Criterion One speaks to our institutional intent, enunciating our mission and the publicly stated purposes. Criteria Two, Three, Four, and Five speak to our institutional structure and behavior, the means of executing our intent. What connects intent to behavior? Planning. That is why we interpose here, between Criteria One and Two, a brief discussion of our planning efforts.

The planning process helps create a shared sense of purpose. Planning is shaped over time by institutional culture and traditions, by the institutional mission, and by the changing social, political, and economic environments in which the institution operates.

Planning occurs on multiple levels, from broad, comprehensive, time-intensive university planning to planning that occurs on a daily basis. The academic units have a long and successful history of operating with considerable autonomy within university guidelines developed by the administration with the advice of faculty and staff governance. In a largely decentralized environment, planning forces us all to take a more holistic view of the institution. KU planning processes, in place now for more than 20 years, continue to evolve.

The kinds of planning activities that we engage in at KU include: assessment of institutional mission and purposes, monitoring of the campus and
external environments, establishment and performance measurement of programmatic goals and objectives, and identification and linkage of resources to programs.

.\textit{c2.1980-81 Long Range Planning:} Beginning in November 1980, a Lawrence campus Committee on Long Range Planning assessed prior planning processes and developed a plan for the ensuing decade. In 1981, the committee issued its report, including a summary of recommendations consisting of primary goals, process goals, and secondary goals (Appendix 2). That report served the campus until 1986, when the Board of Regents adopted mission statements for the Regents system and each Regents university.

.\textit{c2.1987 Mission Planning:} The new mission statement adopted in 1986 led to the renewal of formal campuswide planning in Lawrence. A planning consultant launched the effort with a February 1988 workshop for 50 administrators, faculty, and staff. Subsequently a planning team composed of the executive vice chancellor and key staff visited the academic units to gain an understanding of the planning processes existing in each.

The process emphasized open discussion of the university and its directions, built upon existing planning efforts, and used a common set of planning questions. Twenty-six university planning priorities, grouped into seven categories, were developed by administrators, faculty governance representatives, and academic
deans by the fall of 1988. Implementation plans accompanied each priority (see Exhibit 7).

The priorities were revised annually as needed. They formed the basis for the annual budget request and shaped internal allocations. Planning notebooks that document the activities of this process also are available in Exhibit 7. This mission planning process provided an invaluable basis for the Regents systemwide planning process described below.

.c2. Board of Regents Systemwide Planning. In 1991, the Regents initiated a study of the system and its institutions. Institutional representatives helped shape the process. The two analytical contexts were those of state educational needs and the changing environment of higher education. A strategic planning document described in the previous chapter, A Strategy for Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System, was adopted by the Regents in January 1992 (Exhibit 4). The document assessed mission achievements from 1986 to 1991, described the near-term environment for higher education, promulgated a systemwide mission statement, established strategic themes and initiatives to guide the system’s efforts, and envisioned institutional missions into the 21st century.

The Regents strategy drew upon existing campus planning processes and past practices. But it revised the system of program review in operation since December 1982. That system had called for the annual study and evaluation of
one-fifth of the academic programs at the Regents universities. Now that all instructional programs would be reviewed at one time. The purpose of the review was to provide a comprehensive evaluation from which institutions would develop statements of role and aspiration and to help establish priorities that would shape the allocation of resources. The new strategy became the basis for the 1992 Program Review.

This systemwide planning effort culminated in a report titled *Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System, 1993-2000*, published in June 1993 (Exhibit 8). Here are the issues addressed in the report.

! The System Mission Statement sets the philosophy and broad goals of the Board of Regents.

! The Strategic Themes and Initiatives articulate the Regents vision for Kansas higher education and common activities of the universities, given anticipated near-term developments.

! The Institutional Mission Statements identify the core values and commitments of each university.

! The Characteristics of Institutional Role provide specific information about each university in an attempt to distinguish among them.

! The Statements of Institutional Aspiration provide information about each institution's planning goals, its unique and exemplary programs, and the programs it intends to develop.
Program Review summaries provide institutional recommendations for the future of each of the approximately 1,000 degree programs offered at Regents schools.

**The KU Response to Systemwide Planning: 1992 Program Review.** KU administrators extended the program review process to include noninstructional programs as well as academic ones. The roles of noninstructional programs were evaluated in the context of the institution's broader mission to help guide resource reallocation from noninstructional to instructional programs. The first step was to revise the institution's mission statement. The second was to develop program review processes.

*Mission Statement and the Mission 2000 Committee.* On the Lawrence campus, a Mission 2000 Committee, chaired by the vice chancellor for academic affairs, was appointed. Members included four faculty and one student representative. It revised the 1986 mission statement to further distinguish KU's mission from those of the other Regents universities. The campus community reviewed the revised mission. Feedback was evaluated and incorporated. The mission statement was reviewed in turn by the Executive Administrative Team and the chancellor and then was submitted to the Regents, who approved the new statement in December 1992.

*Roles and Aspirations.* The Mission 2000 committee also developed
statements of institutional role and aspiration. Like the mission statement, the institutional role and aspiration statements were reviewed by the Executive Administrative Team, which made recommendations to the chancellor. Later upon completion of the instructional and noninstructional self studies, units prepared aspiration statements describing their major goals for the years 1992 to 2000 and suggesting areas for program development.

_The Executive Administrative Team._ When KU decided to include both instructional and noninstructional programs in the program review process, an administrative committee, the Executive Administrative Team, was established on the Lawrence campus. Members include the executive vice chancellor (chair), the vice chancellors, the associate executive vice chancellor, the university director of administration, and key staff.

