University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1990

The Influence of the Strategic Planning Process on a Nonprofit Board and a Public Commission

Mary Alicia Powers EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Powers, Mary Alicia EdD, "The Influence of the Strategic Planning Process on a Nonprofit Board and a Public Commission" (1990). *Dissertations*. 551.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/551>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**THE INFLUENCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS
ON A NONPROFIT BOARD AND A PUBLIC COMMISSION**

by
Mary Alicia Powers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1990

Dissertation Committee

William P. Foster, Ed.D., Director
Edward F. DeRoche, Ph.D.
Fred R. Bahr, D.B.A.

Copyright © 1990

by

Mary Alicia Powers

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

THE INFLUENCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS ON A NONPROFIT BOARD AND A PUBLIC COMMISSION

POWERS, MARY A., Ed.D., University of San Diego, 1990, 297 pp.

Director: William P. Foster, Ed.D.

Recently, scholars have shown greater interest in nonprofit organizations. More and more authors are documenting the need for nonprofit organizations to borrow from the management practices of the private sector. Strategic planning is one such practice. Most of the earlier research attempts to link strategic planning with nonprofit organizations have failed to provide the descriptive data necessary for a realistic account of an organization's planning efforts.

The intent of this study was to document the strategic planning process conducted by a nonprofit Board of Directors and a public Commission and to describe the influence of the planning process on Board Members and Commissioners. The design of this study used a broad interpretation of action research and was enriched through participant observation. Data was collected during pre- and post-planning interviews with Board Members and Commissioners as well as Strategic Planning Committee meetings. Interview data was analyzed and presented. A narrative of the planning process was compiled in the genre of story telling for each participating organization.

Among the conclusions drawn are the following: (a) the planning process is unique to each organization, (b) the product of the planning process is unique to each organization, (c) the planning process serves as an arena for

valuable discussion, (d) the selection of the strategic planning committee and its chair is very important, (e) the planning process is a four-part process, (f) the full Board or Commission should be involved in the assessment and implementation phases of planning, (g) the majority of Board Members and Commissioners interviewed defined strategic planning as rational and linear, believed that strategic planning is equally beneficial in all sectors, believed that strategic planning is the responsibility of the Board or Commission (as opposed to staff), preferred using the services of a planning consultant, and believed that the entire Board or Commission must be involved in the planning process.

To my parents
John and Dorothy Powers

for their infinite ability to give.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was born from the desire of one and the sustenance of many. Had I known of the sacrifices to be made and the consequent needs to be filled by family and friends, the decision to embark on such an ambitious undertaking would have been made by consensus.

Many have contributed to the successful completion of this work. I am indebted to the City Heights Community Development Corporation, the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture and their respective leaders Barry J. Schultz and Milton Fredman for agreeing to participate in this research.

To Barry Schultz, Jim Bleisner, Valerie Hoffman, and Jake Jacobs of the City Heights Community Development Corporation and Ann Winslow MacCullough, Karen Cohn, Larry Baza, and Victoria Hamilton of the Commission for Arts and Culture who spent hours in Strategic Planning Committee Meetings without complaint--my sincere thanks and appreciation for their commitment to this work.

I also wish to thank the other Board Members and Commissioners who participated in the interview process: Dan Salazar, John Stump, Sandra Wilson, and Nghiep Le of the City Heights Community Development Corporation and Milton Fredman, Warren Kessler, Darlene Shiley, Sylvia M'Lafi Thompson, and Catherine Woo of the Commission for Arts and Culture.

Most of all I wish to thank my champions Barry J. Schultz, Ann Winslow MacCullough and Warren Kessler for their support, encouragement, and the conviction with which these were offered. I was privileged to have them in my corner.

I am sincerely grateful to the three members of my committee, Bill Foster, Ed DeRoche and Fred Bahr. One believed in strategic planning, one in qualitative research, and one in academic rigor, but their belief in me and my goals was what sustained me.

