linked rankings with accreditation or quality assessment processes, using the results to decide whether a particular HEI should be formally recognized or how it should be classified: teaching, teaching/research, research (Hazelkorn, 2014).

As attention to these rankings increased, teaching and learning became more global in nature, and corporations and foundations opened large grant opportunities to the

best university in the world. In response, institutions worldwide focused on enhancing their reputations and performance by developing strategic plans.

**Growth of global planning.** As discussed, strategic planning has become a common practice over the past several decades in American higher education. There have been many possible explanations for this growth in the United States (U.S.), including that it is a requirement by accrediting bodies and donors, that there are normative pressures since strategic planning is seen as a sign of good professional practice and necessary to create legitimacy, and institutions believe they should replicate what everyone else is doing (Bryson, 2010). Globally, higher education was also engaging in planning because it was seen as vital for clarifying future directions, important for developing a coherent basis for decision-making, necessary for establishing priorities, and helpful at improving organizational performance (Shah, 2013).

Strategic planning was seen as a symbolic activity by some and as a promotional tool by others, but in the 1990s perspectives started to shift as leaders realized the complexities of globalization and competition in the marketplace (Albon, Iqbal, & Pearson, 2016). Literature supports that U.S. institutions often begin their efforts with the intention to produce a guiding document which will enable all stakeholders to work together seamlessly toward a shared vision (Bryson, 2010; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Schein, 2004). To address global similarities or differences to that statement, three examples will be shared illuminating strategic planning and change processes led across the globe. First, there will be a review of the wide-sweeping national changes Denmark underwent, in order to transition from a specific institution to an entrepreneurial university. Second, there will be a review of King Saud University's strategic plan for 2030, which

emphasized moving beyond the planning phase toward implementation in Saudi Arabia. Finally, there will be a review of a faculty-led, departmental strategic planning process for the teaching and learning center in the Pharmaceutical Sciences Department at the University of British Columbia.

**Strategic planning at the national level.** European higher education has experienced dramatic changes in the past few decades as a result of several reforms that have taken place in an effort to address the perceived crisis in higher education (Maassen & Stensaker, 2011). These reforms were designed to address decreased quality of education, lack of efficiency, and lack of educational relevance to the work force. From a macro-level perspective, Denmark is an interesting case, since few European university systems have undergone such abrupt changes in the last decade with the intention of strengthening their public universities as a system (Pinheiro & Stensaker, 2014).

This case, in particular, addresses the impact of national influence on Aarhus University. In 2001, the National Research Commission proposed a number of changes targeting the funding system, the institutional landscape, and the internal management of universities (Pinheiro & Stensaker, 2014). One major policy objective was to increase the effectiveness and relevance of all educational research efforts. When a new Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation took over in 2001, funding proposals became the focus of policy development. As a result, the research funding system was split into two subsystems which consisted of a council for independent research and a council for strategic research. This separation resulted in a number of shifts from core funding to funding based on competition across institutions.

The second large change implemented by the Danish national government came in 2003, when the University Act introduced central Boards comprised of *external* individuals to serve as the superior authority of universities and began appointing rather than electing leaders. These Boards are similar to Boards of Regents or Trustees in the United States. The ultimate objective with the creation of these Boards was to enhance the profiles of individual institutions and to increase collaboration with industry executives. This decision seemed wise, but it also lacked any input from individual university personnel; thus, stakeholders felt undermined and not trusted by their government. Additionally, and most troubling to leadership, was that the University Act emphasized the new Board should set the research and educational agenda and then develop strategies and tactics to achieve those goals in the future.

As if that was not enough system change, the next major shakeup happened in 2005, when the Danish Globalization Council was created. Its purpose was to advise the government on a national strategy for higher education, and the members developed 350 specific initiatives which recommended further extensive reforms of education. The most dramatic outcome of the plan was a reduction, through mergers, in the number of universities from 12 to eight. Additionally, 12 out of 15 public sector research institutes were integrated across the remaining public universities. As is often the case, the merger process produced winners and losers. In particular, Copenhagen University, the Technical University of Denmark, and Aarhus University gained from the mergers in terms of increased size and influence. Together, they now account for about two-thirds of all Danish public research. In the eyes of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, the new, larger “super-universities” would not only be more competitive

when applying for external funds, but they would also facilitate the recruitment and retention of international, scientific talent (Pinheiro & Stensaker, 2014). The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation believed that the modernized universities would be able to respond more efficiently to external demands by developing new educational offerings and forming stronger relationships with industry. However, how these universities should be internally organized was entirely left to the institutions themselves despite the fact they never had any influence over the process of their own assembly. This resulted in a 40% rise in annual turnover of employees.

Ultimately, after the initial pains and culture shock, the leadership of Aarhus University began to refocus and created a five-year plan that has since been extended until 2028. The leadership united diverse constituents by revisiting the values of the Magna Carta of the European Universities that was signed by 388 rectors and heads of universities from all over Europe 1988. The Magna Carta of the European Universities contains principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy as a guideline for good governance and self-understanding of universities in the future. Subsequently, Aarhus University leaders set out to craft one unified mission statement for the previously distinct institutions. Formal goals, roles, and responsibilities were developed in partnership, and resources were allocated in accordance with the new mission, vision and values. Relationships were cultivated with the Board, and the external influence was finally viewed as positive. It is undeniable that the merger process led by the national government necessitated the creation of a new strategic plan for Aarhus University, which was not developed with change readiness or best practices in mind.

**Strategic planning at the institutional level.** King Saud University began the strategic planning process because its leaders recognized the highly competitive landscape and felt that it was their responsibility to develop and implement an actionable strategic plan for the institution (Alqahtani, 2016). Institutional leadership placed emphasis on the importance of implementation from the very beginning. That emphasis was evidenced by the development of a Strategic Implementation Plan, which provided a framework to ensure all major initiatives were supported and monitored to best enhance King Saud University's campus. In addition, the leadership established a Strategic Management Office (SMO) to provide oversight for the daily implementation of the plan, while providing leadership the flexibility and responsibility necessary to adapt the plan for the next 20 years. The purpose of the SMO was to make sure that each new program being implemented was effective in terms of finance, quality, time, and transparency and was consistent with the approved strategic plan. The core responsibilities were to manage overall communication, provide regular reports and updates, support decision-making, manage finances, coordinate operations, set targets, escalate issues or decisions to higher levels, track progress, and provide guidance. Progress on the implementation was assessed based on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and results were widely communicated.

As progress got underway, a larger leadership structure was created to report up to the leader of the SMO. In preparation, six team leaders for categories of strategic objectives underwent training which consisted of attendance at three training courses on strategic planning and management and on-the-job training provided by the leader of the

SMO. Additionally, a dashboard was created to keep the community apprised of the progress of the plan.

A summary of the project highlighted challenges that were very similar to those in U.S. literature, such as financial planning not keeping pace with strategic planning, a lack of buy-in from some officials, and insufficient data provided by some units. Notably, the first achievement listed in the KPI summary was an increase in the ARWU world ranking for KSU from 498th to 160th in four years. In addition, faculty distinction rose along with the number of citations in publications by faculty, employer satisfaction results with graduates rose, the endowment rose, as did the scores for faculty, staff and student satisfaction surveys. These results in only three years support this highly-developed and thoughtfully-executed strategic management approach.

**Strategic planning at the departmental level.** The teaching and learning center within the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences at the University of British Columbia underwent a strategic planning process. The self-appointed leaders of the process had been involved in strategic planning previously, but had never led a process (Albon et al., 2016). The creation of the 2014 strategic plan was motivated by several significant changes the faculty had experienced since 2011: a move into a new facility with more than five times the square-footage, a complete turnover of the senior leadership, a 25% growth in the faculty, a nearly 50% increase in undergraduate class size, and extensive curriculum revision. The Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences gradually grew, and in 2013 leadership of the teaching and learning center fell to two faculty members who shared directorial duties while maintaining their existing teaching and service responsibilities.

Believing they were in a state of constant change, the leaders deemed it the right time to develop a strategic plan for the teaching and learning center. Albon et al. (2016) reflected on their plan by reporting “Accordingly, we embarked on this exercise, confident that the task would be straightforward if we applied our scholarly habits and prior strategic planning experiences, and remained mindful of our limited expertise in strategic planning” (p. 212).

This approach is quite contrary to that of King Saud University and Aarhus University. The timeline below reflects the complexity of how the plan evolved:

- June 2014 they began focusing on an environmental scan to leverage strengths using Appreciative Inquiry theory. They reviewed those results, clustered them in to four goal areas, and were pleased with their progress.
- August 2014 brought the start of the academic year and other commitments took priority, losing some momentum from the process. They determined that their next steps should be to brainstorm objectives and action items for each goal. It was at that point they realized the extent of the variability in usage of strategic planning terms; the result was confusion. Therefore, they spent time examining and clarifying the definitions of a goal, an objective, and an action item.
- October 2014 they began to work independently, sharing work electronically, to advance the project with competing schedules. They struggled to gain consensus on appropriate goals, objectives, and action items this way. At this stage, a sense of paralysis crept in as they struggled with the complexity of their situation and lack of direction.

- November 2014 - February 2015 no further work was done on the plan.
- March 2015 they began to receive pressure from the faculty leadership team, so one of the leaders took it upon themselves to finish the plan. The draft was forwarded to the other leader for edits.

The plan went to the senior management team for review, and was endorsed, subject to revision. The leaders felt support for their work, but they continued to struggle to complete the revisions along with their primary job responsibilities in the allocated timeframe. Resources remained ever changing, and the leaders felt powerless over their ability to implement action. It should be no surprise that prior to beginning the process, the leaders thought models for successful strategic planning were linear and straightforward, but found that, in spite of established formulas for creating plans, they found the process to be “non-linear and messy” (Albon et al., 2016, p. 208). The authors were humble and honest concerning their role in the process and shared constructive recommendations which included approaching the process with a scholarly review of literature, accepting that it will be an iterative process, agreeing on definitions of key terms earlier, being time-bound, hiring a facilitator, and aligning the plan with a process for implementation.

Overall, strategic planning at higher education institutions across the globe is pervasive and takes on many different dimensions. The commonality shared is that all plans are designed with the intention of providing a clear framework for the system for which they are crafted. They are all complex in creation and implementation with varying levels of buy-in across the institutions. The differences seem to lie in the impetus or conditions under which the process commences, the approach to leading the process,

the backgrounds of the identified leaders, the level of emphasis placed on moving from plan to implementation, and what appeared to be the duration for the plans, since both King Saud University and Aarhus University strategic plans stretched out to 20 years.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

The review of current literature discussed the regularity with which strategic plans are conducted in higher education, along with negative perceptions held by personnel and reasons for failure during the strategic planning process. Due to the gap in the literature regarding optimal leadership styles for individuals leading strategic plans, this dissertation study was conducted. To determine whether there are a primary leadership styles and best practices for leaders of strategic plans, senior leaders at three different institutions were interviewed about their style and experience leading strategic planning processes. Subsequently, two people who worked closely under each leader during the planning process were also interviewed. Next, each leader and a group of colleagues who worked with the leader during the strategic planning process were asked to complete a questionnaire that identified each respondent's perceptions of the leader's leadership style. The research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis is discussed in this chapter.

#### **Research Questions**

The researcher sought to answer the following qualitative and quantitative research questions:

RQ #1: Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is the leadership profile of leaders of strategic plans? (qualitative and quantitative)

RQ #2: What are the key aspects (steps, decisions, actions, activities and/or strategies) that leaders of plans do that can be attributed to the development and implementation of the plan? (qualitative)

RQ #3: What barriers exist, perceived or otherwise, that inhibit individuals and/or institutions from implementing strategic plans? (qualitative)

RQ#4: What kind of relationship is there between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style and the perceptions of their colleagues? (quantitative)

### **Research Design**

In order to answer the research questions and develop informed recommendations that would impact how higher education leaders think, approach, and operationalize strategic planning, a mixed methods approach was used. Mixed methods research considers the roles of philosophical lenses in order to address social behavior. As such, this mixed methods study utilized a case study approach from a worldview of pragmatism. Those who approach research from this worldview are focused on the practical outcomes of the research and tend to use both qualitative and quantitative data to ground the recommendations (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, mixed methods research can be defined as “research in which the investigator collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or program of inquiry” (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p. 4).

This approach was applicable for this study because it captured the intentions and approach of each of the leaders in-depth, as well as quantified the perceptions of a larger group of colleagues.

For this study, the researcher used a sequential design, conducting semi-structured interviews with broad, open-ended questions as the first method for collecting qualitative data. This approach ensured consistency in the questions asked of all subjects, while allowing flexibility to better understand each individual's approach and experience. Then, Bolman and Deal's (1990) Leadership Orientation Instrument for both self and others was administered to collect quantitative data. Conducting the interviews prior to the distribution of the questionnaire was designed to ensure that the participants would not have any awareness of the questions, subsequently resulting in more authentic responses. The inclusion of the quantitative element was designed to increase the depth of the qualitative findings.

### **Participants**

Three participants identified as leaders of a strategic plan were selected, based on their level of authority, oversight, and degree of involvement in the development either of a university strategic plan or a direct subset of the plan. Two people who worked under each leader during the planning process were identified during conversations with the leader, and those participants were chosen based on gender diversity and availability. In addition, participants at each institution who worked directly with the leader during the strategic planning process were invited to participate and complete the questionnaire electronically. These individuals were selected based on their membership in committees or workgroups that the leader oversaw.

Quantitative survey data were collected from 33 staff members who worked under the three different leaders during strategic planning processes at three separate institutions identified as Institutions One, Two, and Three. Complete details regarding the categorical demographics of the survey sample are found in Table 1. Twenty-five people were invited from Institution One, and 15 people completed the survey. Twelve people were invited from Institution Two, and 12 completed the survey. Twenty-three people were invited from Institution Three, and six completed the survey.

The respondents were 27.2% male and 60.6% female. Of the personnel who responded, 9.0% were in their initial employment at the institution (under three years); 33.3%, three to five years; 21.2%, six to 10 years; 12.1%, 11 to 20 years; and 24.2%, more than 20 years of employment at that institution. For 93.9% of the respondents, the working relationship was that of a subordinate to a leader (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Demographics of Respondents*

| Item                             | Category             | Institution One |        | Institution Two |        | Institution Three |        | TOTAL |       |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                                  |                      | n               | %      | n               | %      | n                 | %      | N     | %     |
| Response Rate                    | Survey Completion    | 15              |        | 12              |        | 6                 |        | 33    |       |
|                                  |                      | of              | 60.0%  | of              | 100.0% | of                | 26.1%  | of    | 55.0% |
|                                  |                      | 25              |        | 12              |        | 23                |        | 60    |       |
| Gender                           | Male                 | 4               | 26.7%  | 2               | 16.7%  | 3                 | 50.0%  | 9     | 27.2% |
|                                  | Female               | 10              | 66.7%  | 8               | 66.7%  | 2                 | 33.3%  | 20    | 60.6% |
|                                  | Prefer not to answer | 1               | 6.7%   | 2               | 16.7%  | 1                 | 16.7%  | 4     | 12.1% |
| Work relationship with the ratee | Higher in Org than I | 15              | 100.0% | 10              | 83.3%  | 6                 | 100.0% | 31    | 93.9% |
|                                  | Same level           | 0               | 0.0%   | 1               | 8.3%   | 0                 | 0.0%   | 1     | 0.03% |
|                                  | I am higher          | 0               | 0.0%   | 0               | 0.0%   | 0                 | 0.0%   | 0     | 0.0%  |
|                                  | Other                | 0               | 0.0%   | 1               | 8.3%   | 0                 | 0.0%   | 1     | 0.03% |
| Years worked at this institution | Less than 3          | 1               | 6.7%   | 0               | 0.0%   | 2                 | 33.3%  | 3     | 9.0%  |
|                                  | 3-5 years            | 7               | 46.7%  | 1               | 8.3%   | 3                 | 50.0%  | 11    | 33.3% |
|                                  | 6-10 years           | 3               | 20.0%  | 4               | 33.3%  | 0                 | 0.0%   | 7     | 21.2% |
|                                  | 11-20 years          | 3               | 20.0%  | 1               | 8.3%   | 0                 | 0.0%   | 4     | 12.1% |
|                                  | 20+                  | 1               | 6.7%   | 6               | 50.0%  | 1                 | 16.7%  | 8     | 24.2% |

*Note.* Org = Organization.

**Setting**

This study was conducted using three small, private institutions representing the Southeast, Northeast, and Midwest regions. Table 2 provides more detailed demographics at each institution. All three institutions began strategic planning

processes within three years following the arrival of new presidents. Institution One was approximately two years into the implementation phase of the plan, while Institution Two and Institution Three were approximately six months into the implementation phase of their respective plans.

Table 2

*Institutional Demographics*

| Category                           | Institution One | Institution Two | Institution Three |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Undergraduate Enrollment           | 3,065           | 2,092           | 2,158             |
| Tuition & Fees                     | \$44,490        | \$34,660        | \$47,838          |
| Number of Degree Granting Programs | 58              | 67              | 54                |
| Percentage of Residential Students | 66%             | 80%             | 75%               |
| Student to Faculty Ratio           | 13 to 1         | 14 to 1         | 9 to 1            |

**Leader Profiles**

All three of the leaders identified were members of their president's leadership team, served on their university strategic planning steering teams, and reported directly to the president. Pseudonyms were used to protect their anonymity.

Leader One, Lynda, was a 43-year-old white female who had served on the president's cabinet for three years. She brought 18 years of expertise in the fields of

student success and retention, student affairs, and campus crisis response. In the following sections, Lynda is at times referred to as L1, and the colleagues interviewed who worked with her are referred to as C1 and C2.

Leader Two, Sharon, was a 63-year-old white female who had been in academic administration for 24 years and had served an additional nine years as a faculty member. She served on the president's cabinet for four years. In the following sections, Sharon is at times referred to as L2, and the colleagues interviewed who worked with her are referred to as C3 and C4.

Leader Three, Stanley, was a 39-year-old white male who had served in enrollment management for 15 years. At the time this research was conducted, he served as a vice-president, with multiple areas reporting through him to the president. He had been on the president's cabinet for two years. In the following sections, Stanley is at times referred to as L3, and the colleagues interviewed that worked with him are referred to as C5 and C6.

### **Instrumentation**

Two separate interview protocols were prepared for the leader (see Appendix A) and the participants (see Appendix B) to match the research questions. The questions for both protocols were developed based on research by Soliday & Mann (2013), Tan, Hee, & Piaw (2015), and Taylor & Taylor-Machado (2010), and were derived from the four leadership frames identified by Bolman & Deal (2013). Research question one was addressed in interview questions four through 11 of the interview protocol for the leader, and in interview questions three through nine for the colleague. Research question two was addressed in interview questions two, five, and six of the interview protocol for the

leader, and in interview questions three, four, 13, and 14 for the colleague. Research question three was addressed in questions three, five, six, and 10 of the interview protocol for the leader, and in interview questions three, four, 13, and 14 for the colleague. Table 3 summarizes these data collection points.