Initially the team coordinated instructional and noninstructional program review activities, reviewed recommendations related to program review and the mission, role, and aspiration statements, and recommended action to the chancellor. The team has evolved into a standing committee, the Administrative Planning Group, that coordinates ongoing planning activities for the campus. Information about its current activities is included in the **Regular Management Meetings** section of Chapter V.

_Instructional Program Review._ KU was asked to forward to the Regents a description of each academic program, its place in the overall mission, and an
assessment of its quality. On campus, information gained from this review was used to guide budget decisions for program enhancement and would be used to make rescission decisions should KU be required to cut its budget. The information also was used to help reallocate funds from programs of lower priority to those of higher priority.

*The Instructional Review Process.* The process was developed following consultation between administration and faculty governance. The three-tiered review, modeled after the annual promotion and tenure process, involved input by the departments, the schools/College of Liberal Arts and Sciences administration, and a university-level committee. Recommendations were then forwarded to central administration. The Regents Degree and Certificate Inventory, 1991-1992 defined the programs to be reviewed.

Beginning in February 1992, each department conducted a self study to be forwarded to the school/College level. Departments were instructed to rate programs based on criteria recommended by the University Council (a faculty-student governance group): faculty and programmatic strengths, service to academic field, service to the university and external constituencies, student quality and demand, cost-effectiveness, and centrality to mission. Detailed information about the evaluative criteria is included in Appendix 3.

At the school level, a review committee of faculty members and then the dean assessed departmental self studies and assigned ratings. The self studies, with
evaluations of the review committees and the deans, were forwarded to the university-level committee.

The University Academic Program Review Committee comprised faculty nominated by each of the schools and the College and student representatives appointed by student governance. Beginning in mid-July, members read all of the materials. They met regularly throughout fall 1992 to discuss each degree program and rate its overall quality and centrality to the KU mission. When there were discrepancies between the judgments of the dean and school or College committees and those of the university committee, formal checkback processes were initiated and additional information was obtained. After a final vote on each degree program, the university committee submitted its ratings to the vice chancellor for academic affairs.

During October 1992, the vice chancellor met with the deans to discuss the ratings and a course of action for the institution. Recommendations were forwarded to the Executive Administrative Team. After some fine-tuning, these recommendations were forwarded to the chancellor for consideration, then to the Board of Regents.

*Noninstructional Program Review.* The review process for noninstructional programs paralleled that for academic programs. However, there was an additional element in the review of noninstructional programs. The chancellor mandated that in the course of three years, an amount equal to 3 percent of the FY 1992 budget for
noninstructional programs would be shifted into the academic mission. This required an examination of the functions, interrelations, and efficiency of noninstructional units in order to maintain noninstructional-unit integrity in the face of reallocations.

*The Noninstructional Program Review Process.* The unit self studies addressed centrality to academic mission or support of basic institutional operations, the quality of services and activities, and cost-effectiveness. A university-level committee assessed each report and wrote summaries. Units reviewed the summaries and provided written responses.

The university committee revised its report based on those responses and submitted it to the Executive Administrative Team, which framed recommendations in consultation with the Mission 2000 Steering Committee. The draft was submitted to KU governance before the recommendations were finalized and forwarded to the chancellor.

The recommendations for academic and noninstructional program review were presented in an open meeting to the Lawrence campus community in November 1992 and were broadly disseminated in a document titled *Program Review: Positioning the University for the Future* (Exhibit 9).

Integration into Continuing Planning and Decision-making Processes.

Major administrative units incorporate their aspiration statements in their annual planning processes. The directions set by these statements guide the annual budget process, identification of program enhancement requests to the Legislature, and institutional allocation decisions.

.c2. Physical Development Master Plan;: The last comprehensive physical development plan for the Lawrence campus was completed in 1973. It served the university well, but by the early 1990s it essentially had been completed and some of the assumptions on which it was based were no longer applicable. In spring 1993, when work on the 1992 Program Review had been completed and energies could be redirected, the Lawrence campus launched work on a new physical development master plan.

A 30-member task force, including faculty, student, alumni, community and neighborhood representatives, administrators, and staff, was appointed. A five-member steering committee provides coordination and direction. The task force is charged with identifying planning goals and objectives and suggesting policies that will guide future campus development.

During the 1993-1994 academic year, a set of assumptions was developed to guide the physical development planning process. The assumptions initially were prepared by the executive vice chancellor and the vice chancellors after a review of
the assumptions that undergirded the 1973 plan. The draft was modified following consultation with the academic deans and again after discussion with faculty/student governance. The planning assumptions, together with lists of steering committee and task force members, are included in Appendix 4.

Also during the past academic year, the task force formed six planning subcommittees to study a range of issues: university/Lawrence community relations, buildings and building sites, transportation planning, environmental issues, student profile and student services, utilities, and infrastructure. Reports of the subcommittees were submitted to the task force in early summer. During the spring semester, the steering committee engaged in extensive interviews with deans and other administrators to gain information about the future needs of academic programs. Issue papers have been prepared on information technology and planning, management of growth and transition, campus accessibility and connections to west campus (which is separated from the central campus by a main thoroughfare), interdisciplinary research and technology transfer, classroom size and distribution/multi-use spaces and computer labs.

The task force will review the reports of the subcommittees during the 1994-1995 academic year and will forward recommendations to the administration. The new physical development plan is expected to be finished in 1995.