Taking an eighteen month hiatus from anything that resembled my previous lifestyle would have been impossible without the constant encouragement, patience, acceptance, and understanding of a few special people. To Jane Hett and Dallas Boggs my cherished friends and chief editors without whom this would have been an unbearably lonely undertaking, and most of all to my family who temporarily regained a dependent child and sister goes my heartfelt gratitude. This would never have been completed without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Appendices.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Issue.....	2
Purpose of the Study	5
Relevance to Leadership	7
Need for Research in This Area	9
Definition of Terms.....	10
Limitations.....	11
Protection of Human Subjects	11
Organization of the Dissertation	11
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Nonprofit Organizations.....	13
Uniqueness of Nonprofit Organizations.....	14
Relationship Between Public and Institutional Organizations.....	17
Management Concerns for Nonprofit Organizations	19
Summary.....	20
Boards of Directors.....	21
Function and Responsibilities of the Nonprofit Board of Directors	23
Research on Nonprofit Boards of Directors.....	27
Role of Nonprofit Board of Director in Planning.....	29
Summary.....	31

Strategic Planning.....	32
Definitions, Models, Processes, and Systems.....	33
Commentary on Strategic Planning in Nonprofit Organizations.....	36
Summary.....	40
Conclusion	41
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	44
Introduction.....	44
Qualitative Research.....	45
Research Design	46
Action Research.....	48
Participant Observation.....	50
Story Telling.....	52
Methodology.....	55
Participant Selection.....	55
Instrumentation.....	58
Data Gathering.....	59
Data Analysis	61
Validity and Reliability.....	62
Problems Encountered.....	63
Conclusion	65
CHAPTER FOUR: A NONPROFIT BOARD OF DIRECTORS.....	67
Introduction.....	67
History of the CHCDC.....	68
Composition of the Target Population	69
Composition of the Remaining Population.....	70

Pre-interview Data.....	70
Introduction.....	70
Question # 1.....	72
Question # 2.....	72
Question # 3.....	73
Question # 4.....	74
Question # 5.....	75
Additional Data.....	75
Summary.....	76
The Strategic Planning Process	76
Introduction.....	76
Session One.....	77
First Report to the Board.....	85
Session Two	86
Session Three.....	91
Second Report to the Board.....	96
Session Four.....	98
Session Five.....	102
Third Report to the Board.....	104
Session Six.....	106
Fourth Report to the Board	107
Preparing the Final Draft.....	109
Post-interview Data.....	111
Introduction.....	111
Question # 1.....	112
Question # 2.....	112
Question # 3.....	113

Question # 4.....	113
Question # 5.....	115
Question # 6.....	116
Question # 7.....	117
Question # 8.....	118
Question # 9.....	118
Question # 10.....	119
Question # 11.....	120
Question # 12.....	122
Summary.....	123
Conclusion.....	123
CHAPTER FIVE: A PUBLIC COMMISSION.....	126
Introduction.....	126
History of the Commission for Arts and Culture.....	127
Composition of the Target Population.....	128
Composition of the Remaining Population.....	129
Pre-interview Data.....	129
Introduction.....	129
Question # 1.....	131
Question # 2.....	132
Question # 3.....	132
Question # 4.....	133
Question # 5.....	134
Additional Data.....	134
Summary.....	136
The Strategic Planning Process.....	137
Introduction.....	137

Session One.....	137
First Scheduled Report to the Commission.....	149
Session Two.....	149
Commission Retreat.....	156
Session Three.....	157
Session Four.....	163
First Report to the Commission.....	167
Session Five.....	169
Session Six.....	173
Session Seven.....	174
Third Report to the Commission.....	179
Preparing the Final Draft.....	181
Post-interview Data.....	182
Introduction.....	182
Question # 1.....	183
Question # 2.....	183
Question # 3.....	184
Question # 4.....	185
Question # 5.....	186
Question # 6.....	187
Question # 7.....	188
Question # 8.....	188
Question # 9.....	189
Question # 10.....	189
Question # 11.....	191
Question # 12.....	192
Summary.....	193

Conclusion	194
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	197
Introduction.....	197
Rationale for the Study.....	198
Results.....	201
Research Question # 1	201
The Nonprofit Organization.....	201
The Public Commission.....	203
Research Question # 2	206
Conclusions.....	207
Participants Observations.....	216
Strengths.....	219
Weaknesses.....	220
Recommendations for Future Research.....	222
Concluding Remarks	224
REFERENCES	226
APPENDICES.....	237