Table 3

*Qualitative Research Questions and Corresponding Interview Questions*

| Research Questions                                                                                                                                                     | Interview Questions                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| #1: Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is leadership profile of leaders of strategic plans?                                                  | Interview Questions:<br>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 for the Leader<br>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 for the Colleague |
| #2: What are the key aspects (steps, decisions, actions, activities and/or strategies) that leaders of plans do that can be attributed to the development of the plan? | Interview Questions:<br>2, 5 and 6 for the Leader<br>3, 4, 10, 13 and 14 for the Colleague                       |
| #3: What barriers exist, perceived or otherwise, that inhibit individuals and/or institutions from implementing effective strategic plans?                             | Interview Questions:<br>3, 5, 6, and 10 for the Leader<br>3, 4, 11, 12, 13, and 14 for the Colleague             |

The Leadership Orientations survey instrument (LOI), authored by Bolman and Deal (1990), was selected to match research question one and research question four. The instrument used for this study consisted of 43 questions divided into three parts. The instrument comes in parallel versions. LOI-Self (see Appendix C) is typically administered to the leader as a way to measure self-perceptions, whereas the LOI-Other (see Appendix D) is administered to the leader's supervisors, peers, and staff to gain their perceptions of the leader in the study. Additionally, there were three parts to the survey.

The first part of the survey consisted of 32 questions about how often certain behaviors are true for the respondent based on the following five-point scale: 1 = *never*; 2 = *occasionally*; 3 = *sometimes*; 4 = *often*, and 5 = *always*. While six forced-choice items make up the second part of the survey, the third section of each instrument had a question about their effectiveness as a manager and their effectiveness as a leader. The latter included the following five-point scale: 1 = *bottom 20%*; 3 = *middle 20%*; and 5 = *top 20%*. Three demographic questions were also added to this study in order to determine the participants' years of experience at that institution, working relationship to the subject, and gender. Table 4 includes a summary of the questions used in data collection.

Table 4

*Quantitative Research Questions and Corresponding Instrument Questions*

| Research Questions from<br>Questionnaire                                                                                                        | Instrument Questions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| #1: Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is leadership profile of leaders of strategic plans?                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions for the structural frame: #1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29</li> <li>• Questions for the human resource frame: #2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30</li> <li>• Questions for the political frame: #3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31</li> <li>• Questions for the symbolic frame: #4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32</li> </ul> |
| #4: What kind of relationship is there between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style and the perceptions of their colleagues? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions #1-32: Behaviors section</li> <li>• Question #1-6: Leadership style</li> <li>• Question #1-2: Overall rating</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

## **Procedures**

This mixed methods study used semi-structured interviews as the method for collecting qualitative data, and the Bolman and Deal (1990) Leadership Orientation questionnaire as the method for collecting quantitative data. The permission letter for use of this instrument is included in Appendix E. In addition, as required by institutional policies, this research was submitted to IRB for approval prior to data collection, and the approval letter is included in Appendix F.

### **Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted either in person or via video conference for both the leaders and the two people who work under each of the leaders, using interview protocols that were designed to match the research questions for this study. The two additional subjects worked closely with each leader during the strategic planning process. These subjects were selected based on availability and gender breakdown. The researcher chose to interview one male and one female subject for each leader. Each interview lasted 35 to 55 minutes. All individuals were asked to review and sign the interview consent form, which included consent to audio record the interview (see Appendix G). If the subjects wished to stop the audio recording at any time, they were permitted to do so without penalty, as outlined in the consent form. Upon conclusion, the interviews were transcribed and coded. All recordings were kept on a password protected laptop in a locked room with no identifiers.

### **Questionnaires**

All interview subjects completed a questionnaire. The leader completed the Leadership Orientations Instrument for Self (LOI-Self) and the two people who worked

under that leader during the planning process completed the Leadership Orientations Instrument for Others (LOI-Others). Additional subjects were identified to complete the LOI-Other, who worked under each leader during the strategic planning process. These subjects were identified by the leader, and their contact information was provided to the researcher. These participants were contacted via email and given an overview of the project. If they choose to participate by completing a questionnaire, they were directed to the online Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI-Others).

Prior to beginning the online survey, participants were asked to read the informed consent (Appendix H). By clicking “Yes, I agree to participate,” individuals moved on to the survey questions. If the subject clicked, “No. I do not wish to participate,” the survey ended. Participants could exit the survey at any time, and if they completed less than 80% of the survey their responses were discarded. Follow-up emails were sent via Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) to those who had not yet completed the assessment seven days after the initial correspondence, and this follow-up message included a link that directed recipients to the survey instrument. By participating in the survey, participants were guaranteed anonymity and asked to submit the survey by a specified deadline. Demographic data were collected from the survey, but responses were not linked to individual participants.

## **Data Analysis**

### **Qualitative**

Interview data were transcribed and analyzed using qualitative analysis. The researcher utilized deductive coding. Deductive coding is a method in which analysis is begun with codes already in mind, based on previous research, a theoretical framework,

or personal experience (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). A matrix was generated based on the deductive coding in relation to the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic leadership frames outlined by Bolman and Deal (2013). Additionally, the coded data were then quantified by matching the number of occurrences with the categories of each leadership frame. Once the qualitative data were analyzed, the findings were then integrated with the quantitative findings to draw relevant conclusions.

**Reliability and validity.** The following approaches were taken to increase the reliability with the interviews conducted. Each interview took place either in person or via video conference, in a private one-on-one meeting with a set of standardized questions. The interviews were audio recorded and then coded to avoid the subjectivity of the interviewer. The use of the matrix, developed based on a larger review of literature, ensured that the coding process was systematic and reliable.

### **Quantitative**

The survey instrument was disseminated through Qualtrics, an online, password protected surveying software. Descriptive statistical tests were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS; version 25.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY), a statistical analysis software package designed for research in the social sciences, to determine the leadership profile and evaluate the extent to which the perceptions of the leadership orientation match. Data were initially collected within Qualtrics surveying software, downloaded into Excel for cleaning, and then imported into SPSS. Data cleaning in Excel began with an examination of missing data. Participants were reviewed if more than two questions in any of the frame sequence were unanswered. Since each frame sequence consisted of eight questions, the determination

was made that no more than two questions within a frame sequence could be missing data, requiring 80% response per frame per participant. One participant opted not to participate in the survey, so there were no responses to include in the analysis. Another participant indicated their agreement to participate but did not answer any further questions in the survey. As such, there were no responses to include in the analysis.

Scoring the 32 questions in part one of the instrument consisted of averaging the group responses to the questions that corresponded to each of the frames (see Table 3). The items were in a consistent frame sequence: structural (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29), human resources (items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30), political (items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31), and symbolic (items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32). The maximum mean score for each frame was five, and the minimum mean score was one. The primary frame preference of each leader was determined by the highest mean frame score given by the colleagues, and the secondary frame preference was determined by the second highest mean frame score given by the colleagues. Due to the small sample size, and literature that found the validity of self-ratings of leadership to be generally low, the researcher chose to use the ratings of the colleagues to account for this disparity (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

**Reliability and validity.** The Leadership Orientations survey is an established instrument that has been used by researchers for more than three decades and is applicable to the research questions for this study. Since this study utilized portions of the existing instrument, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was conducted on questions one through 32 to ensure that the data in this study were consistent with the data generated by these questions in other studies. Results of this study were comparable to

Bolman's Reliability statistics for Leadership Orientation (Bolman, n.d.). These statistics were based on a multi-sector sample of approximately 1309 managers in business and education. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the four frames in this study (see Table 5) were comparable to Cronbach's Alpha coefficients in Bolman's analysis as for all populations they ranged they between .91 and .93. As indicated in Table 5, all scores for the Cronbach's Alpha test for internal consistency in the current study were above the acceptable level of .70 or higher (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994).

Table 5

*Reliability of Survey Questions Related to Frame Sequences*

| Scale     | Complete responses<br>(n) | Number<br>of Items | Cronbach $\alpha$ |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Overall   | 32                        | 32                 | 0.975             |
| Structure | 33                        | 8                  | 0.940             |
| HR        | 33                        | 8                  | 0.950             |
| Symbolic  | 33                        | 8                  | 0.892             |
| Political | 32                        | 8                  | 0.928             |

*Note.* HR = Human Resource.

A series of tests were run to make sure the test assumptions were met for the inferential statistical tests. Before interpreting inferential test results for planned comparison testing, data were screened to make sure that normality, homogeneity of variances, and independence of observation were met. To determine the comparison of self to other ratings, one-sample *t*-tests were run, using the leader's subscale score as the comparison value. Data are reported as mean  $\pm$  SD. The 95% confidence interval (95%

CI) and effect size statistic (Cohen's  $d$ ) were calculated. Cohen  $d$ , using pooled standard deviations, was calculated to determine effect size (Cohen, 1988). The strength of the effect size was determined as small (0.20), medium (0.50), or large (0.80). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (version 25.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY) was used to perform all analyses. The level of statistical significance was set to  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **PRESENTATION OF DATA**

#### **Introduction**

In Chapter IV, the researcher presents the findings from the qualitative and quantitative data analyses based on the research questions in order to draw conclusions concerning leadership profiles and drivers to enhance strategic planning processes at small, private institutions. The qualitative data presented below include interview excerpts that align with each of the four frames of Bolman and Deal's (1991) leadership model. The scores were initially analyzed separately per frame, and then further analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between the perception of the leaders and their colleagues.

#### **Coding**

Bolman and Deal's (2013) four leadership frames were used to generate guiding questions during the semi-structured interviews. Transcribing the interviews verbatim provided a mechanism for coding. Deductive coding was then used by identifying concepts from literature that resonated with each of the four leadership frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. Table 6 includes a summary of the matrix

compiled for the four leadership frames and the key words the researcher associated with each frame based on literature and interviews.

Table 6

*Criteria for Coding*

| Leadership Frame | Key Words                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Structural       | Goals, roles, clear, clarity, process, attention to detail, structure, purpose, timelines, spreadsheets, deadlines                                                            |
| Human Resource   | Relationships, support, care, concern for others, trust, open, collaborative, inclusive, appreciation, listener/listening, genuine, authentic                                 |
| Political        | Power, conflict, influence, manipulate others, pacify, negotiate/negotiator, gets support from people in power, good support base, strong alliances, assertive                |
| Symbolic         | Culture, connection to mission, ceremonies, story-telling, celebrations, ability to excite, energize, charisma/charismatic, creative, generates enthusiasm, generates loyalty |

## Findings

In this chapter, the researcher presents the results from the analysis of data collected to answer each of the research questions. Data are presented per research question, with the source of the data for each research question presented in Table 7.

Table 7

*Identification of the Source of Data by Research Question*

| Research Question | LOI (Self and Other) Questions # | Interview Protocol Questions for Leader and Colleague                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1                 | 1-32; 1-6; 1-2                   | 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the Leader Protocol                                     |
| 2                 |                                  | 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 in the Colleague Protocol<br>2, 5 and 6 in the Leader Protocol |
| 3                 |                                  | 3, 4, 10, 13 and 14 in the Colleague Protocol<br>3, 5, 6, and 10 for the Leader        |
| 4                 | 1-32; 1-6; 1-2                   | 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, and 14 in the Colleague Protocol                                     |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument.

**Research Question One**

*Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is the leadership profile of leaders of strategic plans?* Both interview question data and survey data were collected and analyzed to address this question. The leadership profile was determined by compiling the results of the primary and secondary leadership frame scores, the leadership style scores, and the perceived effectiveness scores. Support for these quantitative findings is provided by excerpts from the qualitative interviews. The results are first presented in categories which then are compiled to create a profile for each leader.

**Primary and secondary frames.** In order to determine primary and secondary frame preferences for each leader, the mean of each frame was calculated for the colleague ratings and for the leader's self-ratings (see Table 8). These ratings were

determined by the responses from questions one through 32 in section one, addressing leadership behaviors. Lynda (L1) from Institution One scored the highest in the symbolic frame for both the self-score ( $M = 4.13$ ) and the other-score ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ). Sharon (L2) from Institution Two scored the highest on the structural frame for both the self-score ( $M = 4.38$ ) and the other-score ( $M = 4.42$ ,  $SD = 0.52$ ). Stanley (L3) from Institution Three scored the highest on the human resource frame for the self-score ( $M = 4.50$ ) and the political frame when rated by his colleagues ( $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ).

Table 8

*Leadership Orientation Frame Scores of Leaders*

| Institution       | Frame          | <i>n</i> | LOI-Other Score |           | LOI-Self-Score |
|-------------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
|                   |                |          | <i>M</i>        | <i>SD</i> |                |
| Institution One   | Structural     | 15       | 3.34            | 0.82      | 2.88           |
|                   | Human Resource | 15       | 3.60            | 0.91      | 3.63           |
|                   | Political      | 15       | 3.55            | 0.63      | 3.88           |
|                   | Symbolic       | 15       | <b>3.73</b>     | 0.84      | <b>4.13</b>    |
| Institution Two   | Structural     | 12       | <b>4.42</b>     | 0.52      | <b>4.38</b>    |
|                   | Human Resource | 12       | 3.71            | 1.07      | 4.25           |
|                   | Political      | 12       | 3.68            | 0.76      | 3.50           |
|                   | Symbolic       | 12       | 3.62            | 0.89      | 3.25           |
| Institution Three | Structural     | 6        | 2.85            | 0.54      | 3.38           |
|                   | Human Resource | 6        | 2.85            | 1.06      | <b>4.50</b>    |
|                   | Political      | 6        | <b>3.19</b>     | 0.91      | 4.38           |
|                   | Symbolic       | 6        | 2.60            | 0.88      | 4.38           |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument. Bold font indicates the highest mean frame score for LOI-Other and LOI-Self.

Interview questions four through 11 in the protocol for the leader were designed to reveal stories and examples of different frames the leaders would use. The responses were coded and then quantified by the number of occurrences of key words from the interviews that matched the categories of the leadership frames. This evidence supported the results reported in Table 9 for both Lynda, who scored the highest in the symbolic frame with 13, and Sharon, who scored the highest in the structural frame with 17. For Stanley, these data supported the colleague's results that Stanley's primary frame is the political frame, with his highest score of 12 in the political frame. Table 9 includes a summary of the results.

Table 9

*Quantification of Leadership Frames from Interviews with the Leaders*

|         | Structural | Human Resource | Political | Symbolic  |
|---------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| Lynda   | 6          | 11             | 6         | <b>13</b> |
| Sharon  | <b>17</b>  | 13             | 4         | 4         |
| Stanley | 4          | 8              | <b>12</b> | 3         |
| Total   | 27         | 32             | 22        | 20        |

*Note.* Bold font indicates the highest number of key word occurrences per leader.

These results are further supported by the following interview excerpts:

**Lynda.** Lynda was strongest in the symbolic frame. She spoke about how she created and communicated a compelling vision to inspire people to move the plan forward. This was demonstrated by the following quote: "I was able to get up in front of

the entire university and provide the inspirational message about where we were going.” She went on to say, “... lots of people have shared that my explanation of the strategic map (plan), or talking about what it can do for us, talking about where we are headed, is inspiring to them... it keeps people motivated toward wanting to complete the map (plan).”

**Sharon.** The primary frame for Sharon was the structural frame. She spoke about the importance of the strategic plan in creating a framework for decision-making, and how she created a new structure to determine priorities and allocate program resources. “The goals developed provide a blueprint or pathway of what needs to happen in a certain timeframe...they should determine the allocation of resources, which is a touchy subject. I saw it as an opportunity to formalize a process for reviewing program viability. I think getting support from the deans to divine this process, that was data-driven, was great for the university and we never had that.” A colleague mentioned the strength of this frame: “Her strength was her ability to move things forward and keep things going. It’s easy to get bogged down in these types of initiatives, so being able to keep on task keeps the committee on the timeline and the ability to actually get things done at the meetings. That was a great benefit for us.” (C3)

**Stanley.** Based on the quantification of frames from the interviews and the LOI-Other ratings, Stanley’s primary frame was the political frame even though he rated himself highest in the human resource frame. When he spoke about moving the plan toward implementation, he focused on communication designed to build a powerbase and allies: “The benefit in making sure your communication is accurate is to help people make informed decisions, to see us as allies in this process...I kind of walked on

eggshells for a little bit.” He went on to explain how he actively desired to understand the political landscape of the institution early on: “I think I did a really effective job of getting to know this institution’s idiosyncrasies—the things that look like on paper they are in our control, but getting some collective or community support would be far more valuable.” He went on to share, “I’ve learned it pretty quick, learning some of the pitfalls so I can help steer conversations with other people in effective ways.”

The human resource frame was also prominent in the leadership of all three leaders. Both Lynda and Sharon scored the second-highest on the human resource frame for the self-score ( $M = 3.63$ , and  $M = 4.25$ ) and the scores of the colleagues ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ , and  $M = 3.71$ ,  $SD = .07$ ). Stanley scored himself the highest in this category as indicated above, and this frame was scored the second-highest by the colleagues ( $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ), along with the structural ( $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = 0.54$ ). All three leaders operating in the human resource frame as their secondary frame is further supported by the following interview excerpts.

**Lynda.** When asked about their leadership style in relation to the strategic plan, Lynda indicated that she “did a lot of pushing for it to be collaborative...it’s just the norm that we would be working in this very integrated environment... in my area, they (my staff) have learned pretty quickly that I am going to default collaboration for sure.” This human resource approach was echoed strongly in the interviews with both of Lynda’s colleagues. Colleague One (C1) indicated: “There are strong relationships between the leader and her direct reports...a spirit of relation is important, a family kind of vibe...there is an opportunity to provide input and that it will be genuinely received and considered.” Colleague Two (C2) indicated: “I think collective collaboration is huge with

the leader, and how we can accomplish one goal using the diverse talents and abilities of different people... (the leader is) open to continuous dialogue in a way that's worked, in a positive way to maintain relationships."

**Sharon.** When asked about their leadership style in relation to the strategic plan Sharon indicated that, "I led the group from more of a listening stance to hear from the group, because it's not my agenda (to develop), it's our agenda...I wanted to hear what their point of view was more than starting with mine." This human resource approach was supported in the following quote from Colleague Three (C3), "She made it very clear that she wanted members of her team to feel empowered, and to speak up, and that she was very open to that...you feel you can speak your peace in a true and honest way." Colleague Four (C4) also noted: "She was very collaborative with her process...she kept a loose hand to really let people participate...there was a general sense that everyone had an equal seat at the table."

**Stanley.** When asked about their leadership style in relation to the strategic plan Leader Three, Stanley (L3) indicated that, "I tried to get to know every one of the staff. I really wanted to engage with them professionally. I met with everybody...we sat down, spent about an hour just chatting, getting to know each other." This style, rooted in the human resource frame, was further illustrated by Colleague Five (C5): "...he is so relationship focused. He was focused on getting to know the people...and his first instinct was to care about the people, not just as professionals...he built a level of trust."

**Leadership style.** Questions one to six in section two of the LOI-Self and LOI-Other are forced-choice items that ask participants to rank the order of the characteristics using a scale of one to four, with four indicating the phrase that best describe the leader,

and a score of 1 indicating the phrase that least describes the leader. It should be noted that each question had four phrase options, each of which corresponded to a different leadership frame. Results from this section can either confirm or contradict the results from section one above. The highest score was four and the lowest score was one. The mean and standard deviation for these results are provided in Table 10.

Lynda's results were consistent with symbolic serving as her primary frame and human resource as her secondary frame. Of the six questions, four were scored highest in the symbolic frame (questions one to four), and two were scored highest in the human resource frame (questions one to four). Responses indicated her ability to excite and motivate, serve as an inspirational leader, energize and inspire people, be charismatic; thus, results indicated she is best described as a humanist. It should be noted that Lynda consistently scored lowest in the structural category.

Sharon's results were also consistent with the structural frame being her primary frame, as the structural frame was scored highest for all six questions. Responses called attention to her analytic skills, technical expertise, decision-making, attention to detail, logical thinking, and she was best described as an analyst. Sharon consistently scored lowest in the symbolic category.

Stanley's results were also consistent with the political frame, as the political frame was scored highest for five questions, and one was scored highest in the structural frame. These responses indicated his political skills, negotiating skills, ability to build strong alliances, ability to succeed in the face of conflict, logical thinking, and he was best described as a politician. Stanley consistently scored lowest in the symbolic frame.

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Style of LOI-Other*

| Item                            | Category                               | Institution One |             |           | Institution Two |             |           | Institution Three |             |           |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|
|                                 |                                        | <i>n</i>        | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>n</i>        | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>n</i>          | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> |
| Strongest skill                 | Analytic skills                        | 15              | 1.87        | 0.99      | 12              | <b>4.00</b> | 0.00      | 6                 | 2.67        | 0.82      |
|                                 | Interpersonal skills                   | 15              | 2.80        | 0.86      | 11              | 2.36        | 0.81      | 6                 | 2.83        | 1.17      |
|                                 | Political Skills                       | 15              | 2.20        | 1.01      | 11              | 2.45        | 0.52      | 6                 | <b>3.17</b> | 1.17      |
|                                 | Ability to excite and motivate         | 15              | <b>3.13</b> | 1.25      | 11              | 1.18        | 0.40      | 6                 | 1.33        | 0.52      |
| Best way to describe            | Technical expert                       | 15              | 1.67        | 0.98      | 11              | <b>3.27</b> | 0.90      | 6                 | 2.50        | 0.55      |
|                                 | Good listener                          | 15              | 2.73        | 0.88      | 11              | 2.64        | 1.21      | 6                 | 2.83        | 0.75      |
|                                 | Skilled negotiator                     | 15              | 2.27        | 0.96      | 11              | 2.45        | 0.82      | 6                 | <b>3.67</b> | 0.82      |
|                                 | Inspirational leader                   | 15              | <b>3.33</b> | 1.05      | 11              | 1.64        | 1.03      | 6                 | 1.00        | 0.00      |
| Does Best                       | Make good decisions                    | 15              | 2.33        | 1.18      | 11              | <b>3.73</b> | 0.65      | 6                 | 3.00        | 0.00      |
|                                 | Coach and develop people               | 15              | 2.47        | 0.83      | 10              | 2.30        | 0.82      | 6                 | 2.00        | 1.10      |
|                                 | Build strong alliances & a power base  | 15              | 2.07        | 1.33      | 10              | 2.60        | 0.97      | 6                 | <b>3.50</b> | 1.22      |
|                                 | Energize and inspire people            | 15              | <b>3.13</b> | 0.92      | 10              | 1.40        | 0.70      | 6                 | 1.50        | 0.55      |
| Most likely to notice           | Attention to detail                    | 15              | 1.27        | 0.70      | 11              | <b>3.64</b> | 0.67      | 6                 | 2.00        | 1.26      |
|                                 | Concern for people                     | 15              | 3.13        | 0.74      | 11              | 2.00        | 0.63      | 6                 | 2.83        | 1.47      |
|                                 | Ability to succeed in face of conflict | 15              | 2.13        | 0.52      | 11              | 3.00        | 0.89      | 6                 | <b>3.00</b> | 0.63      |
|                                 | Charisma                               | 15              | <b>3.47</b> | 0.92      | 11              | 1.36        | 0.67      | 6                 | 2.17        | 0.98      |
| Most important leadership trait | Clear, logical thinking                | 15              | 2.00        | 0.85      | 12              | <b>4.00</b> | 0.00      | 6                 | <b>3.17</b> | 1.17      |
|                                 | Caring and support for others          | 15              | <b>3.20</b> | 0.86      | 11              | 2.27        | 0.79      | 6                 | 2.67        | 1.03      |
|                                 | Toughness and aggressiveness           | 15              | 1.93        | 1.22      | 11              | 2.09        | 0.94      | 6                 | 2.00        | 1.26      |
|                                 | Imagination and creativity             | 15              | 2.87        | 1.06      | 11              | 1.64        | 0.67      | 6                 | 2.17        | 0.98      |

Table 10 (cont.)

|                         |            |    |             |      |    |             |      |   |             |      |
|-------------------------|------------|----|-------------|------|----|-------------|------|---|-------------|------|
| Best<br>described<br>as | Analyst    | 14 | 1.50        | 0.65 | 12 | <b>4.00</b> | 0.00 | 6 | 2.17        | 1.17 |
|                         | Humanist   | 14 | <b>3.36</b> | 0.63 | 11 | 2.27        | 0.90 | 6 | 2.67        | 1.37 |
|                         | Politician | 14 | 2.21        | 1.31 | 11 | 2.27        | 0.79 | 6 | <b>2.83</b> | 0.98 |
|                         | Visionary  | 14 | 2.93        | 0.83 | 11 | 1.45        | 0.52 | 6 | 2.33        | 1.21 |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument. Bold font indicates highest score in frame and italics indicates lowest.

**Perceived effectiveness.** Section three had two one-item measures: effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. These items were on a five-point scale, with an overall effectiveness score of five indicating the top 20% of individuals, a score of three representing the middle 20% of individuals, and a score of one representing the bottom 20% of individuals when evaluating the effectiveness of people with comparable levels of experience and responsibility. The mean and standard deviation for these two questions are provided in Table 11.

Overall, both Lynda and Sharon were perceived as both relatively effective managers and leaders with mean scores over 3.5 on a five-point scale. Managerial effectiveness is most often related to high scores in the structural frame, whereas leader effectiveness is most often related to high scores in the symbolic or political frames (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Therefore, with Lynda's primary frame result of the symbolic frame, it was logical to see her evaluated higher in the leader category ( $M = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ) than in the manager category ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ). Sharon scored the highest of the three leaders in both the leader category ( $M = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ) and the manager category ( $M = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ). Similar to Lynda, the high effectiveness score as a

manager is not surprising, as her primary frame was the structural frame. Stanley scored the lowest of the three leaders in both the leader category ( $M = 2.67$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ) and the manager category ( $M = 3.17$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ). These results are also not surprising, since Stanley scored highest in the political frame and lowest in the symbolic frame.

Table 11

*Perceptions of Effectiveness as Indicated by LOI-Other*

|              | Effectiveness | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--------------|---------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Leader One   | Manager       | 15       | 3.80     | 1.26      |
|              | Leader        | 15       | 4.20     | 0.94      |
| Leader Two   | Manager       | 12       | 4.33     | 0.98      |
|              | Leader        | 12       | 4.25     | 1.06      |
| Leader Three | Manager       | 6        | 3.17     | 1.33      |
|              | Leader        | 6        | 2.67     | 1.37      |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument.

**Leadership profile.** By compiling the results of LOI-Other into a profile for each leader (see Table 12), the uniqueness of the layers of each frame for each leader emerged. Analysis revealed how the leaders are most likely to lead, what is important to them, and what they do best. This type of profile was created to provide valuable information for presidents and others, to enhance individual and institutional effectiveness and learning. Leaders tend to view their experiences through their own perspectives, and they can often have blind spots that broadly impact their work (Bolman & Deal, 1991). While these

profiles indicated the frames and responses most likely to be used, leaders may move in to the other frames as situations and organizational culture shift.

Table 12

*Leadership Profiles as Determined by Results from LOI-Other*

| Profile                            | Lynda<br>Institution One | Sharon<br>Institution Two | Stanley<br>Institution Three |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Primary Frame                      | Symbolic                 | Structure                 | Political                    |
| Secondary Frame                    | HR                       | HR                        | HR/Structure                 |
| Strongest skill                    | Excite/Motivate          | Analytical                | Political                    |
| Best way to describe               | Inspirational            | Technical Expert          | Negotiator                   |
| Does Best                          | Energize/Inspire         | Good Decisions            | Alliances/Power              |
| Most likely to notice              | Charisma                 | Attention/Detail          | Succeed in<br>Conflict       |
| Most important<br>leadership trait | Caring/Support           | Clear/Logical             | Clear/Logical                |
| Best described as                  | Humanist                 | Analyst                   | Politician                   |
| Effec. as Manager                  | 3.8/5                    | 4.3/5                     | 3.2/5                        |
| Effec. as Leader                   | 4.2/5                    | 4.2/5                     | 2.7/5                        |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument; Effec. = Effectiveness; HR = Human Resource; proportion value indicates score of perceived effectiveness on a five-point scale.

## Research Question Two

*What key practices (steps, decisions, actions, activities and/or strategies by the leader) positively impact the development and implementation of plans?* Both the leaders and the colleagues provided examples of key practices that could be categorized into each

of the four leadership frames. Questions two, five, and six in the interview protocol for leaders, and questions three, four, 10, 13, and 14 in the interview protocol for the colleagues, provided insight to key practices. The findings are presented as they pertain to each leadership frame.

**Structural frame.** The leaders shared examples of structural actions that influenced the development and implementation of the strategic plan. They included how they organized meetings (C4), encouraged the creation of goals and measures (L1, L2), and then used outcomes to change the organizational structure (L2). Some examples were:

“We were really, really good at (being organized) in the beginning of the plan... every director had to make a goal about this aspect of the plan, and how they would measure the goal. Then we would touch base on it once per quarter.” (L1)

“This is connected to our accreditation work. That has to be directly connected to the strategic plan because it helps us identify institutional priorities, the budget, and all of that needs to be wrapped together in to one cohesive document.” (L2)

“Based on the plan, I made a change to the structure of the area, abandoning a staffing model in favor of another. The plan affirmed ideas, formalized them, and gave us credibility to fill positions or do whatever (to change the structure).” (L2)

“I’ve pushed for more personal responsibility and accountability. You are here to be a partner in change.” (L3)

A colleague also affirmed the use of structure as a key aspect that positively impacted the plan. “We worked systematically through a process to develop a series of goals. We worked individually, and in pairs...we put ideas around the room so everyone

could view them. We continued to hone and we looked for overlap. I think the process went very well..." (C4)

**Human resource frame.** Human resource practices that advanced the development and implementation of the strategic plan were prevalent. A theme that emerged across all three leaders was their practice of inviting people to participate in the plan and building relationships that led to greater plan ownership and investment. This finding was consistent with research, which indicated that when individuals are involved in defining problems and solutions, they will be more motivated to achieve the desired outcomes (Kotter, 2007).

Some examples of this were:

"He really just gave me a platform that I hadn't had here yet. I felt like it was so easy for me to be engaged because there was someone here who wanted my opinion."  
(C5)

"A plan that develops from a process where people are involved or engaged, like this one, will be a more powerful plan." (C4)

"People have volunteered to serve on committees across the board (that are designed to complete the work of the plan). I think people want to serve because they were part of the plan development, and they, I think for the most part, have presented ownership for the institution." (L2)

"She was so collaborative in her process. There was an invitation in all aspects for ideas and opinions. There was a general sense that everyone had an equal seat at the table we were all invited to." (C4)

“Being open to continuous dialogue is a way that’s worked in a positive way to maintain relationships.” (C2)

“In my area, staff turnover is really low and partially I think it’s because people feel really valued about their work. They see where it can plug in to the overall university message.” (L1)

**Political frame.** The most prominent key practice in the political frame was that each leader built a strong alliance with one other member of the president’s leadership team during the development of the plan that continued as the plan moved in to implementation. This was illustrated by the following excerpts from the interviews:

Lynda built a strong partnership with a person who had strengths in the structural frame. “When we got together, we put together a spreadsheet and pre-populated some of the boxes with things we thought they (other cabinet members) should be working on. This was an important moment for the plan.” (L1)

Sharon felt like a few of her colleagues took this more seriously than others, and she partnered with a colleague “to do some behind the scenes things to get things in to play. We talked with the president about making sure the whole university was involved and what that might look like. I think both of us took pride in making that happen a little bit.” (L2)

A pivotal moment happened for Stanley when he built a coalition with a very well-respected senior leader. “There was a point midway through where we finally had a meaningful conversation about (what it was going to take to solve a few significant problems). This person then started to have the conversation publicly, taking me off the hook...and then everyone started following suit.” (L3)

**Symbolic frame.** The symbolic frame saw the most varied use across the three leaders to advance the plan. Lynda gave several examples illustrating her strengths in this frame (L1), while Stanley exhibited potential in this area (L3), and Sharon tapped into it in a very limited, yet intentional way (C3), as illustrated by the following:

“One tangible, very connected way we created tradition and celebration around the plan was through the End of the Year Awards. We changed the awards so each one centered on a component of the strategic plan. So, there was someone who gets an award for having advanced the priority the most. It’s one really tangible way to say this was important to us, and remind everyone this is what we’re supposed to be aiming after.” (L1)

“The strategic plan could be the heartbeat of the institution. I tried to paint the big picture of what we were trying to do as an institution...I thought to myself, if these people are so down and we are still doing all right, if they realized how great this is, we were going to get a bit happier. Wild optimism, I guess.” (L3)

“She started each meeting with a prayer, and it was a prayer for educators, so I think that helped us get focused and grounded in our intent and purposes for the meeting. It kept us rooted in our culture, so I’d say that was celebrated.” (C3)

### **Research Question Three**

*What barriers exist, perceived or otherwise, that inhibit individuals and/or institutions from developing and implementing strategic plans?* The barriers expressed by the leaders could be attributed to all four leadership frames. This was similar to the barriers expressed by the colleagues, as they tended to focus on those rooted in the structural and symbolic frames. These results support the findings from Bryson (2010),

which indicated that the barriers encountered in the strategic planning processes are communication issues, lack of clarity, and competing priorities.

**Structural frame.** Two themes that emerged as barriers from the structural frame were the lack of clear roles and ownership for the plan (L1), as well as a gap between the strategic plans, assessment, and budget (C1, C2, C3, C4). The first theme is illustrated by:

“I would say what has definitely stifled plan progress and success is not having an (overall) owner. Is it institutional research and effectiveness? Is it marketing? Those are very different choices. There was a real lack of clarity about plan ownership, and so it became all of us a little bit, and therefore none of us a little bit. So, that I think was a big mess for us—that it wasn’t clearly articulated to someone, like, hey, you are the firekeeper (the owner) and this is what that would look like.” (L1)

“That’s honestly been one of the biggest challenges. It depends on the scope (what my role is). Within my team, it’s easy—it’s my role to lead. What’s been a little more challenging for me to figure out is what my role is as a university-wide leader. It is challenging to figure out when I should lead, when I should follow, or when I should co-lead. When you cross lines...it’s not something we are particularly good at.” (L1)

The second theme was revealed through inconsistent answers regarding the connection between the strategic plan and assessment or budget initiatives. For Institution One, the leader stated that there was an assessment plan and budgets were connected, but the colleagues had conflicting responses:

“An overarching assessment plan? Not to my knowledge,” and “It’s not like there is a pot of money set aside to strategically advance the plan. We have talked about it a lot and it would be nice if that existed.” (C1)

“Yes, yes definitely there is an assessment plan in place,” and “I think it depends about the budget. If someone says I need more funds for this particular area and it attaches to the plan, then it is easier to get those funds, and that’s from a human resource and operational standpoint as well.” (C2)

Members of Institution Two had mixed responses as well:

“I’m not aware (if there is an assessment plan in place). There may be one and I’m not aware of it though,” and “Not to my knowledge (if institutional or departmental budgets have been linked to the plan).” (C3)

“Yes. There is an assessment plan in place because each piece of the plan has to have an assessment component to it. When we talked about it in our committee we looked at that, but I’m not exactly sure where it falls now,” and “I don’t know for sure, but I can say, that it was part of every discussion we had at the committee...so, budget is definitely, it was definitely a significant part of the conversation, and I can’t see how it could not be linked.” (C4)

**Human resource frame.** Another barrier identified for the development of the strategic plan was personnel feeling overwhelmed by the amount of change (L1), and leaders not being certain the team could sustain (L1, L2), as illustrated by:

“The process itself can be a bit tiring and we’ve been at it for a while, so I think people are a little frustrated. For example, when you are in the change and the ice cube is

frozen, we've been unfrozen for a long time. I think people would like to just freeze into any form for just a little bit." (L1)

"I provide lots of inspiration and thoughts about new ideas and brainstorming where we could go, (and I've gotten feedback) that I'm just putting added work on top of people who already feel really busy." (L1)

"There's just a lot happening at the same time. I'm not sure how much more people can do." (L2)

And when the personnel at one institution started to notice a shift in the leader's time, it put a strain on their relationships:

"Early on I tried to get a sense of what made them tick, what they love about this place. Um, but as the year progressed, you get busy and you're not in the office all the time...you started to see the fear on their side, like he's not going to be around, he's just going to go off and do this. People started to go back to their old ways...and I had to go back to them and remind them I'm not going away." (L3)

This was echoed by C5: "He needs to be more present. They (the staff) so desperately want to hear from him because we're a little old school and a lot of people look at his title...and we have to follow him. I think he just needs to have a better sense...just be a little more aware of these are the needs of the people in our office for better or for worse...I think if he could just be a little more aware of the needs of his particular personnel in the office, that would go such a long way." (C5)

**Political frame.** Themes from political barriers were rooted competition (C3), poor negotiating (C5), and turf wars (L1).