List of Appendices

Letter	Contents	Page
A	Strategic Planning Process	237
B	Interview Participant Consent Form	238
C	Pre-interview Guide	239
D	Post-interview Guide	242
E	City Heights Community Development Corporation, <i>Strategic Plan 1990 - 1993</i>	244
F	City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, <i>Directions for the Future</i> Draft Copy	271

CHAPTER ONE
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE
Introduction

For many years the nonprofit sector has shared the burden of public needs with national and local governments. Governments on all levels in the United States today are criticized for excessive expenditures, bureaucratic mismanagement, programmatic inadequacies and an overall failure to acknowledge the role of the American public as customer/consumer. Criticisms of the nonprofit sector are not nearly so broad or faultfinding; they are typically limited to poor management and insufficient development of volunteers on the program and policy-making levels. The quality and quantity of nonprofit services directly benefit a community. The hope of impacting the provision of nonprofit services provides ample motivation for exploration into practical interventions, such as strategic planning, which may improve the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations.

Data from the Urban Institute Nonprofit Sector Project (1982) quantified the relationship between government and nonprofit organizations in their joint task to provide for individual and societal needs. The data in this report showed that nonprofit organizations account for 42% of the share of all human services receiving government funding. Government's share was 39% and the remaining 19% of services were provided by businesses. The report also showed the extent of government reliance on nonprofit organizations in 16 sites across the country. The percentages of public spending going into the nonprofit sector ranged from a high of 50% in

Allegheny County, Pennsylvania to a low of 12% in Tuscola, Michigan. The weighted average of all sites was 42.4%. These reports covered the fields of social services, health, employment and training, housing and community development, arts, culture, and recreation (Salamon, 1987).

The relationship described above encompasses all sectors of the economy. Bryson (1988) described a turbulent, troubling environment which is challenging leaders in the private, public and nonprofit arenas. This turbulence, the unpredictable nature of the environment in which competition for funds is fierce and survival is made more challenging by the increased inter-connectedness of the world (Luke, 1988). Change in one arena results in change in another. The distinctions among the public, private and nonprofit sectors are no longer as predictable as they once were. The boundaries between these sectors have eroded to the extent that nonprofit organizations are increasingly relied upon for the provision of human services. "The increased environmental uncertainty and ambiguity requires public and nonprofit organizations (and communities) to think and act strategically as never before" (Bryson, 1988, p. 4). For years, strategic planning has been considered a useful tool for profit-making organizations. More recently, planning has been linked to the nonprofit sector.

The Issue

The literature provides a number of definitions for strategic planning and a variety of perspectives on the usefulness and necessity of specific planning models. In order to more efficiently meet the challenges of public service, nonprofit organizations must begin to utilize some of the organizational and management practices exercised by the private sector (Bryson, 1988). Many authors agree that nonprofit organizations need some version of a planning model (Bryson, 1988; Conrad & Glenn, 1983; Espy, 1986;

Unterman & Davis, 1984; Wolf, 1984). Grant and King (1982) described strategic planning as involving "an organization's most basic and important choices—the choice of its mission, objectives, strategy, policies, programs, goals and major resource allocations," and defined it as "the organized process through which such strategic decisions can be systemically and rationally analyzed and made" (p. 3). Strategic planning creates the need for "broadscale information gathering, an exploration of alternatives, and an emphasis on the future implications of present decisions" (Bryson, 1988, p. 5).

Strategic planning has generally been limited to the private sector during this century. What has existed in the public sector was mostly used for military purposes and grand scale issues of state (Bracker, 1980; Quinn, 1980). Bryson (1988) emphasized the usefulness of strategic planning in the public sector for very different types of operations. He cited the applicability of strategic planning to public agencies and departments, major organizational divisions, city, county or state governments, entire communities, urban and metropolitan areas, regions, or states.

Many nonprofit organizations deny the need for planning. Espy (1986) elaborated on seven reasons that nonprofit organizations, reluctant to enter the planning process, use to justify their decisions. These include issues concerning time and staffing demands, lack of knowledge of the planning process and lack of control over the basic mission of the organization. Espy refuted these rationalizations by giving seven reasons for practicing strategic planning: (a) the organization's concern for the future, (b) the allocation of resources, (c) fundraising issues, (d) competition (no longer a concern unique to the private sector), (e) team building, (f) the coordination of efforts, and (g) good management practices. These issues are of concern to every nonprofit

organization, no matter how small, how poor or how busy, leaving little room for a rationale against planning.