“There were some issues that were raised that were contentious between departments, and you kind of know that historically there has been that competition for resources piece. And we know historically this department always get this, and that department will want that.” (C3)

“He can be pretty wishy-washy. I’ll give him a suggestion or we’ll be talking about something, and the next day he’ll have had a conversation with someone else and he’s completely flip-flopped his position. It feels like anyone can change his mind at any point.” They went on to say, “I think people take advantage of him. 100% I think they do take advantage of his wanting to be a good partner...I do worry sometimes that he gets railroaded.” (C5)

For Lynda, the use of the political frame increased as the scope of her work widened from divisional to departmental level, and that has caused barriers. “At the university-wide level, my leadership style needs to be more (of an) influencer, coordinator, leader, (and) communicator. Trying to have all the parties communicate with each other.” She went on to say, “Another VP (vice president) has joked with me that he feels like there are two types of people: lumpers and splitters, and I am a lumper. I always see things as very interconnected, and some people see it as sure, I’ll talk to them, but it’s my job at the end of the day...and there have been pluses and minuses because of that.” (L1)

**Symbolic frame.** A leader with a strong command of the symbolic frame can create a powerful vision that is a beacon for the community. The absence of that can prevent challenges in terms of advancing the strategic plan, as demonstrated by the following excerpts:

“Some of the power dynamics (across the executive leadership team) come from a lack of shared inspirational vision about where we are headed...and some of the relationships of the leadership, of the VPs (vice presidents), have probably stifled clarity of the message out to the community, and clarity of the ask of what we’re asking them to do with the plan.” (L1)

“Things that I think about changing...I would say the things I think about with the plan that weren’t the greatest are not individual moments. They’re mostly moments when we should have inserted it and we didn’t. I would say it’s more that absence and that’s a choice too. We don’t always keep it as plan-centric as we could.” (L1)

Another interviewee went on to discuss the barrier that arose from not creating a grand enough vision from the beginning:

“I’d like to go back to the beginning and revisit the broader vision focus piece again...to create some kind of frame from which the plan might evolve. I think the process was good, but going back and starting with what do we want to look like in five years from now. Kind of have some point where we look to...start out with a broad, general idea and then we come back and start doing goals and tactics. But we started with something more constrained.” (C5)

Each leader also spoke to the barriers created due to lack of celebration.

“As far as formally building it (celebration) into the systems or anything, no, not really. Part of that has been a problem with measurement I think, so how do we know what to celebrate?” (L1)

“Well, I did bring food to the meetings (laughs). I do think that goes a long way. But I don’t think institutionally we did much, or anything, frankly.” (L2)

“I don’t do a very good job. I do a terrible job actually of formally recognizing the celebratory way, our victories and our wins.” (L3)

#### **Research Question Four**

*What kind of relationship is there between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style and the perceptions of their colleagues?* Quantitative and qualitative findings were reviewed independently and then together to determine the relevancy of the relationship. To determine the comparison of self to other ratings, the mean scores were first ranked by frame to determine if there was overall agreement between self and other regardless of score. These results are displayed in Table 13. To deepen the comparison of self-ratings to other ratings, a mean score analysis was run by frame for each leader, and one-sample *t*-tests using the leader’s subscale score as the comparison value were administered to evaluate the relationship between the effectiveness scores. These results are displayed in Table 14.

Table 13

*Rank Order Comparison of Mean Frame Scores*

| Institution          | Rank           | Frame<br>LOI-Self | M    | Frame<br>LOI-Other | <i>n</i> | M    | SD   |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------|--------------------|----------|------|------|
| Institution<br>One   | 1              | Symbolic          | 4.13 | Symbolic           | 15       | 3.73 | 0.84 |
|                      | 2              | Human Resource    | 3.88 | Political          | 15       | 3.55 | 0.63 |
|                      | 3              | Political         | 3.63 | Human Resource     | 15       | 3.60 | 0.91 |
|                      | 4              | Structural        | 2.88 | Structural         | 15       | 3.34 | 0.82 |
| Institution<br>Two   | 1              | Structural        | 4.38 | Structural         | 12       | 4.42 | 0.52 |
|                      | 2              | Human Resource    | 4.25 | Human Resource     | 12       | 3.71 | 1.07 |
|                      | 3              | Political         | 3.50 | Political          | 12       | 3.68 | 0.76 |
|                      | 4              | Symbolic          | 3.25 | Symbolic           | 12       | 3.62 | 0.89 |
| Institution<br>Three | 1              | Human Resource    | 4.50 | Political          | 6        | 3.19 | 0.91 |
|                      | 2 <sub>a</sub> | Political         | 4.38 | Structural         | 6        | 2.85 | 0.54 |
|                      | 2 <sub>b</sub> | Symbolic          | 4.38 | Human Resource     | 6        | 2.85 | 1.06 |
|                      | 4              | Structural        | 3.38 | Symbolic           | 6        | 2.60 | 0.88 |

*Note.* LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument. Subscript a and b = tie in ranking between political and symbolic LOI-Self Scores.

Table 14

*Comparison Analysis of Frame Perceptions Using One-Sample t-tests*

| Leader       | Frame          | <i>n</i> | LOI-Other Score |           | Self-Score | <i>df</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|
|              |                |          | <i>M</i>        | <i>SD</i> |            |           |          |          |
| Leader One   | Structural     | 15       | 3.34            | 0.82      | 2.88       | 14        | 2.18     | 0.047*   |
|              | Human Resource | 15       | 3.60            | 0.91      | 3.63       | 14        | -0.128   | 0.900    |
|              | Political      | 15       | 3.55            | 0.63      | 3.88       | 14        | -2.040   | 0.061    |
|              | Symbolic       | 15       | 3.73            | 0.84      | 4.13       | 14        | -1.873   | 0.082    |
| Leader Two   | Structural     | 12       | 4.42            | 0.52      | 4.38       | 11        | 0.244    | 0.812    |
|              | Human Resource | 12       | 3.71            | 1.07      | 4.25       | 11        | -1.762   | 0.106    |
|              | Political      | 12       | 3.68            | 0.76      | 3.50       | 11        | 0.803    | 0.439    |
|              | Symbolic       | 12       | 3.62            | 0.89      | 3.25       | 11        | 1.435    | 0.179    |
| Leader Three | Structural     | 6        | 2.85            | 0.54      | 3.38       | 5         | -2.366   | 0.064    |
|              | Human Resource | 6        | 2.85            | 1.06      | 4.50       | 5         | -3.807   | 0.013*   |
|              | Political      | 6        | 3.19            | 0.91      | 4.38       | 5         | -3.219   | 0.023*   |
|              | Symbolic       | 6        | 2.60            | 0.88      | 4.38       | 5         | -4.953   | 0.004**  |

Note. LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

**Lynda.** By comparing the initial ranking order of the mean scores between LOI-Self and LOI-Other (see Table 13), both Lynda and her colleagues ranked her highest in the symbolic frame and lowest in the structural frame. The rankings were inverted for the human resource and political frames but were relatively close together for both LOI-Self and LOI-Other scores. Overall, her colleagues rated Lynda much more evenly across the frames than she did herself.

The results of the statistical analysis (see Table 14) indicated that Lynda's self-score of 2.88 in the structural frame was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 3.34,  $t(14) = 2.180$ ,  $p = .047$ . The 95% confidence interval for the structural frame ranged from 2.89 to 3.80. The effect size,  $d = .56$ , indicated a medium effect. From this relationship, we can infer that Lynda had a lower self-perception of her ability in the structural frame than did her colleagues. This is supported by the qualitative data from Lynda's interview as she mentioned several times aspects of structure as an area of improvement for her.

"I'm a great big picture thinker, but I have not been as great about tracking it and being able to tell our story internally and externally," and separately "I could have done more due diligence with tracking what the measurable looks like," and "I'm not sure we've done a great job of updating where we are with certain things," and "We haven't always done a great job of figuring out processes or different payment structures to reinforce parts of the plan." (L1)

This is in direct contrast to what both colleagues indicated in their interviews, as one expressed: "I think a lot of the structure that we've created that the leader has generated and endorsed around the plan, is through the assessment lens. So, we've got it (the plan) in our annual reports, and then basically our assessment should be guided by this." (C2). The other participant suggested: "I think she was strong in making sure that folks were always working towards accountability and assessment." (C1)

**Sharon.** By comparing the initial rank order of the mean scores between LOI-Self and LOI-Other (see Table 13), the ranking of Sharon's LOI-Self scores from highest to lowest mirror that of the LOI-Other scores, indicating complete agreement. As the

data indicates (see Table 14), there were no statistically significant differences for Sharon between the LOI-Self scores and the LOI-Other scores. She scored herself slightly higher in the human resource frame with a mean difference of -0.54, but the LOI-Self scores were lower than the LOI-Other score in the remaining three frames. There was only a slight mean difference in the structural frame of 0.04, the political frame had a mean difference of 0.18, and the symbolic frame saw the greatest mean difference of 0.37.

**Stanley.** The comparison of the initial ranking order of the mean scores between LOI-Self and LOI-Other indicated a lack of agreement in all frames (see Table 13). Stanley ranked himself first in the human resource frame, while his colleagues scored him highest in the political frame. The human resource frame and the structural frame were both ranked second. Therefore, it is not surprising that the results indicated that there were significant differences for three of the four leadership frames when analyzing Stanley's self-score compared to the LOI-Other score. First, Stanley's LOI-Self score of 4.50 in the human resources frame was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 2.85,  $t(5) = -3.807$ ,  $p = .013$ . The 95% confidence interval for the human resource frame ranged from 1.74 to 3.97. The effect size,  $d = 1.56$ , indicated a large effect. Second, Stanley's LOI-Self score of 4.38 in the political frame was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 3.19,  $t(5) = -3.219$ ,  $p = .023$ . The 95% confidence interval for the political frame ranged from 2.24 to 4.14. The effect size,  $d = 1.31$ , indicated a large effect. Finally, Stanley's LOI-Self score of 4.38 in the symbolic frame was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 2.60,  $t(5) = -4.953$ ,  $p = .004$ . The 95% confidence interval for the political frame ranged from 1.68 to 3.53. The effect size,  $d = 2.02$ , indicated a very large effect.

These results support the conclusion that Stanley had a higher self-perception of his command of the human resource, political, and symbolic frames than did his colleagues. This was supported by the qualitative data from a colleague who mentioned the lack of awareness of the leader of both the climate he was entering, as well as the needs of the staff. When asked if the leader had a good understanding of the culture prior to starting the plan, the colleague said: “He had no clue, no clue. I feel bad for him because at this point I had been here almost four years by then (and knew differently).” The colleague went on to share that, “I think it would be helpful if he was more present. He’s the king of calling meetings and not showing up to them, cancelling them, or not sticking to what the plan was for that meeting. I think our team just desperately wants to hear from him. I don’t know if he sees himself as the VP (vice president) at times and he doesn’t think people want to hear from him, and it’s the total opposite.”

Data presented in Table 15 indicates the relationship between the perception of the leader and the perception of their colleagues on their effectiveness as a leader and effectiveness as a manager. One-sample *t*-tests were conducted on the effectiveness scores of the leaders as compared to the effectiveness scores of their colleagues.

Table 15

*Comparison Analysis of Effectiveness Scores Using One-Sample t-tests*

| Institution          | Effectiveness | <i>n</i> | <i>LOI-Other</i> |           | LOI<br>Self | <i>df</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|---------------|----------|------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
|                      |               |          | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> |             |           |          |          |
| Institution<br>One   | Manager       | 15       | 3.80             | 1.26      | 4           | 14        | -0.61    | 0.55     |
|                      | Leader        | 15       | 4.20             | 0.94      |             | 14        | 0.82     | 0.42     |
| Institution<br>Two   | Manager       | 12       | 4.33             | 0.98      | 5           | 11        | -2.35    | 0.0*     |
|                      | Leader        | 12       | 4.25             | 1.06      |             | 11        | -2.46    | 0.03*    |
| Institution<br>Three | Manager       | 6        | 3.17             | 1.33      | 4           | 5         | -1.54    | 0.18     |
|                      | Leader        | 6        | 2.67             | 1.37      |             | 5         | -2.39    | 0.06     |

Note. LOI = Leadership Orientations survey instrument.

\* $p < .05$ .

The only significant findings for the effectiveness scores were found for Sharon. The results indicated that Sharon's self-score of five for effectiveness as a manager was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 4.33,  $t(11) = -2.345$ ,  $p = .039$ . The 95% confidence interval for the structural frame ranged from 3.71 to 4.96. The effect size,  $d = .68$ , indicated a medium effect. Additionally, Sharon's self-score of five for effectiveness as a leader was significantly different from the LOI-Other score of 4.25,  $t(11) = -2.462$ ,  $p = .032$ . The 95% confidence interval for the structural frame ranged from 3.58 to 4.92. The effect size,  $d = .71$ , indicated a medium effect. While these results are statistically significant, it should be noted that, based on the LOI-Other overall ratings, Sharon was rated the most effective of all three leaders in both leadership and management. Additionally, while the results for Stanley in this comparison were not

statistically significant, this may reflect the small sample size rather than the congruence of perceived effectiveness between himself and his colleagues.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

#### **Introduction**

This aim of this study was to understand the leadership profiles of leaders of strategic plans in higher education at small, private universities, along with key aspects and barriers to the strategic planning process. This was accomplished through the use of semi-structured interviews using interview protocols that were prepared to match the research questions for this study. The leaders identified then completed the Bolman & Deal (1990) Leadership Orientations Instrument for Self (LOI-Self), and staff members who worked under that leader during the planning process completed the Leadership Orientations Instrument for Others (LOI-Others). This mixed methods approach was selected as the basis for determining the leadership profile and best practices associated with strategic planning. In Chapter V, the researcher explains the results of the study and the importance of the findings for each of the research questions. Current literature is compared and contrasted for connections, and the implications of these findings are discussed. The limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are provided.

#### **Conclusions and Discussion**

Strategic planning practices have grown over the past several decades in higher education and do not show any signs of stopping (Buhring & Liedtka, 2018; Gardner,

2017). Small, private colleges remain financially unstable amid an accelerating social and technological change, with the pressure continuing to mount on leadership to maintain a competitive edge. Members of executive leadership teams at institutions are most often hired based on their knowledge, skills, and expertise in their direct disciplines, but often become straddled with strategic planning responsibilities, especially at small, private institutions (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Insights into understanding how each of the four leadership frames impact and generate a leader profile can better prepare senior-level administrators to effectively lead strategic planning processes through this continually-evolving landscape.

Four research questions guided the research process. After the interviews were conducted and the data from the questionnaire were analyzed, several themes emerged that addressed the research questions. The qualitative nature of the responses to the questions provided rich examples of the how the leaders demonstrated each of the leadership frames at various points of the life cycle of the strategic plan. This is supported by Bolman & Deal (1991), who noted that “qualitative methods provide a more direct measure of frames of constructs, because they can tap the subtleties and complexities of leaders’ internal worlds” (p. 514). If the leaders and presidents were able to review this type feedback or collect their own, it would provide a valuable tool to approach the strategic planning process. A brief overview of the researcher’s findings follows.

*Research question one: Using the four frames provided by Bolman & Deal (2013), what is the leadership profile of leaders of the strategic plan?* Building the profile for the leaders began with the primary and secondary frame scores. The

researcher chose the primary frame score to come from the highest scored frame according to the LOI-Other scores (see Table 4). Therefore, this frame indicates how others perceive the leader and their leadership style. Each of the three leaders had a different primary frame. This finding is consistent with each of the three leaders holding a different executive position at their respective institutions, as different skills and talents are needed to excel in these roles at an executive level. Executive leadership teams are interdisciplinary in nature, combining different skills, talents, perspectives, priorities, and leadership frames.

The researcher chose the secondary frame to come from the second highest frame score according to the LOI-Others score. For all three leaders, the secondary frame was the human resource frame. This finding was consistent with research that the human resource frame of choice was overwhelmingly the case among other studies of leaders in higher education (Bolman & Deal, 1991, 1992, 2013; Kimencu, 2011; Little, 2010; Probst, 2011; Sypawka, 2008). Preference for the human resources frame in higher education is not surprising, given the high level of face-to-face interaction, shared governance, and complex committee work found on most college campuses. This frame is concerned with involving employees through collaboration, participation, listening, and open communication (Bolman & Deal, 2013). This is especially the case for small, private colleges where relationships are paramount ways to proceed (Soliday & Mann, 2013). It could be reasoned that the human resources frame may be a necessary frame for senior leaders to have at small, private institutions.

Table 16

*Abridged Leadership Profiles*

| Profile           | Institution One |           | Institution Two |           | Institution Three |                    |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
|                   | Other           | Self      | Other           | Self      | Other             | Self               |
| Primary Frame     | Symbolic        | Symbolic  | Structure       | Structure | Political         | HR                 |
| Secondary Frame   | HR              | Political | HR              | HR        | HR/Structure      | Political/Symbolic |
| Effec. as Manager | 3.8/5           | 4/5       | 4.3/5           | 5/5       | 3.2/5             | 4/5                |
| Effec. as Leader  | 4.2/5           | 4/5       | 4.2/5           | 5/5       | 2.7/5             | 4/5                |

*Note.* Effec = Effectiveness; HR = Human Resource; proportion value indicates score of perceived effectiveness on a five-point scale.

A deeper look in to the effectiveness scores of the leaders has several implications. In reviewing the Leader Profiles found in Table 8, in conjunction with the planned comparison analysis by leader of frame perceptions found in Table 9, the concept of self-awareness stands out. The leaders from Institution One and Institution Two had higher scores in the *overall effectiveness as a manager* and *overall effectiveness as a leader* categories, than did the leader from Institution Three. It should be noted that there is greater congruence of the scores between LOI-Self and LOI-Others for both Institution One and Institution Two, and both of those leaders are perceived as effective. However, for Institution Three, there was a disconnect in how colleagues perceived the leader and how the leader perceived himself, as illustrated by the statistically significant differences found in the scores of three frames between the LOI-Self and LOI-Other scores. Therefore, this can imply that self-awareness, more likely than not, can increase others'

perceptions of the overall effectiveness of a leader. Further review of the overall effectiveness scores, both as a leader and as a manager, show that a leader with high scores in the structural frame, followed by the human resource frame are perceived as more effective than a leader with high symbolic or political frame scores, followed by the human resource frame.

The strong presence of the political frame for Stanley may have eroded the perception of his other frames and overall effectiveness. Data from the qualitative interviews demonstrated that while the leader was attempting to develop positive relationships with others, he was often walking on eggshells, and once his availability became limited, fear started to creep in and the attitudes of his colleagues shifted. From this study, it is difficult to conclude whether Stanley was less effective in his role, or whether the health of the environment was a factor. One conclusion may be that leaders need to assess and address the culture and health of the environment at the onset, or they will struggle with effectiveness. This conclusion is supported by the importance of understanding organizational culture in research by Keller (1983), Mintzberg (1994), and Schein (2004). Further research on the implications of the culture and organizational health of the institution with leadership frames would be impactful to the academy.