The explanations used by nonprofit organizations to deny their need for planning reflect the symptoms of an organization that does not plan. The strategic planning process helps an organization clarify an ambiguous mission statement, address internal organizational issues such as staffing and time usage, and teaches Board Members and staff about planning. Too often representatives of nonprofit organizations claim that an increase in funding would solve all of their problems. Granted, funding will always be the primary concern of nonprofit managers and Boards of Directors, but a number of the problems which plague these organizations can be addressed by the strategic planning process without the need for additional funds. The excuses cited above are used as a rationale against planning when the problems themselves could and should be addressed within the planning process. Not every problem of nonprofit organizations is solved with an increase in funding. The rationale against planning, as reported by Espy (1986), lends strength to the argument for planning.

Proponents [of strategic planning] argue that precisely because of its emphasis on organizations, strategic planning can help governments, public agencies, and nonprofit organizations deal with the wrenching changes many have experienced in recent years. Further, unless these organizations increase their own capacity to think and act strategically, they are unlikely to be effective supporters of their communities' well-being. (Bryson, 1988, p. 6)

Purpose of the Study

From my observations and experiences, I have found a number of problems prevalent in organizations directed by volunteer policy-making Boards. Many of these problems pertain to the expectations and activities of the Board Members and the relationships among individuals and groups both internal and external to the organization. Some of these problems include:

1. The Board Members' commitment to the organization is often questionable.
2. There is poor clarification of roles.
3. Meeting attendance is poor.
4. The responsibilities of the Board Members are too often left to staff.
5. Board Members are not made to feel important or needed.
6. There is poor follow through on the committee level.
7. Relationships among Board Members are poor and hinder productivity.
8. The time spent addressing the mission of the organization is insufficient.
9. Programs are reactive, not proactive.
10. There is a perceived lack of leadership.
11. Communication of the organizational vision is poor.

These problems are not experienced universally nor does one organization experience these problems to the same degree as another organization. However, complaints such as these are common to many organizations, as they address issues essential to the successful pursuit of a mission.

The purpose of this study was to document the strategic planning process used by a nonprofit Board of Directors and a public Commission. The primary focus was on how a strategic plan is developed and on how the

process was experienced by the members of the Strategic Planning Committees responsible for making planning recommendations to the full Board of Directors and Commission. Although an emphasis was placed on the planning process at the committee level, documentation included portions of the regular Board and Commission meetings that covered the topic of strategic planning and the influence of the process on the Board Members and Commissioners not involved with the Strategic Planning Committees.

To support the purpose of this study, two research questions were studied. Strategic Planning Committee Members were considered the target population. The remaining population included all those Board Members and Commissioners not participating on the committee level. The research questions were:

1. How does a nonprofit Board and a public Commission develop a strategic plan?
2. What influence does the strategic planning process have, as determined by self-reports, on the two populations?

Today, more than ever, nonprofit and public organizations directly impact the quality of life experienced by the American public. I believe that the study of an intervention (such as strategic planning which may assist nonprofit and public policy makers in improving the overall effectiveness of their organizations) will improve the provision of services from such organizations and will provide direct benefits to communities. I was able to find two organizations willing to engage in the strategic planning process. They provided a laboratory for studying how organizations in general, and policy makers more specifically, utilize and respond to strategic planning.

Relevance to Leadership

Burns' (1978) critical view of policy makers within institutions credited them as little better than bureaucrats satisfied with mediocrity. He went on to elaborate on the potential of leaders who are effective policy makers and planners when they successfully acknowledge and address the psychological and structural forces impeding real, intended change instead of concentrating only on administrative and technical factors.

The generally accepted function of a nonprofit Board of Directors or public Commission is that of leading their organization. As policy makers and monitors, and in the legislative role of advice and consent, Board Members and Commissioners have the opportunity and obligation to impact the image, operation and future of their organization.

This study was designed to document two groups of policy makers as they wrestled with the difficult decisions involved in strategic planning. Issues regarding the values, goals, policies, programs and stakeholders of the organization were identified, weighed and agreed upon as the strategic planning process unfolded. The descriptive information gained through this study will contribute to the literature on strategic planning in the nonprofit and public sectors and may enhance the potential effectiveness of such organizations.

Although insight into nonprofit and public leadership is gained through this study, it was unwise to impose prior constructs on the data. I believe that leadership is a dialogical relationship between leaders and followers striving for real change based on mutual purposes. Leaders gain the trust of others, manage conflict, express their vision clearly and persuade others to participate (Bennis, 1989). The essence of my understanding of leadership is founded in the scholarly work of Burns (1978), Rost (1988),

Foster (1989), and Bennis (1989). The early work by Burns was rooted in the industrial paradigm (a machine metaphor for all social interaction in which technology can solve all problems) and written from the historical/political perspective of the author. Burns introduced the concept of transformational leadership, "when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). Recent thought on the topic of leadership finds its roots in Burns' in-depth study. Bennis adopted the concept of transformational leadership but chose to refer to it as transformative leadership. Bennis and Burns concur regarding the inclusion of morality in their respective definitions. Foster too includes morality in his definition of leadership:

Leadership, in the final analysis, is the ability of humans to deeply relate to each other in the search for a more perfect union. Leadership then is a consensual task, a sharing of ideas and a sharing of responsibilities, where leader is a leader for the moment only, where the leadership exerted must be validated by the consent of followers, and where leadership lies in struggles of a community to find meaning for itself. (p. 61)

Rost (1988), like Burns (1978), was anchored in the political model. He differed, however, from Burns, Bennis (1989) and Foster (1989) in his definition of leadership as a process. Rost's view of leadership was "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect the purposes mutually held by both leaders and followers (p. 17)."

I too see leadership as a dynamic human process and agree with Rost that leadership is not value bound. Leaders may, and in fact have, done evil. From Bennis, I have taken my ideas of how leaders manage conflict, solicit

trust in others, use persuasion and clarify their vision. And finally, pertinent to this study is Foster's notion that the leader is a leader for the moment only.

Leadership was not assumed to be a recurring theme found throughout the data but instead was allowed to emerge as other themes and was handled in the same manner.

Need for Research in This Area

As stated above, I believe that nonprofit services directly impact the quality of life in a community. If the quality or quantity of such services might be improved with better understanding of the strategic planning process, this understanding must penetrate not only the world of academics but that of practitioners as well. The literature addressing strategic planning for nonprofit organizations is, for the most part, limited to planning theory, models, and commentary on the need for strategic planning or strategic management. The literature provides few case studies of the planning process. Almost unheard of are studies supported by thick description of how an organization or agency conducted the formulation of a strategic plan.

What is needed are specific case examples of how organizations diverse in maturity, size, structure, and mission go about creating a strategic plan. Not only are brief, readable versions of these cases needed for journals favored by practitioners; but extended versions rich in description and intended to enable the reader to become a part of the planning experience are called for as well. It will be these case examples which will demystify the strategic planning process thereby encouraging the practitioner/reader to initiate the planning process within an organization or to simply lend support to an existing planning practice.

The nonprofit community needs further education about the need for and benefits of strategic planning. This study was designed with the intent to assist that effort.

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be referred to and used throughout the course of this research:

1. Board Member: A member of an organization's governing body.
2. Commissioner: A member of a politically-appointed advisory group.
3. Nonprofit organization: A tax-exempt organization eligible to receive tax-deductible gifts because it provides a service to the public. A nonprofit organization has three particular attributes: (a) it is legally and structurally nonprofit (described above), (b) it provides for societal needs, and (c) it is a philanthropy having a large part of revenues come from tax-deductible contributions (James, 1987).
4. Private organization: An organization or entity, not related to the public sector, doing business for monetary purposes.
5. Public organization: Within the broad definition of nonprofit, an organization or entity of or relating to a government.
6. Stakeholder: A person, group or organization that can affect an organization's attention, resources or output, or is affected by that output (Bryson, 1988, p. 33).
7. Strategic planning: An organized effort to produce decisions and actions integral to the shape and direction of an organization, what it does and why it does it (Bryson, 1988, p. 5).