The scope of the implications can provide a head start to presidents and executive leadership councils that effective positional leaders fit in these profiles. Lynda, the leader from Institution One, was the chief student affairs officer, with higher frame scores in the symbolic and human resource frames. Sharon, the leader from Institution Two, was the provost, with higher frame scores in the structural and human resource frames. Stanley, the leader from Institution Three, was the chief enrollment management officer, with

higher frame scores in the political and human resources frames. The frame scores of the people in these roles were determined by their colleagues, and two of the three were viewed as effective by the same people.

The importance of this finding is that, while frames are simply ways in which leaders see the world (Bolman & Deal, 1991), those involved in the strategic planning process being able to identify and understand how frames can create a profile the leader uses can advance several aspects of the strategic planning process. Furthermore, this awareness can help colleagues understand how leaders can see the same situation differently based on the frame they are using, and it can help presidents determine which member(s) of the leadership team could effectively champion different aspects of this work, or which would work well and complement each other.

*Research question two: What are the key aspects (steps, decisions, actions, activities and/or strategies) that leaders of plans do that can be attributed to the success of the plan?* Qualitative data from the interviews was analyzed to draw conclusions regarding this research question. The researcher found that several of the key steps taken by the leaders could be connected to all four leadership frames. Key actions of which the leaders spoke coded to the structural frame included using the results to drive change to the organizational structure, integrating the strategic plan with accreditation, and creating a spreadsheet for the leadership team with pre-populated priorities and timelines. A theme that surfaced across all of the interviews with the colleagues encompassed the importance of meetings. Future leaders of strategic plans should note that effective use of this face-to-face time was important to all of the colleagues interviewed.

Sharon was the leader with the highest LOI-Other score in the structural frame and was rated the highest in overall effectiveness for manager, while Stanley was the leader with the lowest LOI-Other score in the structural frame and had the lowest overall effectiveness score as a manager. Based on the qualitative data from the interviews from Institution Two, Sharon spent considerable time, effort, and energy on the structure and management of meetings, whereas Stanley was frequently absent from meetings, or changed agendas. While it may seem overly basic, it can be concluded from the data that having clear goals, roles and processes for meetings is a component of success for this frame. Meetings are the opportunity for others to see how the leader works. People can have individual organizational styles that vary in how they coordinate their projects and emails, but facilitating meetings should be viewed as a leadership opportunity, not a burden.

A potential improvement for leaders in the structural frame is to create an environment where all personnel working toward the development of the strategic plan are working from the same assumptions and data. Data have changed tremendously over the past 30 years, and sources of data have grown in breadth and depth. A recommendation would be to create a fact book prior to beginning the process, which has all demographic data and recent assessment work from the institution compiled in a central location. This way, plans for the future can be connected to the baseline of what currently exists.

Key actions of which the colleagues spoke coded to the human resource frame included working collaboratively, encouraging participation from diverse constituents, and spending individual time with personnel in advance of beginning the process in an

effort to cultivate positive relationships. This frame is concerned with involving employees through collaboration, participation, listening, and open communication (Bolman & Deal, 2013). It seems that each of the leaders used this frame well, and both the strategic planning and the participants benefitted from it, as evidenced by the qualitative data shared regarding a high-level constituent ownership of the plan.

A recommendation for leaders in the human resource frame is to be purposeful in choosing the right mix of constituents to serve on the strategic planning committee (Seltzer, 2018). Assess their overall strengths, level of expertise, and the respect level they garner across campus. Research indicates that the people involved can heavily influence the success or outcome of the process (Bryson, 2010; Peters, 1994; Seltzer, 2018).

Key actions of which the colleagues spoke coded to the political frame included developing strategic alliances during the process to advance their agenda, supervising across or up at times, as well as trying to understand the institutional dynamics. The political frame was rated the highest in the LOI-Other scores for Stanley, but he was rated statistically significantly lower than the other two leaders in both overall effectiveness scores. This finding is counter to research “that people who are more adept in understanding and using political frame are perceived by their colleagues, superiors, and subordinates as better managers and leaders regardless of sector, culture and nationality” (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 526). While this is only a sample of one, Stanley’s perceived use of the political frame did not lead to a more positive perception of his effectiveness.

This could be explained by the level of Stanley’s position in comparison with the level of position of those who evaluated him. Based on the demographic data (see Table

2), 100% of the people who responded reported to Stanley, and 83.3% of them had five or fewer years of work experience at that institution. According to Bolman and Deal (1991), managers who work in more political environments are more likely to see through a political lens, act more politically, and create a more political work environment. While working in this frame may be a reality for Stanley at the senior level, it seems to be a challenge for newer professionals to gravitate towards. Strategies from design thinking may be helpful to work with this population.

A recommendation for new leaders of strategic plans who score highest on the political frame would be to leverage the human resource frame consistently throughout the process. Relationships grounded in trust, both professionally and personally, have a far greater chance to overcome challenge and misunderstanding (DeJong & Elfring, 2010). Leaders adept at the political frame are advocates and negotiators who spend much of their time networking, creating coalitions and building a powerbase (Bolman & Deal, 1991). While these qualities are essential to advancing the increasingly corporate landscape of higher education today, they can be viewed critically by members of the academy rooted in much more traditional models of leadership. Leaders with strong political frames need to guard against being viewed negatively depending on the culture of the institution.

Key actions that colleagues spoke about in the symbolic frame included the use of prayer to start meetings to celebrate mission, as well as revamping the end of year awards program to reflect the values of the strategic plan. Lynda had the highest scores in this frame and had the most mentions of it in her interviews. Her mean score ( $M = 4.20$ ) in overall effectiveness as a leader was higher than her mean score ( $M = 3.80$ ) in overall

effectiveness as a manager. This is supported by research that indicates leadership effectiveness is linked to symbols and culture (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The symbolic frame is one of the best predictors of leadership effectiveness. Research on corporate managers demonstrated that they were often very high on the structural frame, very low on the symbolic, and moderately high on the other two. They would struggle when confronted with symbolic issues (Bolman & Deal, 1991). This implies that more structural leaders are not always better. Leaders in higher education who lack depth in this frame could face the same challenges, especially at small, private institutions. Being able to build a distinctive identity rooted in culture and communicated through symbols would be an outstanding outcome of strategic planning. A recommendation is to keep concepts of this frame at the front of one's mind to integrate during all phases of strategic planning.

*Research question three: What barriers exist, perceived or otherwise, that inhibit individuals and/or institutions from developing and implementing strategic plans?*

Qualitative data from the interviews was analyzed to draw conclusions regarding this research question. Interestingly, the barriers reported by the participants were not rooted in the resistance to change, budget, or time commitments, as indicated in the research by Bryson (2010), but rather were rooted in the strength of one frame impeding progress, a lack of development in the other frames, or lack of awareness of the culture of the organization.

One of the interviewees spoke of strong relationships as a barrier to creativity: "Sometimes when you've worked together for a long period of time with a group of people, because that sense of family that's established, or you just know each other so

well and you've worked together so long, sometimes I think that inhibits what can get done in a committee because we've worked together so we think, 'that's not going to happen because it hasn't happened before. So, why even ask now...' it's almost that sense that we know what they're going to be able to do and not be able to do, and so why push too hard in a direction that we know is a dead end?" (C3). A way to ameliorate this barrier is through the use of the design thinking framework which provides tools for nonlinear thought, or by hiring an external consultant who can promote innovation with a fresh perspective (Kolko, 2018).

The political landscape seemed to cause barriers rooted in the human resources frame for both Lynda and Stanley. Lynda was grounded in the work with the team she directly supervised, as indicated in the positive qualitative and quantitative data collected from her colleagues, but she spoke about struggling to determine when to lead, when to follow, and when to collaborate when working with the senior staff at the institutional level. She reported that the president was not directive with her staff in instructing them how to work but did expect the work to be completed at a high-level. Qualitative data implied that she combated this barrier by partnering with a member of the senior leadership team to create a coalition, leveraging her strength in the human resource frame to combat this barrier.

Additionally, as the scope of work increased at the institutional level for Stanley, qualitative evidence demonstrated that the relationships with his direct staff suffered. Stanley may have been successful at networking and building important alliances with those lateral or higher than him, but this was perceived negatively by the staff who worked for him. Unfortunately, data further indicated that Stanley was unaware of how

he was perceived by his colleagues, as indicated by the mean difference in scores for the frames. As a result, he was unable to address or correct this barrier, unlike Lynda.

Another barrier for strategic planning stemmed from a lack of the leader, or leadership team, to fully understand the organizational culture and change readiness aptitude. This was reflected in the following quote:

I think it takes some effort to kind of realize that, we are going to evolve and that we need to, particularly as young faculty come in, and faculty from outside the university. We've got people who have been here a long time, and some who are graduates. So, you've got people with one institutional sense and then you've got people from an outside lens coming in with different points of view. And I think finding the place where those things meet can sometimes be challenging because, you know, for a long time we were an institution that didn't change very much and then we're now an institution that fits and starts changes somewhat rapidly, at least by some people's sense, and not rapidly enough for others. (C4)

Research has indicated a lack of cultural awareness is detrimental to the college's ability to create a transformative environment, rather than one that is just a bit better (Eckel & Kezar, 2003). This barrier can easily be combatted by leaders by including a change readiness assessment as a step in the strategic planning process.

A final barrier as discerned from the data was rooted in the lack of clarity regarding ownership of the plan for Institution One. The barrier to that lack of clarity and communication was further heightened by the inconsistent answers given about the existence of an assessment plan or process to connect the budget to the strategic plan. This is support in research by Bryson (2010), who indicated that there is call for

stakeholder inclusion, data analysis, and data synthesis in both day-to-day operations and long-term strategy development. Often, those three elements suffer at the expense of working at such rapid speeds (Bryson, 2010).

*Research question four: What kind of relationship is there between the perceptions of the leader of their leadership style and the perceptions of their colleagues?* Questionnaire data was analyzed to draw conclusions regarding this research question. Findings were mixed in this area, indicating several opportunities for future research. As noted in the findings for research question four, the data indicated that Sharon was the only leader who had statistically significant differences between her overall effectiveness LOI-Self score and LOI-Other score. The results also indicated that Sharon was the only leader to rate herself a five on a five-point scale, where a score of five indicated “top 20%” as compared to individuals the rater had known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility. While the findings were statistically significant between the ratings, Sharon’s colleagues still rated her highly with 4.3 in effectiveness as a manager and a 4.2 in effectiveness as a leader. The researcher does not believe this is a blind spot for Susan, but rather a reflection of confidence in her outcomes and approach that have been proven over time.

When comparing this type of ranking data between institutions, there could be merit in further understanding how people at each institution evaluate leaders and score perceived effectiveness. Perhaps a rating of a five would be perceived as a perfect rating at an institution, and if the culture supports a belief that no one is perfect then it is reasonable to believe that people would give the second highest rating. Additionally, as previously noted, the findings for Stanley in this comparison were not statistically

significant. A rationale for this result is that it may reflect the small sample size of responses, rather than the congruence of perceived effectiveness between himself and his colleagues. As the newest of the three leaders to his institution, Stanley may lack authentic relationships with his staff, making them hesitant about responding to a survey about his leadership.

Additionally, as noted in the findings for research question four, the data indicated statistically significant findings between the mean LOI-Self score per frame, as compared to the mean LOI-Other score for Stanley in three of four frames, in which he rated himself higher than his colleagues; Lynda for only one frame, in which she rated herself lower than her colleagues; and no significant findings in the differences in Sharon's frames, which is interesting because there was a significant difference in the effectiveness scores, as noted above. Stanley was given the lowest effectiveness scores for both a leader and manager by his colleagues. Based on these findings, it could be concluded that if the perceptions of a leader and their colleagues are significantly different in multiple frames, especially if the self-scores are significantly higher than the scores given by the colleagues, then it is likely that they will not be perceived as effective leader or manager. The difference between the ratings demonstrates a disconnect between the leader and their colleagues, and perhaps a lack of authenticity in the way a leader approaches their work that is perceived by the colleagues.

Finally, since the sample was small, the researcher hesitates to draw conclusions based on the demographic information. However, it is worth noting that the leader that scored the highest in effectiveness as both a leader and manager is the oldest of the three leaders and has the most years of professional experience in higher education. Further

research to include the impact of age and years of experience on perceived effectiveness should be conducted to draw any conclusions about this effect.

### **Related Conclusions**

When asked, all participants agreed that the plan had been either effective in leading to positive change or believed that it showed signs of leading to positive changes for the institution. This is an important signal to presidents and leadership teams that personnel find value in the strategic planning process and that it does provide a sense of hope amongst those involved. Quotations indicating this level of support of the work that has come from the planning process are:

“Yes. It’s early, but we’ve changed the complexion of how we spend our money. We (now) question why we are spending it, where, and why.” (L3)

“I think it has forced us to consider what’s important and I think some tangible results have come from the strategic plan...the fact that you can point back to the plan is really, I think, advanced...it has taken an issue that can be controversial and gave us initiative to try and work through.” (C2)

“My hope is that it will. It’s really just getting started. You never know how it will all shake out in the end, but the initiatives and strategies that have been listed in the plan are designed to move us forward, so I can only hope they are successful.” (C3)

“I think that part of the benefit of any (plan) is just the time you spend talking about it. I remember a particular (moment) with a faculty member where we got so jazzed about what we could do around problem-based learning and the curriculum, and how we could integrate it with the community. In and of itself, regardless of what comes out in the plan, that was time well spent.” (L1)

This conclusion is important to this study, as it provides relief and reassurance to people engaged in this work that even when faced with challenges and barriers, strategic planning can still be seen as a vehicle to make positive changes for the institution. Therefore, sound leadership can greatly influence the potential of this practice. It is clear that employees desire a strong vision, a deeper understanding of what is important to the institution, and an opportunity to be part of the process to get there.

### **Limitations**

There were a number of limitations to this study. This study was conducted with a convenience sample of three institutions, and therefore is only generalizable to the population directly related to this study. Additionally, due to the nature of small, private institutions, staff sizes tend to be smaller, resulting in a smaller sample size of colleagues to survey. However, while the sample sizes of the three institutions were consistent, the return rate from Institution Three was suppressed. Colleagues responding to the survey answered questions about their current supervisor. Even though they were told their answers would be confidential, some may have been hesitant, especially in a more political environment, to complete the assessment. Another limitation was the choice to limit the scope of this study to small, private institutions. A larger number of diverse schools may generate different results.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

The researcher recommends that future research on strategic planning includes measuring plan effectiveness. This would include an analysis of the financial health of each institution studied, as well as marks of cultural transformation, as defined by Eckel & Kezar (2003). Research that further assesses the organizational culture of the

institution using the framework from Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) is also recommended. In their book, *Engaging the Six Cultures of the Academy*, the authors indicated that culture provides meaning and context for a group of people. Understanding the primary cultural type, along with the leadership profiles of executive members of the leadership team, can further strengthen and inform the position from which an institution begins the strategic planning process. This type of research might aid in further explaining the differences found in the data between Stanley and Institution Three. Finally, as design thinking is a more recent phenomenon in the planning sphere of higher education, future research on the perceived effectiveness of this methodology, along with evaluation of participant experience of the process using design thinking strategies, would help inform the industry.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE**

#### **Introduction**

After decades of strategic planning efforts, higher education remains in crisis with tangible threats to the traditional college experience (Blumenstyk, 2015; Seltzer, 2018). Strategies, tactics, and choices institutions make amidst escalating demands and limited resources cost time and money (Seltzer, 2018). Effective strategic planning is critical to help institutions navigate this high-pressure, competitive landscape. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions. The researcher used a mixed methods design to understand the perceptions of leadership styles and best practices for leaders of strategic plans. The findings led to the development of a leadership profile and will be used to develop a dynamic implementation plan based on Kotter's (1996) eight steps of successful large-scale change and Bolman and Deal's (2013) leadership framing theory, which infuses design thinking. This chapter was written for use by a president of a small, private institution prior to beginning the strategic planning process and is in alignment with the dissertation in practice model.

#### **Problem Restated**

The problem addressed in this study deals with the lack of research-proven strategic planning practices used by higher education leaders at small, private institutions.

Pressure is mounting on higher education as the industry continues to face intense criticism for rising costs and underperformance. Leaders should better understand how to implement effective strategic planning processes across their institutions to combat the critical issues they face, such as decreasing federal and state funding, increasing demand, changing demographics of customers, compelling new models for the delivery of education, increasing demands for accountability from the federal government, and continually being asked to do more with less (Blumenstyk, 2015; Scott, 2013). College presidents and leadership teams have engaged repeatedly in strategic planning processes over the past several decades with the intention that they would create a framework to achieve desired success and value propositions that form competitive advantages. However, even with decades of these initiatives underway, higher education remains in crisis with tangible threats to the traditional college experience (Billups, 2015).

Many small, private colleges are highly dependent on tuition revenues, have been historically operating on slim margins, and have few reserves available (Carey, 2014). Increasing the capacity for higher education to be fiscally and socially responsible is an issue of concern not only to the students, faculty, and staff in direct contact with the institution but also to society as a whole due to the impact higher education has on community wellbeing (Arnove et al., 2013). The benefit of assessing leadership styles and understanding key leadership characteristics is to enable leaders involved in all phases of strategic planning processes to lead positive change.

### **Solution**

Challenges with strategic planning are often related to participant impressions that strategic planning is too time consuming, just another task in an already busy day, a tactic

for public relations, or simply a financial drain (Mintzberg, 1994; Soliday & Mann, 2013). Leaders have also grown weary of strategic planning, at times approaching it as a requirement to be met, or an exhaustive wish list of all constituents' hopes and dreams (Seltzer, 2018). If, through the application of research-proven strategies, presidents had a clear understanding of how leadership, innovation, and communication impacted the trajectory of the strategic plan and had ways to improve these practices, the planning process might shift to an element of organizational behavior that institutions appreciate and benefit from. A multi-frame implementation model is a means to achieve this goal.

### **Leadership Platform**

This leadership platform is built on the premise that effective leaders are able to develop authentic relationships between themselves and their followers to achieve strategic organizational objectives through collaboration, innovation, and change (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005; Komives & Wagner, 2017; Lussier & Achua, 2016). This platform is further built on the belief that leadership skills can be taught, practiced, and developed, while understanding that skill development is not a substitute for the integrity and character development needed for the complex role of university president.

Rooted in the Social Change Model (SCM) of leadership development, leadership is viewed as a purposeful, collaborative, values-based process that results in positive social change. The two primary goals of this model are to enhance learning and development of the participants involved and to contribute to social change within the organization or in the community (Komives & Wagner, 2017). This type of impact is consistent with the goals of strategic planning. Institutions that can cultivate environments that are supportive of organizational learning, prior to beginning the

strategic planning process, will greatly benefit as research suggests this is a helpful element in achieving successful and sustained institutional change (Boyce, 2003).

Organizational learning adds value and can become part of the culture of the institution.

## **Leadership**

With the tenure of college presidents decreasing by almost two years (American Council on Education, 2017), there has been an increase in the hiring of nontraditional presidents, from both inside and outside of the academy, who bring diverse skillsets but often have steep learning curves. It is clear that there is not a one-size-fits-all prototype for university presidents now, nor will there be in the future. The same could be said for a one-size-fits-all leadership style or theory, as they are concepts that are both desired and detested by many. There is a gap in the literature between the formal, academic study of leadership and the more practical methods for translating that knowledge into everyday practice. Great leaders move people. They know their emotions are powerful and use them as a way to create positive contagion for others (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005).

Leadership can also be stressful, lonely, and put distance between the leader and the people with whom they work. This distance is sometimes understood by society as power, which can contribute to political environments and stratification within organizations (Dugan, 2017). Using a critical approach would allow presidents to review this material through their lived experience, deconstruct and reconstruct these beliefs, and refine their own approach to leadership.

## **Beliefs**

Resonant leadership theory indicates that “people follow resonant leaders because the leader’s heart is so clearly in the work” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 22). Resonant

leaders bring out the best in others and are inspirational and compassionate. These leadership traits are very similar for those who score high in the symbolic framework of Bolman and Deal (1991). It is important for these leaders to believe that leadership is a two-way street. Humble leaders recognize they also need to be led at times by the mission of the institution, those with more experience, and those with different perspectives. They crave learning and are continually learning, listening, and adjusting to those around them, which is in alignment with the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Lussier & Achua, 2016). Resonant leaders are also mindful and seek to live to “full consciousness of self, others, nature, and society” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 3). This type of belief would be very important to a new president. Practicing mindfulness enables leaders to renew themselves and be resilient in the face of adversity. Small, private institutions are often leaner organizations, meaning there is more work to be done and it can be harder for people to renew. Presidents who believe in renewal can model these practices for others.

## **Values**

It is critical for leaders, especially new presidents, to deeply connect with their values to ensure they align with the values of the institution they are considering leading. Strategic leaders, who believe core values should be more than a blurb on the website, incorporate values into the culture of the organization (Lussier & Achua, 2016). Often, new presidents enter with the desire to change the culture and anticipate using a strategic plan to do so (Mitchell & Maldonado, 2015). Changing culture is quite hard, but changing the values of an institution is even more challenging and often times should not be attempted unless instructed to do so by the hiring board of trustees or directors. Once

value alignment is determined, a few important values for presidents to cultivate and project include optimism and hope. Hope allows leaders to inspire others through vision, optimism, and a deep belief that together anything is possible (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005). These values would be especially useful in a strategic planning process to encourage stakeholder engagement.

A valuable exercise for leaders to conduct prior to starting a strategic planning process is values clarification and congruence across the institution. The outcomes of that type of activity can then provide a strong foundation and common language upon which a strategic plan can be built, and clear priorities can be set for the institution. For example, a strategic plan for a university that determined that their values include student success, student engagement, access, and team-based learning would look very different from an institution that determined that their values include developing a workforce for the local community, enhancing the application of technology, and academic excellence. The generation of definitions and examples of what the values look like in practice at each institution would also be valuable, as concepts such as collaboration, transparency, and shared governance are often discussed as desired ways to operate but are vague in how they are best practiced. Values clarification can also minimize tension that may occur between the different stakeholder groups and leaders due to the lack of operational definitions.

Additionally, to maximize the effectiveness of a collaborative strategic planning process, the president and senior leadership need to value shared governance, which means they are willing to share power and decision-making responsibilities. Faculty and staff can quickly see through meetings and committees predicated upon generating

recommendations and providing feedback, that never gets acted upon by the leadership. It can be very unsettling to some presidents to be both humble and confident enough to share power and decision-making, but that can be made easier when there is a common value set upon which the strategic plan and shared priorities are developed.

Additionally, there is an opportunity to enhance accountability within strategic planning processes beyond the metrics of goals and tactics that can accurately assess the life cycle of the planning process. A taxonomy can be created that calibrates the strength of the governance structure, integrity of the process, and level of campus buy-in related to strategic planning. This type of context for planning would elevate the level of leadership, agility, and innovation in an ongoing manner.

### **Implementation Strategy**

Table 17 below displays an eight-step implementation plan for presidents to consider when embarking on the strategic planning process. This plan is based on Kotter's (1996) eight steps of successful large-scale change and on Bolman and Deal's (2013) leadership framing theory, while also infusing design thinking.

Table 17

*Eight-Step Implementation Plan*

| Steps of Change                                   | Organizational Frame                            | Actions                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Urgency Starts with Knowing Yourself              | Structural                                      | Conduct self-assessments in connection with environmental assessments.                                                                               |
| Assemble a Team with Diverse Leadership Profiles  | Human Resource                                  | Determine when to begin the plan, who should lead the plan, and who has a seat at the table.                                                         |
| Use Design Thinking to Develop the Strategic Plan | Structural, Human Resource, Symbolic            | Generate engagement & innovation by applying design methodology as a framework for problem-solving.                                                  |
| Communicate the Strategic Plan                    | Structural, Political, Symbolic                 | Explain the why and how in multiple formats to generate buy-in & action of all stakeholders. Be aware of saturation. Advance the message every time. |
| Launch the Implementation Phase of the Plan       | Structural, Human Resource, Political, Symbolic | Provide direction, while promoting engagement. Goals & timelines need to be met with resources and metrics for success.                              |
| Celebrate Wins and People                         | Symbolic                                        | Build momentum; reward plan-oriented objectives; provide feedback; silence the critics.                                                              |
| Making the Plan a Reality                         | Structural, Human Resource, Political           | Keep urgency high and raise the bar. Integrate financial, strategic, assessment and accreditation (if applicable) plans.                             |
| Embed Change as a Tradition                       | Structural, Symbolic                            | Assess; adjust; reward; repeat.                                                                                                                      |

*Note.* Adapted from *Leading Change* by J. P. Kotter, 1996, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. Copyright 1996 by John P. Kotter.

*Step one: Urgency starts with knowing your own leadership profile.* While Kotter (1996) suggests the first step in leading change is through creating urgency in others, this implementation plan suggests that a sense of urgency needs begin with the president in the form of conducting self-assessments in connection with environmental assessments. Presidents often arrive with a vision of success for moving the institution forward, ensuring financial stability, and elevating the profile of the institution (Mitchell & Maldonado, 2015). The reality of the arrival of a new president is that it is often accompanied by a sense of unease, fear of change, and the hoarding of current resources by institutional personnel.

The first step for new presidents is to take the Bolman and Deal (1990) LOI-Self survey and determine their leadership profile. They can use the resultant profile to enhance competencies needed in emotional intelligence and relationship management during the transition. Additionally, regardless of whether they have served as a university president before, they would also benefit from understanding the unique culture of the institution as quickly as possible. Even for those who score high in the human resource frame, developing new relationships are particularly hazardous for people brought in to lead change (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005). Additional self-assessments in this area, such as the *behavioral leadership style inventory* and the *charismatic, transformational or both inventory*, may also be helpful for leaders to continue to grow in this arena (Lussier & Achua, 2016).

Determining one's leadership profile by taking the LOI-Self will reinforce a leader's strengths by identifying what they do best and locating their blind spots. To better understand how their profile interacts with the environment, the president should

assess change readiness, organizational culture, and/or the climate to understand the culture of the institution at a deep level as quickly as possible. Antheil and Spinelli (2011, p. 24) share an “everyday trade-offs” exercise that was designed to deepen their understanding of influences on the university culture prior to embarking on the planning process. Beginning with initiatives to increase self-awareness in connection with an environmental assessment sets the stage for the leader to advance to the next step.

*Step two: Assemble a team with diverse leadership profiles.* Leadership of the plan is critical and should be designated to the most skilled and respected professionals at the institution who are capable of managing a comprehensive change process, not necessarily those that are the highest ranking (Soliday & Mann, 2013). This process, especially with the infusion of design thinking, is about breaking down walls to release creativity and foster comradery. The importance of the president and executive leadership team to identify the right champions at the various stages of this process should not be underestimated. This can be the difference between an institution going through the motions or being inspired to lead transformational change (Latham, 2013).

Once the leaders with appropriate profiles are identified, assembling a team that represents all groups with an interest in the college is often considered a best practice, along with those individuals who can think about the institution first (Seltzer, 2018). Some leaders may wonder about student involvement in a steering committee, recognizing that not all leaders are comfortable with student participation in strategic conversations. It is imperative that, if the president is not comfortable with students serving on steering committee, students should be engaged directly. Committees often spend time theorizing what students would benefit from, rather than simply asking them.

*Step three: Infuse design-thinking strategies to develop the plan.* Change the language to change the results. This begins with clear instruction to do away with traditional strategic planning verbiage, in favor of language that reflects design thinking and innovation. Language matters, especially in higher education, and small shifts could make large differences in the outcome of the process. Good design-thinking approaches begin with a focus on user-experiences, especially their emotional ones. This would be a very different approach for many institutions to take when it comes to developing a strategic plan, as most start with ways to increase enrollment and diversify revenue streams. A design-thinking approach is well-suited for the strengths and value propositions that small, private colleges provide in the marketplace. Furthermore, it provides a window for leadership to be able to focus on every customer-facing function, which at times gets lost in the prioritization for change. Empathetic interviews can help committee members see opportunities and define problems in ways they had not considered before. Ultimately, innovation should be an outgrowth of the strategic plan process if done correctly.

The results from this study, and from the research of previous studies, indicated that many leaders in higher education have strong human resource frames, which would appear to be a good fit for the design-thinking approach. If a president or executive leadership team was strongly considering this approach, they should plan to invest in intensive training not only for the identified leaders of the strategic plan but for members of the steering committee as well.

*Step four: Communicate the strategic plan.* It is imperative for the leaders to ensure that the strategic plan is not the best kept secret on campus. Carefully craft a

communication plan with the professionals at the institution who specialize in this area. This can include public relations, media relations, government relations liaisons, marketing faculty, etc. Communication is one of the most complex and difficult issues for organizations, which can be frustrating due to all of the methods institutions have to communicate today.

The institutional website should be a valuable resource for the leadership team to share information and keep the community up to date on the progress. Reports should be given at all open forum events, faculty senate meetings, student government meetings, and any time the president is speaking, which explain both the why and how of the plan to generate buy-in and serve as a call to action of all stakeholders. Be aware of saturation. Assess and communicate.

*Step five: Launch the implementation phase of the strategic plan.* Once the plan is developed and communicated, presidents need to signal the end of the planning phase and the beginning of the implementation phase. This is often a missed opportunity in higher education, especially at small, private institutions where strategic planning is often an additional job responsibility given to a senior leader. A way to mark this transition can be as simple as sending an email or hosting a reception to thank the leaders of the planning phase and introduce the leaders of the implementation phase to campus stakeholders. The lack of clear ownership as plans move in to the implementation phase is one of the biggest inhibitors of success of strategic plans. Conflation often happens during this transition with respect to accountability, as Institutional Research offices are often tasked with generating reports based on the plan without any authority over the initiatives designed to propel the plan forward.

As the plan moves in to the implementation phase, it is important for leaders to provide a balance of clear direction while still encouraging engagement in the plan (Kotter, 1996). Goals and timelines should to be met with resources by leaders that are designed to remove barriers. Failure to allocate resources to support the plan will forfeit any opportunity for innovation or change to occur.

A key constituent group which is often neglected in strategic planning is the strong director-level staff of the institution (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Involving them early and often in the implementation phases of the strategic plan helps them understand the bigger picture of the institution, and this empowers them to lead their teams purposively. They should be viewed as the future leaders of the college; thus, intentional development of that group through a process as comprehensive as this would be highly valuable.

*Step six: Celebrate wins and people.* Leaders with high scores in the symbolic frame would be excellent champions of efforts to celebrate and acknowledge work that supports the strategic plan. Institutions should spend time and effort to work on institutional self-esteem, which Soliday and Mann (2013) define as a tangible feeling that shows up at institutions as excitement and motivation. When morale is low innovation is often stagnant, leaving people to retreat into silos and supervisors to listen to complaints for hours. Improving institutional self-esteem is typically an indicator of institutional success. One way to improve institutional self-esteem is to share success stories highlighting both the personnel and the programs that successfully implemented initiatives from the strategic plan. This type of celebration gives the community reasons to be proud and inspires them to create their own change daily by living the plan.

*Step seven: Make the plan a reality.* Strategic planning is a complex process that takes substantial time and effort to execute at a high level. Strategic leadership involves adaptation, and tradition-oriented leaders routinely accept the status quo. The role of the president is to understand the consequences of accepting mediocrity, especially when it comes to strategic planning and fiscal sustainability. If those consequences aren't fully understood, the institution will be thrust into a cycle of periods of stagnation followed by sudden periods of crisis (Soliday & Mann, 2013). Many leaders of small, private institutions are already painfully aware of their financial standings and know they cannot endure repeated cycles of turmoil. This step requires executive leaders to collaborate across lines to integrate the financial, strategic, assessment, and accreditation (if applicable) plans. In order to reinforce the importance of integrated processes and working collaboratively, the president could direct his senior leadership team to define shared goals, as well as develop metrics around key performance indicators (KPIs) that connect back to the overall plan. This type of work would allow them to see areas that can be accelerated by partnering more closely.

*Step eight: Embed change as a core value/tradition.* This step is described as assess, adjust, reward, repeat. This final step in the implementation plan is about solidifying strategic management as a way the institution will proceed forward. It moves the focus beyond the creation of a plan that is designed to guide the institutions for the next three to five years, providing a framework for the institution to proactively address and be flexible when navigating the inevitable changes of the future.

## **Sustaining the Solution**

This eight-step plan is not meant to solve all problems when it comes to strategic planning processes for colleges and universities. Rather, it is designed to help organizations cut through the complexity and take a course of action. By beginning with a greater understanding of oneself along with the campus culture, a president will begin to frame the right planning process for their institution at that given time. Ongoing key issues that should periodically be revisited are the timing of plans, stakeholder involvement in the plan, financial support for plan initiatives, ongoing communication, assessment, and celebration of the plan.

Leaders should stop approaching strategic planning as “a project that a college does,” but rather as a process of strategic management. A major challenge to improving strategic-planning, therefore, is to create processes designed specifically to facilitate strategic thinking, acting, and learning rather than processes that stagnate it. Since a strategic management *process* is a large shift from a strategic planning *project*, many colleges who have not been successful in getting sustained results from prior strategic planning processes should strongly consider hiring a senior leader for Strategy and Decision-Making. Higher education as an industry is starting to gravitate towards the creation of Offices of Institutional Effectiveness with varying intent and mission. Some colleges create these offices to provide a lift to the concept of Institutional Research, while others are viewing Institutional Effectiveness more broadly as a vehicle to bolster change and innovation.

As noted earlier, organizations spend an estimated \$10 billion on leadership development training alone, and most of that is in the structural and human resource

frame (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Lussier & Achua, 2016). Changes in personnel at the president, cabinet, and trustee level can set institutions back years. The severity of the situation would be dependent on the longevity of the person in the role, and the positive or negative relationship they have with the community. Some cabinet members and trustees may be able to exit with very low impact, while others may not. However, a presidential transition will typically yield a more substantial impact to the momentum of a strategic management process.

Strategic planning has typically been implemented in higher education as a project that needs to be completed within a specific timeframe for a specific timeframe, rather than as an ongoing management philosophy that could help the institution achieve success with the proper planning and champion(s) to lead. Elite organizations are planning, implementing, and learning on a continuous basis. It is only during the implementation of a plan that people will start to change their language, their mental models, and their perceptions of what this particular institution is—and will be—in its distinctiveness, that we can say the change is actual and sustainable (Antheil & Spinelli, 2011).

### **Overarching Considerations**

#### **Financial**

Small, private colleges are among the most vulnerable in higher education today. Several have been closed, merged, or bought out in recent years, with less than one in eight having the financial resources needed for sustainability (Carey, 2014). Presidents are under immense pressure with several competing entities. Together, an integrated strategic and financial plan can serve as the guiding document that presidents need to

clarify the vision and priorities for the institution. Leadership that attempts to remedy their financial situation in a holistic manner, rather than reacting to each symptom of the problem, will have a fighting chance to distinguish themselves in the marketplace in the next decade (Carey, 2014).

Presidents are falling short in utilizing strategic plans and strategic management as a vehicle to drive fiscal health. Most small, private colleges will be perpetually tuition-driven (Hunter, 2012). They need to be clear and disciplined around factors that could lead to missed targets in enrollment or fundraising, unless the endowment is so large that it can fulfill the revenue needed to meet the enrollment goals. Revenue should be generated not just by raising tuition and fees annually, but also by making cuts in the least impactful programs and services each year to reallocate funds to new and inventive initiatives. To change the history of this problem, leadership should emphasize that sometimes it is not fiscal resources that are needed but rather appropriate attention, focus, and effort spent on a strategic initiative (Soliday & Mann, 2013).

A president's approach to understanding financial considerations related to the strategic planning over the next ten years could be a multi-prong approach:

- Clear understanding of the demographics and demand for higher education including enrollment trends, net tuition and pricing factors, and endowment implications.
- Acute awareness of research that suggests key factors for leading change at small, private colleges include presidential transparency, decisiveness, and collaboration as three of the greatest contributors to financial turnarounds (Carey, 2014).

Transformation is about getting people to think differently and change mindsets, as much as it is about improving processes and realigning budgets.

- The development of a strategic financial plan in alignment with the strategic plan.

A comprehensive financial plan should be implemented and connected to the strategic plan that has equal focus on expenditure and cost patterns, as well as on revenue (Brinkman & Morgan, 2014).

Without this type of integrated approach, institutions run a very real risk of making strategic decisions that are not be in the institutions' best financial interests long-term. When properly developed and implemented, a strategic financial plan serves as a blueprint for future growth. It brings key issues into focus by mapping out available financial resources and matching those resources with strategic capital requirements. It also will highlight any gaps, allowing institutions to make proactive adjustments. In short, strong strategic financial plans will provide institutions with the foundation to support the execution of the strategic plan. It also provides the knowledge needed to make informed strategic and operational decisions. An integrated strategic financial plan can help universities and colleges link the institution's strategic mission and vision to measurable financial objectives; identify whether strategies can be supported financially given the institution's capital capacity; quantify future financial risks, consider alternative scenarios, and specify sensible reactions to expected or unexpected changes; make better decisions grounded on solid data; and operate quickly and flexibly in a dynamic and complex marketplace, with improved oversight and control (KaufmanHall, 2018).