Limitations

This study had two primary limitations. The first was my dual role as participant observer which may have placed undue pressure on the participants to conform, thereby influencing the collection and interpretation of data. I dealt with this problem by introducing the dual roles to all participants, by distinguishing the two roles at various times during the strategic planning process, and by accounting for the two roles during the data analysis and the writing of each story.

The second limitation was the small sample size. Generalizability of a study such as this is very difficult when only two organizations have been examined. This limitation is made worse when the participants have been chosen based to some degree on researcher bias. Two organizations cannot be representative of the diversity found in the public and nonprofit sectors but these cases can be used to illustrate the impact of a particular process on two types of organizations.

Protection of Human Subjects

This study was approved by the Human Subjects Committee of the University of San Diego. Participants were briefed orally and in writing regarding the study, their participation, and the use of the data. Informed consent was obtained from each interview participant (see Appendix B).

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter Two presents a review of the literature pertaining to nonprofit organizations, Boards of Directors and strategic planning. Research design and methodology are discussed and evaluated in Chapter Three. Chapter Four describes the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC), the nonprofit participant in the study. This chapter includes the researcher's analysis of the pre- and post-interview data as well as thick

description of the data obtained during the Strategic Planning Committee meetings and the portions of the regular Board meetings that addressed the work of the Committee. A chronology of the CHCDC's strategic planning process is reported as a story. The Researcher's observations and interpretations of the data collected from the CHCDC are included in this chapter.

Chapter Five describes the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, the public participant in the study. This chapter includes the Researcher's analysis of the pre- and post-interview data as well as thick description of the data obtained during the Strategic Planning Committee meetings and the portions of the regular Commission meetings that addressed the work of the Committee. A chronology of the Commission's planning process is reported as a story. The researcher's observations and interpretations of the data collected from the Commission are included in this chapter.

Chapter Six presents a summary of the researcher's observations, interpretations and conclusions regarding the experience of the strategic planning process for each respective participant. Conclusions and participant observations are set forth. This is followed with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the study and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature will introduce pertinent writings on each of the three topics under investigation (nonprofit organizations, Boards of Directors and strategic planning) and will identify themes found within the literature. The literature pertaining to each of these subjects is, to some degree, a subset of a larger body of work addressing the private sector. There is an abundance of work on corporate structure and organizational issues, the corporate Board of Directors, and corporate strategy and planning. Significantly less has been written on nonprofit organizations, nonprofit Boards of Directors, and strategic planning in the nonprofit sector. A certain amount of comparing and contrasting of the two sectors will be included in each of the sections. The chapter closes with a brief integration of the research and implications for this study.

Nonprofit Organizations

Throughout the literature, scholars and practitioners have wrestled with the issue of how nonprofit organizations compare and contrast with private organizations. Ansoff (1979) hypothesized a convergence of the private and nonprofit sectors that would cause private sector organizations to become "progressively diluted" and nonprofit organizations to become more commercial (p. 31). The lines between the three sectors (private, public, and nonprofit) have become more and more blurred as organizations struggle to

share the responsibility for serving public needs while wrestling with a turbulent environment.

Wortman (1979), after an evaluation of the research on nonprofit organizations, concluded that there are differentiating characteristics between nonprofit organizations and private organizations but that these differences remain too ambiguous for clear categorical differentiation. He did, however, develop a typology classifying three types of nonprofit organizations: (a) public organizations, executive agencies and departments, and urban and environmental organizations (i.e., governments, fire, police, conservation, etc.); (b) third-sector organizations [In other writings, the first sector is typically the private sector and the second sector--public.], including public-private agencies and consumer cooperatives (i.e., AMTRAK, nonprofit consultants, etc.); and (c) institutional organizations, including those for education, health care, religion, and the arts (Wortman, 1979, p. 354). Wortman's typology has been adopted for use in this study in order to refer to both institutional and public organizations as part of the same sector.

Uniqueness of Nonprofit Organizations

The most comprehensive collection of writings on the nonprofit sector was edited by Powell (1987) and provided a state-of-the-art review and assessment of scholarly research. The collection covered the history, demographics, government and private sector relations, economic theories, political theories, management theories, support sources and comparative perspectives on the nonprofit sector. Powell and many of the contributing authors of this work are presently or were previously affiliated with Yale University's Program on Non-Profit Organizations.

Nonprofit organizations are distinctive in that they work with ambiguous performance criteria, complex management-related values, and

imposing legal and financial constraints. They derive economic sustenance from a variety of sources (including federal, state and local government dollars, revenue-generating programs, and foundation gifts, in addition to private contributions), employ a work force which differs from the private sector's, and typically exist with a governing structure different from most private organizations (O'Neill & Young, 1988). Contributing to the uniqueness of nonprofit organizations is their lack of a bottom line (Drucker, 1989; Mattar, 1985; O'Neill & Young, 1988). This one point, returned to again and again, impacts both practical and value-related aspects of organizations.

One way to understand the difference between nonprofits and organizations in other sectors is to realize that the particular activities that business and government organizations undertake are instrumental to achieving their overall objectives. For nonprofits [institutional organizations], the particular service or the given constituency or the articulated cause is of primary concern, not subservient to an overriding financial or political bottom line. (O'Neill & Young, 1988, p. 4)

O'Neill and Young included these issues and others in the introduction of their argument that managers of nonprofit organizations require alternative educational opportunities which will specifically address the unique qualities and characteristics of nonprofit organizations.

The status of available research data regarding the nonprofit economy was presented by Weisbrod (1988). Although knowledge of the nonprofit economy has grown, a number of gaps still remain. For instance, Weisbrod reported that little is known about the changing composition of the sector or about how effective nonprofit organizations are at delivering public services. Lack of sufficient data to describe how well nonprofit organizations are

meeting the wants and needs of society has precluded the examination of key issues related to the the design and implementation of public policy.

Even though knowledge of the nonprofit economy lags far behind that of private organizations, this sector has not been bypassed entirely by the information age. Data from 1982 told us that the nonprofit economy is very urban with 50% of the 61.5 billion in revenues (tax-exempt organizations) went to non-governmental nonprofit organizations in 20 of the 300 metropolitan areas in the United States. Twenty-two percent went to Washington, D.C., New York City, and Los Angeles alone. What remains unknown is how these funds are distributed geographically by the organizations. Answers to many more questions about the efficiency, innovation, competitiveness, entry, and exit of nonprofit organizations have yet to be discovered and reported in the literature.

Both public agencies and institutional nonprofit organizations may be governed by a voluntary Board and staffed by paid professionals. Both types of nonprofit organizations must deal with the operational concerns associated with running an organization which relies on voluntary decision/policy makers. Public agencies have the additional burdens associated with the political process as reported in the next section by Zusman (1982) and Ring and Perry (1985). Wortman (1979) accused public executives as primarily being interested in retaining their jobs, not establishing goals. These limitations, constraints and unique qualities and characteristics of nonprofit organizations raise a number of distinctive management concerns which will be discussed in a later section.

Relationship Between Public and Institutional Organizations

Throughout the literature, many authors have discussed the relationship between public and institutional nonprofit organizations (e.g. Bryson, 1988; Firstenberg, 1986; Zusman, 1982). Some have taken a three sector approach which separates institutional and public nonprofit organizations into two different sectors (e.g. Conrad & Glenn, 1983; Firstenberg, 1986; White, 1981). Bryson (1988), like Wortman (1979), addressed the needs of the two types of organizations as being more similar than different.

Salamon (1987) examined this relationship and described the delivery of public services in the United States as a system of "third-party government", going on to illustrate this by showing the interconnectedness of public and institutional nonprofit organizations with private organizations (p. 110). Consequently, this complex pattern of interconnection which links organizations by revenue sources and the shared responsibility for delivery of services impedes accurate measurement of the nonprofit sector.

Ring and Perry (1985) outlined the various differences between the public and private sectors. In doing so they presented a number of propositions regarding public organizations which can be used in an analysis of differences and similarities between public and institutional nonprofit organizations. Public organizations suffer from policy ambiguity due to poorly defined policy directives. Ambiguity in strategy, characteristic of many public organizations, (a consequent of the openness of decision making) results in constraints on managers and executives. And finally, public organizations are subjected to more "direct and sustained influence" from individuals and groups (p. 280). Public sector management must cope with

time constraints that are more artificial than those that confront private sector management. Tenure of public officials is a major contributing factor.