## **Integrating Diversity and Inclusion Efforts in Planning**

When strategic planning began to gain momentum in higher education in the 1980s, there was a tendency for campuses to try to adopt textbook business strategic planning approaches, and most failed (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). Interestingly, it was also in the 1980s when higher education leaders began to address campus climate and equity issues (Kezar, 2008). Diversity initiatives often have several broad goals, including developing an understanding of diversity, infusing attention to differences, and creating greater equity in the experience and outcomes of individuals from diverse backgrounds (Hale, 2004). Strategic diversity initiatives often emerge either from the top down, with the president or other leaders in positions of authority, or from the bottom up from faculty, staff, or students to eventually become integrated into the overall institutional strategic plan.

In these discussions, presidents are able to fulfill many roles that most other leaders cannot because they do not have the authority or leverage to help advance a diversity agenda which is often as complex as the organization (Kezar, 2008). For example, presidents can help to create institutional commitment by relating a diversity agenda to the institutional mission, including diversity in strategic planning and budget processes, or establishing rewards and incentives. Some suggest that leadership is perhaps the most important factor in ensuring institutional transformation and institutionalizing a diversity agenda (Kezar, 2008).

## **Leading Change in a Political Environment**

Colleges and universities are inherently political organizations, and many scholars argue that they are becoming even more political over time (Kezar, Chambers, &

Burkhardt, 2005). While this alone might make leaders consider the importance of the political frame for creating and negotiating change, the type of change initiative is also important to examine in evaluating the right leadership framework to leverage when navigating change.

In order for presidents to be able to advance a diversity agenda, they need to be aware that if an issue is identified as political, then change is often not likely to occur (Gioia & Thomas, 1996). Kezar (2008) indicated that if leaders believed conflict would emerge, interest groups and factions were formed, competing interests were prevalent, or fighting over resources was likely on an issue, then they tended to avoid the concern. Presidents are traditionally not well-equipped to address politics, and this often prevents strategic change and weakens change processes. While practitioners shy away from issues that are labeled political, research suggests that leadership is the most important factor when it comes to creating and sustaining a diversity agenda (Hurtado, Miley Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Tierney, 2009).

Bolman and Deal (2013) suggested that there are four main activities for political leaders, or presidents in this case, to undertake when trying to lead change: mapping the political terrain, coalition building and developing advocates/allies, persuasion, and bargaining and negotiating. While these strategies are not used in any strict progression, certain strategies are more helpful at the beginning phase of politics, such as mapping the political terrain, and some are better as the politics become more advanced, such as negotiation. Bolman and Deal (2013) argued that to be successful at change, leaders need to carefully assess the political landscape of their organization.

Leaders also need to be able speak effectively with individuals representing different interests and help them see commonalities. For example, a president might identify key staff, students, administrators, and faculty and bring them together to create a larger coalition, creating an advisory team around certain issues. In addition, presidents are also encouraged to gain support from influential individuals such as long-time faculty members, dedicated alumni, or local leaders who can become advocates or allies (Bolman & Deal, 2013). These influential individuals tend to have the trust and attention of a variety of groups on campus, and they are the individuals that people check in with to clarify their own perspective. Usually seen as being fair and not maintaining a particular political position, these individuals vary by campus, so it is important for leaders to build relationships with these trusted leaders.

Once the political terrain is mapped, presidents may want to look to the teachings of relational leadership. Relational leadership is defined as a relational process of people attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good, and this type of leadership is deeply focused on the building and cultivating of relationships (Uhl-Bien, 2011). The five components of relational leadership are: being inclusive of people and different points of view, empowering those that are involved, committing to common goal(s), being ethical, and understanding that leadership is process-oriented. To be a truly effective president, one should not only understand the political landscape; one should build relationships that will impact positive change.

The upside of the rapid societal changes impacting higher education is that these changes are filled with opportunity. Institutions that can unpack and maximize those

opportunities, with presidents who have the courage it takes to change mediocre business practices, can transform their organizations and carve a sustainable path for the future.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Albon, S. P., Iqbal, I., & Pearson, M. L. (2016). Strategic planning in an educational development centre: Motivation, management, and messiness. *Collected Essays On Learning and Teaching*, (9), 207-226. doi:10.22329/celt.v9i0.4427
- Alqahtani, S. S. A. (2016). King Saud University's strategic plan implementation (KSU 2030). *Journal of Competitiveness Studies*, 24(1&2), 1-15. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/c33f29af48118034a8244117aaf03b60/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=32907>
- American Council on Education. (2017). *American college president study 2017*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Antheil, J. H., & Spinelli Jr., S. (2011). Action research to support the sustainability of strategic planning. *Planning for Higher Education*, 39(4), 23-31. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ944313>
- Arnone, R. F., Torres, C.A., & Franz, S. (2013). *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (4th Ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Austin, A. W., & Lee, C. B. (1972). *The invisible colleges: A profile of small private colleges with limited resources*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

- Auld, D. (2010). Strategic planning and the principal-agent issue in higher education leadership. *Academic Leadership*, 8(3), 220-224. Retrieved from <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1483&context=alj>
- Balzer, W. K. (2010). *Lean higher education: Increasing the value and performance of university processes*. New York, NY: Productivity Press.
- Batra, A., Kaushik, P. & Kalia, L. (2010). System thinking: Strategic planning. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 7(4), 5-12.
- Batra, A., Kaushik, P., & Kalia, L. (2010). Systems thinking: Strategic planning. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 7(4), 5-12.
- Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education*. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy: Revised and expanded edition of the four cultures of the academy*. San Francisco, CA John Wiley & Sons.
- Billups, F. (2015). Strategic planning in the academy: Reflections on what really matters. *Planning for Higher Education*, 43(3), 41-45. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/c17a30d8e08ddbb9beccffe30eee922c/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47536>
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they came from, what they do, and why they fail*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Blumenstyk, G. (2015). *American higher education in crisis? What everyone needs to know*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Bolman, L. (n.d.). Research using Leadership Orientations Survey Instrument. Retrieved from <http://www.leebolman.com/orientations.htm>
- Bolman L.G., & Deal, T. E. (1990). *Leadership orientations instrument*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 509-534.  
doi:10.1002/hrm.3930300406
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 314-329.  
doi:10.1177/0013161X92028003005
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2005). *Resonant leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 28(2), 119-136.  
doi:10.1023/B:IHIE.00000006287.69207.00
- Bracker, J. (1980). The historical development of the strategic management concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(2), 219-224. doi:10.5465/amr.1980.4288731
- Brinkman, P.T., & Morgan, A.W. (2014). Financial Planning: Strategies and lessons learned. In Weidman, J., Yeager, J., Cohen, L., DeAngelo, L., DeLuca, K., and Gunzenhauser, M. (Eds.), *ASHE Reader Series: Economics and finance of higher education* (pp. 653-662). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

- Brown, A. W., & Ballard, S. L. (Eds.). (2011). *Changing course: Reinventing colleges, avoiding closure: New directions for higher education*, 156 (109). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bryson, J. M. (2010). The future of public and nonprofit strategic planning in the United States. *Public Administration Review*, 70(1), 255-267. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02285.x
- Bryson, J. M., & Alston, F. K. (2011). *Creating your strategic plan: A workbook for public and nonprofit organizations* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Buhring, J., & Liedtka, J. (2018). Embracing systematic futures thinking at the intersection of strategic planning, foresight and design. *Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(3), 134-152. doi:10.24840/2183-0606-006-003-006
- Buller, J. L. (2015). *Change leadership in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Capelo, C., Lopes, A., & Mata, A. (2015). A simulation-based approach for teaching the systems perspective of strategic performance management. *Accounting Education*, 24(1), 1-26. doi: 10.1080/09639284.2014.979430
- Carey, A. (2014). On the edge: A study of small private colleges that have made a successful financial turnaround. *Christian Higher Education*, 13(5), 306-316. doi:10.1080/15363759.2014.948693
- Carlson, S. (2013, November 25). Are colleges ready to adjust to a new higher education landscape? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/bottomline/are-colleges-ready-to-adjust-to-a-new-higher-education-landscape/>

- Chaffee, E. E. (1985). Three models of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 89-98. doi:10.5465/AMR.1985.4277354
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change*. Brunswick, OH: Crown Custom Publishing, Inc.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dam, R., & Siang, T. (2018). 5 stages in the design thinking process. *Interaction Design Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/5-stages-in-the-design-thinking-process>
- DeJong, B., & Elfring, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and efforts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 535-549. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.51468649
- Dooris, M. (2002). Two decades of strategic planning. *Planning for Higher Education*, 31(2), 26-32. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.523.4793&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. San Francisco: CA. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., Cavanagh, T., & Watts, A. (2012). Analytics that inform the university: Using data you already have. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(3), 21-38. doi:10.24059/olj.v16i3.276

- Ellis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckel, P. D., & Kezar, A. J. (2003). *Taking the reins: Institutional transformation in higher education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Fain, P. (2008). How colleges can keep strategic plans on course in a stormy economy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(9). Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Colleges-Can-Keep/10913>
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80-92. doi:10.1177/160940690600500107
- Fink, L. D. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, L. (2017). Can design thinking redesign higher ed? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from [http://universityinnovationfellows.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Can-Design-Thinking-Redesign-Higher-Ed\\_-The-Chronicle-of-Higher-Education.pdf](http://universityinnovationfellows.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Can-Design-Thinking-Redesign-Higher-Ed_-The-Chronicle-of-Higher-Education.pdf)
- Gilbert, C. G., Crow, M. M., & Anderson, D. (2018). Design thinking for higher education. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 16(1), 36-41. Retrieved from [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/design\\_thinking\\_for\\_higher\\_education](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/design_thinking_for_higher_education)

- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 370-403.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 4-17.
- Grawe, N. D. (2017). *Demographics and demand for higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hale, F. W. (Ed.). (2004). *What makes racial diversity work in higher education?* Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2017). Some tests of the effectiveness and functional attributes of Miles and Snow's strategic types. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(1), 5-25.  
doi:10.5465/256132
- Hazelkorn E. (2011). *Reshaping higher education. Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.  
doi:10.1057/9780230306394\_7
- Hazelkorn, E. (2014). Reflections on a decade of global rankings: What we've learned and outstanding issues. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 12-28.  
doi:10.1111/ejed.12059
- Hill, T. & Westbrook, R. (1997). SWOT analysis: It's time for a product recall. *Long Range Planning*, 30(1), 46-52. doi:10.1016/S0024-6301(96)00095-7
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (6th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Hunter, J. M. (2012). *An integrated framework for understanding the financial health of small, private colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC.
- Jones, D. (2011). Board budget decisions: Protecting and building your institutions assets. *Trusteeship*, 19(1), 30-33. Retrieved from <https://www.agb.org/trusteeship/2011/januaryfebruary/board-budget-decisions-protecting-and-building-your-institutions>
- KaufmanHall. (2018). Four best practices in financial planning in higher education [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from [https://www.kaufmanhall.com/sites/default/files/ebook-he-financial-planning-4bp\\_2.pdf](https://www.kaufmanhall.com/sites/default/files/ebook-he-financial-planning-4bp_2.pdf)
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kezar, A. (2008). Understanding leadership strategies for addressing the politics of diversity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 406-441.  
doi:10.1080/00221546.2008.11772109
- Kezar, A., Chambers, T., & Burkhardt, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kimencu, L. (2011). *Leadership orientations and conflict management styles of academic deans in master's degree institutions*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 20113476414)

- Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 56(5), 746-759.  
doi:10.1177/0013164496056005002
- Kolko, J. (2018). Design thinking comes of age. *Harvard Business Review*, 93(9), 66-71.  
Retrieved from [https://enterpriseproject.com/sites/default/files/design\\_thinking\\_comes\\_of\\_age.pdf](https://enterpriseproject.com/sites/default/files/design_thinking_comes_of_age.pdf)
- Komives, S. R., & Wagner, W. (2017) *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(1), 1-10. Retrieved from [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/568b4a81a976afe460995115/t/5993fcc61e5b6c02f8e23ce1/1502870733648/Leading+Change\\_%C2%A0Why+Transformation+Efforts+Fail+-+HBR.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/568b4a81a976afe460995115/t/5993fcc61e5b6c02f8e23ce1/1502870733648/Leading+Change_%C2%A0Why+Transformation+Efforts+Fail+-+HBR.pdf)
- Latham, J. R. (2013). A framework for leading the transformation to performance excellence part I: CEO perspectives on forces, facilitators, and strategic leadership styles. *Quality Management Journal*, 20(2), 22-33.  
doi:10.1080/10686967.2013.11918095
- Leitzel, J., Corvey, C., & Hiley, D. (2004). Integrated planning and change management at a research university. *Change*, 36(1), 37-43. doi:10.1080/00091380409605082
- Lerner, A. L. (1999). *A strategic planning primer for higher education*. College of Business Administration and Economics, California State University. Retrieved from <http://grapevine.laspositascollege.edu/academicservices/documents/InstitutionalEffectiveness/CSUStrategicPlanningReport.pdf>

- Little, S. D. (2010). *Perception or reality? A frame analysis of leadership behavior, style, and effectiveness among selected community college administrators*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3439268)
- Lorenzo, D. (2016, Dec 7). Why higher education needs design thinking. *Fast Company*. Retrieved from <https://www.fastcompany.com/3066293/why-higher-education-needs-design-thinking-right-now>
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2016). *Leadership: Theory, application & skill development*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2011). The knowledge triangle, European higher education policy logics and policy implications. *Higher Education*, 61(6), 75-769. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9360-4
- McNamara, C. (2006). Basic overview of various strategic planning models. Retrieved from [http://www.managementhelp.org/plan\\_dec/str\\_plan/models.htm](http://www.managementhelp.org/plan_dec/str_plan/models.htm)
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The rise and fall of strategic planning*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Mitchell, R. L. G., & Maldonado, C. (2015). Strategic planning for new presidents: Developing an entrance plan. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(2), 113-121. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.755650
- Nag, R., Hambrick, D. C., & Chen, M. J. (2007). What is strategic management, really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition of the field. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(9), 935-955. doi:10.1002/smj.615
- Norris, D., Bordnick, R., Lefrere, P., Gilmour, J., & Baer, L. (2013). Transforming an age of disruptive change: Part 2: Getting started, getting it done. *Planning for Higher*

- Education*, 39(4), 44-53. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-342177540/transforming-in-an-age-of-disruptive-change-part>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, L. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Paulsen, M. B. & Smart, J. C. (2001). *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy and practice*. New York, NY: Agathon Press
- Peters, T. (1994). *The Pursuit of WOW!* New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Pinheiro, R., & Stensaker, B. (2014). Designing the entrepreneurial university: The interpretation of a global idea. *Public Organization Review*, 14(4), 497.  
doi:10.1007/s11115-013-0241-z
- Probst, M. B. (2011). *An analysis of leadership frame preference of academic administration: Using the Bolman and Deal four frame model*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3450562)
- Prokesch, S. (2009). How GE teaches teams to lead change. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(1), 99-106. Retrieved from [https://www.ge.com/pdf/news/hbr\\_crotonville.pdf](https://www.ge.com/pdf/news/hbr_crotonville.pdf)
- Putnam, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? *Change*, 44(1), 60-63.  
doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.636007
- Rinne, R., & Koivula, J. (2005). The changing place of the university and a clash of values the entrepreneurial university in the European knowledge society a review of the literature. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17(3), 91-123.  
doi:10.1787/hemp-v17-art20-en

- Rivard, R. (2013, December 9). Private distress. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/09/private-colleges-remain-under-weather>
- Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., & Dolence, M. G. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rowley, D. J., & Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 898-920.  
doi:10.1177/000312240507000602
- Scott, R. A. (2013). The state of a university: A campus president's view. *On the Horizon*, 21(4), 268-274. doi:10.1108/OTH-10-2012-0026
- Seltzer, R. (2018). *Smart, succinct and agile: Strategic planning in an age of uncertainty (executive summary)*. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/content/smart-succinct-and-agile-strategic-planning-age-uncertainty>
- Shah, M. (2013). Renewing strategic planning in universities at a time of uncertainty. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(1), 24-29.  
doi:10.1080/13603108.2012.679753
- Soliday, J., & Mann, R. (2013). *Surviving to thriving: A planning framework for leaders of private colleges & universities*. Whitsett, NC: Credo.

- Spector, B. (2013). *Implementing organizational change: Theory into practice* (3rd Ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Sypawka, W. (2008). *A study of division deans' in the North Carolina community college system self-perceived leadership style based on Bolman and Deal's four frame theory*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3303589)
- Tan, M., Hee, T. F., & Piau, C. Y. (2015). A qualitative analysis of the leadership style of a vice-chancellor in a private university in Malaysia. *SAGE Open*, 5(1), doi:10.1177/2158244015577665
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). The new era of mixed methods. *1*(3), 3-7. doi:10.1177/2345678906293042
- Taylor, M.C. (2010). *Crisis on campus*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Taylor, J. S., & Machado-Taylor, M. L. (2010). Leading strategic change in higher education: The need for a paradigm shift toward visionary leadership. *At the Interface / Probing the Boundaries*, 72, 167-194. doi:10.1163/9789042030978\_011
- Tierney, W. G. (2009). Advancing democracy: A critical interpretation of leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3), 157-175. doi:10.1080/01619568909538654
- Trainer, J F. (2004). Models and tools for strategic planning. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 123, 129-138. doi:10.1002/ir.127
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2011). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership, gender, and organization*, 27, 75-108. Retrieved from doi:10.1007/978-90-481-9014-0\_7

- U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov>
- Valentin, E. K. (2005). Away with SWOT analysis: Use defensive/offensive evaluation instead. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 21(2), 91-104. Retrieved from <http://repiev.ru/doc/Away-With-SWOT-Analysis.pdf>
- Wade, R. H. (2011) Emerging world order? From multipolarity to multilateralism in the G20, the World Bank, and the IMF. *Politics and Society*, 39, 347-378.  
doi:10.1177/0032329211415503

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix A

### Interview Protocol for Leader

Interview Protocol for Leader for IRB  
Carpenter, Rosalie

#### I. Questions

1. How would you describe an effective leader?
2. How would you describe the role of a strategic plan on a college campus? Is that similar or different to the role of this plan?
3. What was the impetus to begin this plan?
4. Please describe your leadership style when it comes to the most recent strategic planning process you led.
5. Think about your leadership from when the announcement was made regarding the creation of a plan to where the institution is with the plan now. What would you consider your overall leadership strengths in relation to this process/experience? Weaknesses in relation to this process/experience?
6. Can you identify anything you did or said that you found positively impacted the planning processes? Anything that held it back or negatively impacted the processes?
7. How do you see your leadership in the areas of roles, goals and policies during these processes? (Structural)
8. How did relationships play into these processes? What was it about you or the process that encouraged individual or collective contributions? Anything you can think of that might have stifled participation? (Human Resource)
9. How did you handle power dynamics and any conflict within the process? (Political)

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approved:                      | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Expires:                       | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number:                    | 18-346/1307166-1 |

10. Did you formally assess the culture prior to starting the process? If so, how did that impact your leadership or plan? If not, do you think you had a good understanding of the culture prior to starting the process? Why or why not? (Symbolic)
11. Was celebration part of the way you facilitated the development of the plan? (Symbolic)
12. Has this plan moved in to the implementation phase yet? Are you continuing to lead it or will the leadership structure change for implementation?
13. Do you feel this plan has led to positive changes for the institution? Why/why not?
14. Looking back is there anything you would have done differently?

## II. Envisioning the Ideal Future

Think of a person you know within the institution who has great leadership potential!

Now, imagine it is 2025 and the institution is getting ready to undergo a new Strategic Planning process. What small action can the person take today be considered to serve as the leader of the plan? What do you think it will take for them to be successful?

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approved:                      | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Expires:                       | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number:                    | 18-346/1307166-1 |

## Appendix B

### Interview Protocol for Colleague

Interview Protocol for Followers for IRB

Carpenter, Rosalie

#### I. Questions

1. How would you describe an effective leader?
2. How would you describe the role of a strategic plan on a college campus?
3. Please describe the leader of your most recent strategic planning process. Think about their leadership from when the announcement was made regarding the creation of a plan to where the institution is with the plan now. What would you consider their overall leadership strengths in relation to this process/experience? Weaknesses in relation to this process/experience?
4. What did he/she do that you found positively attributed to the planning processes? Anything that held back or negatively attributed to the processes?
5. How do you see their leadership in the areas of roles, goals and policies during these processes? (Structural)
6. How did relationships play into these processes? What was it about the leader or the process that encouraged individual or collective contributions? Anything stifle participation? (Human Resource)
7. How did the leader handle power dynamics and any conflict within the process? (Political)
8. Do you think the leader had a good understanding of the culture of the organization prior to starting the process? Why or why not? (Symbolic)
9. Was celebration part of the leader's way of facilitating the development of the plan? (Symbolic)

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approved:                      | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Expires:                       | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number:                    | 18-346/1307166-1 |

10. Has this plan moved in to the implementation phase yet?
11. If so, are you aware if there is an assessment plan in place?
12. In addition, do you know if institutional or departmental budgets have been linked to this plan yet?
13. Do you feel this plan has led to positive changes for the institution? Why/why not?
14. What could he/she have done differently that might have made a difference?
15. Were you personally engaged in the process? Why or why not?

#### Envisioning the Ideal Future

Think of a person you know within the institution who has great leadership potential – it might even be you! Now, imagine it is 2025 and the institution is getting ready to undergo a new Strategic Planning process. What small action can the person take today be considered to serve as the leader of the plan? What do you think it will take for them to be successful?

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approved:                      | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Revised:                       | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number:                    | 18-346/1307166-1 |

## **Appendix C**

### **Survey Instrument (LOI-SELF)**

#### Leadership Orientations Survey

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION (SELF) 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal.  
Used with permission.

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions.

This questionnaire contains four sections. The questionnaire should take about 5-10 minutes of your time. The first section asks your opinion about your behaviors. The next section asks about your style. The third asks your overall assessment of yourself. Please respond truthfully, so that your answers accurately describe your perceptions. Read each item and the directions for each section/subsection carefully. Lastly, there is a demographic section at the end that will assist the researcher in the analysis of the data.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You do not have to participate. You may quit at any time without any penalties. There are no known risks to participation beyond those encountered in everyday life. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. The information gathered will be kept strictly confidential, and any reports of the findings of this research will not contain any name or other identifying information. It is understood that at the conclusion of this study all records that identify individual participants will be destroyed.

For questions about your rights as a research participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 251-460-6308 or email [irb@southalabama.edu](mailto:irb@southalabama.edu)

There are no right or wrong answers.

You have read and understand the purpose and procedures of this research. By completing this questionnaire, you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study, and affirm that you are at least 19 years of age.

- Yes, I agree to participate
- No, I do not wish to participate

## I. LEADER BEHAVIORS

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style.

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you.

- 1- Never
- 2- Occasionally
- 3- Sometimes
- 4- Often
- 5- Always

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of the person you are describing, '2' for the one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true, and so on.

**Be selective!** The results will be more helpful to the ratee if you think about each item and distinguish the things you really do all the time from the things you seldom or never do.

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_ Think very clearly and logically.
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_ Show high levels of support and concern for others.
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_ Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
- 4. \_\_\_\_\_ Inspire others to do their best.
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_ Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
- 7. \_\_\_\_\_ Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
- 8. \_\_\_\_\_ Am highly charismatic.
- 9. \_\_\_\_\_ Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
- 10. \_\_\_\_\_ Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
- 11. \_\_\_\_\_ Am unusually persuasive and influential.
- 12. \_\_\_\_\_ Am able to be an inspiration to others.
- 13. \_\_\_\_\_ Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.

14. \_\_\_\_\_ Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. \_\_\_\_\_ Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ Am politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ Have extraordinary attention to detail.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ Give personal recognition for work well done.
27. \_\_\_\_\_ Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. \_\_\_\_\_ Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ Am a highly participative manager.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.
32. \_\_\_\_\_ Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

## **II. Leadership Style**

This section asks you to describe your leadership style. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the item that is next best, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

1. My strongest skills are:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Analytic skills
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Interpersonal skills
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Political skills
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe me is:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Technical expert
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Good listener
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Skilled negotiator
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Inspirational leader

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Make good decisions
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Coach and develop people
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Attention to detail
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Concern for people
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Charisma.

5. My most important leadership trait is:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Clear, logical thinking
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Caring and support for others
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Imagination and creativity

6. I am best described as:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. An analyst
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. A humanist
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. A politician
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. A visionary

### III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a **manager**.

|            |   |            |   |         |
|------------|---|------------|---|---------|
| 1          | 2 | 3          | 4 | 5       |
| Bottom 20% |   | Middle 20% |   | Top 20% |

2. Overall effectiveness as a **leader**.

|            |   |            |   |         |
|------------|---|------------|---|---------|
| 1          | 2 | 3          | 4 | 5       |
| Bottom 20% |   | Middle 20% |   | Top 20% |

#### IV. Background Information

1. Are you: \_\_\_\_Male      \_\_\_\_Female      \_\_\_\_Prefer not to answer

2. How many years have you been in your current job?

\_\_\_\_ Less than 3 years  
\_\_\_\_ 3-5 years  
\_\_\_\_ 6-10 years  
\_\_\_\_ 11-20 years  
\_\_\_\_ More than 20 years

3. How many total years of experience do you have as a manager:

\_\_\_\_ Less than 5 years  
\_\_\_\_ 5-10 years  
\_\_\_\_ 11-15 years  
\_\_\_\_ 16-20 years  
\_\_\_\_ More than 20 years

## **Appendix D**

### **Survey Instrument (LOI-OTHER)**

#### Leadership Orientations Survey

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION (OTHER) 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal.  
Used with permission.

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions.

This questionnaire contains four sections. The questionnaire should take about 5-10 minutes of your time. The first section asks your opinion about behaviors of the leader. The next section asks about the style of the leader. The third asks your overall assessment of the leader. Please respond truthfully, so that your answers accurately describe your perceptions of the leader. Read each item and the directions for each section/subsection carefully. Lastly, there is a demographic section at the end that will assist the researcher in the analysis of the data.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You do not have to participate. You may quit at any time without any penalties. There are no known risks to participation beyond those encountered in everyday life. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. The information gathered will be kept strictly confidential, and any reports of the findings of this research will not contain any name or other identifying information. It is understood that at the conclusion of this study all records that identify individual participants will be destroyed.

For questions about your rights as a research participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 251-460-6308 or email [irb@southalabama.edu](mailto:irb@southalabama.edu)

There are no right or wrong answers.

You have read and understand the purpose and procedures of this research. By completing this questionnaire, you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study, and affirm that you are at least 19 years of age.

- Yes, I agree to participate
- No, I do not wish to participate

## I. LEADER BEHAVIORS

You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of the person that you are rating.

Please use the following scale in answering each item:

- 1- Never
- 2- Occasionally
- 3- Sometimes
- 4- Often
- 5- Always

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of the person you are describing, '2' for the one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true, and so on.

**Be selective!** The results will be more helpful to the ratee if you think about each item and distinguish the things the ratee really does all the time from the things that they seldom or never do.

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_ Thinks very clearly and logically.
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_ Shows high levels of support and concern for others.
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_ Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
- 4. \_\_\_\_\_ Inspires others to do their best.
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_ Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships.
- 7. \_\_\_\_\_ Is a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
- 8. \_\_\_\_\_ Is highly charismatic.
- 9. \_\_\_\_\_ Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
- 10. \_\_\_\_\_ Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
- 11. \_\_\_\_\_ Is unusually persuasive and influential.
- 12. \_\_\_\_\_ Is an inspiration to others.
- 13. \_\_\_\_\_ Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures.

14. \_\_\_\_\_ Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ Is highly imaginative and creative.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ Approaches problems with facts and logic.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ Is consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. \_\_\_\_\_ Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ Is politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ Sees beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ Has extraordinary attention to detail.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ Gives personal recognition for work well done.
27. \_\_\_\_\_ Develops alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. \_\_\_\_\_ Generates loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ Is a highly participative manager.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.
32. \_\_\_\_\_ Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

## **I. Leadership Style**

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person that you are rating. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes this person, "3" to the item that is next best, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like this person.

1. The individual's strongest skills are:

- ☐ a. Analytic skills
- ☐ b. Interpersonal skills
- ☐ c. Political skills
- ☐ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe this person is:

- ☐ a. Technical expert
- ☐ b. Good listener
- ☐ c. Skilled negotiator
- ☐ d. Inspirational leader

3. What this individual does best is:

- ☐ a. Make good decisions
- ☐ b. Coach and develop people
- ☐ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
- ☐ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about this person is:

- ☐ a. Attention to detail
- ☐ b. Concern for people
- ☐ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
- ☐ d. Charisma.

5. This individual's most important leadership trait is:

- ☐ a. Clear, logical thinking
- ☐ b. Caring and support for others
- ☐ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
- ☐ d. Imagination and creativity

6. This person is best described as:

- ☐ a. An analyst
- ☐ b. A humanist
- ☐ c. A politician
- ☐ d. A visionary

### III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate this person on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a **manager**.

|            |   |            |   |         |
|------------|---|------------|---|---------|
| 1          | 2 | 3          | 4 | 5       |
| Bottom 20% |   | Middle 20% |   | Top 20% |

2. Overall effectiveness as a **leader**.

|            |   |            |   |         |
|------------|---|------------|---|---------|
| 1          | 2 | 3          | 4 | 5       |
| Bottom 20% |   | Middle 20% |   | Top 20% |

**IV. Background Information**

The following information will not be provided to the ratee, but will contribute to our efforts to understand how perceptions of leadership styles are influenced by the relationship between rater and ratee.

1. Are you: \_\_\_\_ Male          \_\_\_\_ Female          \_\_\_\_ Prefer not to answer

2. Which of the following best describes your work relationship with the ratee:

- \_\_\_\_ The ratee is at a higher level in the organization than I am.
- \_\_\_\_ The ratee and I are at about the same organizational level.
- \_\_\_\_ I am at a higher level in the organization than the ratee.
- \_\_\_\_ Other

3. How many years have you worked at this institution:

- \_\_\_\_ Less than 3 years
- \_\_\_\_ 3-5 years
- \_\_\_\_ 6-10 years
- \_\_\_\_ 11-20 years
- \_\_\_\_ More than 20 years

## Appendix E

### Permission to Use Instrument

**From:** Rosalie Carpenter <rac1622@jagmail.southalabama.edu >  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2018 6:40 PM  
**To:** lee@leebolman.com  
**Subject:** Request Permission

Dr. Bolman,

Hello. My name is Rosalie Carpenter and I am a doctoral student at the University of South Alabama in the Educational Leadership program, under the leadership of my dissertation chair, Dr. Ronald A. Styron who can be reached at rastyron@jagmail.edu.

I am writing to seek your permission to use the 3 sections of the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Survey. My study is titled: The Effects of Leadership on Strategic Planning Processes at Small, Private Institutions, and I would be honored to use this instrument.

I would be happy to provide you with a copy of my research and any data files you request.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Rosalie Carpenter  
Ed.D. Candidate  
Vice President of Student Affairs  
Seton Hill University  
407.415.9531

---

From: Bolman, Lee G. <BolmanL@umkc.edu>  
Sent: Wed, Aug 15, 2018 at 10:12 AM

Dear Ms. Carpenter,

I am happy to give you permission to use the Leadership Orientations survey in your work.

Best wishes on your research. I look forward to learning about the results.

Lee G. Bolman  
Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership  
Bloch School of Management  
University of Missouri-Kansas City  
5110 Cherry Street  
Kansas City, MO 64110

## Appendix F

### IRB Approval Letter

irb@southalabama.edu



TELEPHONE: (251) 460-6308  
CSAB 138 · MOBILE, AL. 36688-0002

#### INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

October 19, 2018

---

|                         |                                                                                                                                |                  |                    |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Principal Investigator: | Rosalie Carpenter, EdD                                                                                                         |                  |                    |
| IRB # and Title:        | IRB PROTOCOL: 18-346<br>[1307166-2] The effects of leadership on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions   |                  |                    |
| Status:                 | APPROVED                                                                                                                       | Review Type:     | Expedited Review   |
| Approval Date:          | September 27, 2018                                                                                                             | Submission Type: | New Project        |
| Initial Approval:       | September 27, 2018                                                                                                             | Expiration Date: | September 26, 2019 |
| Review Category:        | Category: 45 CFR 46.110 (6):<br>Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes. |                  |                    |

---

*This panel, operating under the authority of the DHHS Office for Human Research and Protection, assurance number FWA 00001602, and IRB Database #00000286, has reviewed the submitted materials for the following:*

- 1. Protection of the rights and the welfare of human subjects involved.*
- 2. The methods used to secure and the appropriateness of informed consent.*
- 3. The risk and potential benefits to the subject.*

The regulations require that the investigator not initiate any changes in the research without prior IRB approval, except where necessary to eliminate immediate hazards to the human subjects, and that **all problems involving risks and adverse events be reported to the IRB immediately!**

Subsequent supporting documents that have been approved will be stamped with an IRB approval and expiration date (if applicable) on every page. Copies of the supporting documents must be utilized with the current IRB approval stamp unless consent has been waived.

#### Notes:

## Appendix G

### Consent Form for Questionnaire

#### Participant Consent Questionnaire Electronic Cover Page

**Project Title:** *The effects of leadership on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions*

**Researcher:** Rosalie Carpenter, a doctoral student at the University of South Alabama

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions.

This questionnaire contains four sections. The questionnaire should take about 5-10 minutes of your time. The first section asks your opinion about behaviors of the leader. The next section asks about the style of the leader. The third asks your overall assessment of the leader. Please respond truthfully, so that your answers accurately describe your perceptions of the leader. Read each item and the directions for each section/subsection carefully. Lastly, there is a demographic section at the end that will assist the researcher in the analysis of the data.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You do not have to participate. You may quit at any time without any penalties. There are no known risks to participation beyond those encountered in everyday life. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous. The information gathered will be kept strictly confidential, and any reports of the findings of this research will not contain any name or other identifying information. It is understood that at the conclusion of this study all records that identify individual participants will be destroyed.

For questions about your rights as a research participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 251-460-6308 or email [irb@southalabama.edu](mailto:irb@southalabama.edu)

There are no right or wrong answers.

You have read and understand the purpose and procedures of this research. By completing this questionnaire, you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study and affirm that you are at least 19 years of age.

**Thank you for completing this survey. Your answers are much appreciated!**

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approved:                      | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Expires:                       | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number:                    | 18-346/1307166-1 |

## Appendix H

### Consent Form for Interview Subjects

#### Participant Consent Form Interview Subject

Project Title: *The effects of leadership on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions*

Researcher: Rosalie Carpenter, a doctoral student at the University of South Alabama

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of different leadership styles on strategic planning processes at small, private institutions.

Procedurally, you will be asked to answer a series of open-ended questions about your leadership style and experience with strategic planning. The interview should last no more than 60 minutes. No additional procedures are required.

It is anticipated that this study will present no more than minimal medical or social risk.

It is understood that in order for this research to be effective and valuable, certain demographic identifiers need to be collected. The strictest confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study, and only the researcher will have access to the confidential information and recordings as they will be kept in a secure and locked location. The information gathered will be kept strictly confidential, and any reports of the findings of this research will not contain any name or other identifying information. It is understood that at the conclusion of this study all records that identify individual participants will be destroyed.

Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate. You may quit at any time without any penalties.

☐ I agree to be audio taped  
☐ I do not wish to be audio taped

For questions about your rights as a research participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 251-460-6308 or email [irb@southalabama.edu](mailto:irb@southalabama.edu)

You have read, or have had read to you, and understand the purpose and procedures of this research. You have had an opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to your satisfaction. You voluntarily agree to participate in this research as described. You are at least 19 years of age.

---

Participant Name (printed)/ Signature of Participant

Date

---

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

Date

|                                                                                     |                                |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | USA Institutional Review Board |                  |
|                                                                                     | Approval                       | 9/27/2018        |
|                                                                                     | Expiration                     | 9/26/2019        |
|                                                                                     | IRB number                     | 18-346/1307166-1 |

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

Name of Author: Rosalie A. Carpenter

Place of Birth: Commack, New York

Graduate and Undergraduate Schools Attended:

Stetson University, DeLand, Florida  
University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina  
Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio  
University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama

Degrees Awarded:

Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science, Minor in Psychology, 1998, DeLand, Florida

Master of Education in Student Personnel Administration, 2000, Columbia, South Carolina

Master of Science in Positive Organizational Development, 2011, Cleveland, Ohio

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership, 2019, Mobile, Alabama

Awards, Honors, and Publications:

Robert D. Bradshaw Small Colleges Student Advocate Award, 2013, National Association and Student-Affairs Professionals Association (NASPA) Region III, 2013

Currier, J. M., McDermott, R. C., Hawkins, D. E., Greer, C. L., & Carpenter, R. (2018). Seeking help for religious and spiritual struggles: Exploring the role of mental health literacy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 49(1), 90-97.