These characteristics of public organizations are in some cases consistent, and in other instances contrary to characteristics of institutional nonprofit organizations. A deciding factor is the degree of dependency an institutional nonprofit organization might have upon government funding, especially local government dollars. Institutional nonprofits that receive a significant portion of their funding from government dollars become entangled in the political loop of city, county, state, and federal allocations programs.

Institutional nonprofit organizations are highly interdependent with government and business. Differing characteristics include general purpose, (mutual versus public benefit orientation) fields of service, and size (Zusman, 1982). One quality of public agency governance which contributes to this uniqueness of character is the fuzziness of the lines of authority and delineation of responsibility between the elected officials who have the final authority, those with managerial appointments, and the appointed Board Member.

Zusman (1982) described this tangle of relationships as competitive and collaborative. The author found the goals and effectiveness of government agencies even more difficult to conceptualize and examine than non-governmental (institutional) nonprofit organizations. In a short series of case examples the author described a county department staffed by a professional and advised by a voluntary Board of citizens. The department was funded by county and state monies. In this example, Zusman's illustration of the lines of authority and responsibility made apparent his claim that these lines are unclear.

Management Concerns for Nonprofit Organizations

A number of themes are prevalent in both the practitioner-written and scholarly literature. Wolf (1984) saw nonprofit organizations as "private sector organizations with public sector purposes" (p. 17). According to Wolf, this combination caused the "double-edged sword" of flexibility (p. 17). This kind of flexibility can cause ambiguity and uncertainty in the areas of mission, programs, and constituency. Concern about ambiguity and other similar issues was echoed by Cyert (1975), Conrad and Glenn (1983) and Kanter and Summers (1987). Wortman (1988) candidly stated that few nonprofit organizations are considered to be well-managed in the short or long run. "When one thinks of organizations that are poorly managed over the long term, have few or no long-range goal structures (or ones that are ill-defined), . . . one probably thinks of organizations such as not-for-profit [organizations]" (Wortman, 1979, p. 353).

Specifically, Kanter and Summers (1987) referred to this same kind of flexibility as the nonprofit manager's "leeway" with programs (p. 163). Kanter and Summers cautioned against the possibilities for political maneuvering and constituencies being played against one another. All this was seen as the product of ambiguous missions, operating goals and objectives of nonprofit organizations. Conrad and Glenn (1983), however, blamed the failure of organizations to integrate Board, staff and organization into a whole for causing this ambiguity.

Another issue related to the management of nonprofit organizations repeatedly cited in the literature is poor program and personnel evaluation practices. Conrad and Glenn (1983) and Kanter and Summers (1987) agreed that personnel evaluation is typically ignored. Program evaluation is made more difficult because most programs sponsored by nonprofit organizations

are related to service and service is difficult to evaluate in both nonprofit and private organizations (Kanter & Summers, 1987). Unterman and Davis (1984) supported the use of quantitative measures to evaluate everything from membership and programs to the organization's executive director. Cyert (1975) boldly stated "perhaps the major difference that most businessmen would allude to in distinguishing their organizations from the nonprofit organizations would be the evaluation process" (p. 8). "The size, complexity, and uniqueness of the private nonprofit sector make management development for the sector an important educational issue" (O'Neill & Young, 1988, p. 1-2).

Many authors, O'Neill and Young (1988) among them, suggest that the 1980s brought an increase in attention to nonprofit organizations and specifically the management of these organizations. This change is of great importance since nonprofit activity accounts for between 5 and 10% of all economic activity (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1986).

Summary

Ten years ago there were no publications reporting conceptual or empirical research on nonprofit organizations. The literature now provides studies which can be generally applied to the field and some which concern particular issues (Wortman, 1988). The improvement in the volume and quality of the research which has taken place over the past decade has been enjoyed by practitioners and scholars alike but still leaves a great many areas to be addressed. Studies which address organizational models, management theories, program implementation, and evaluation are needed. With the increased interest in nonprofit organizations, significant research is called for in this area.

The literature that currently exists on nonprofit organizations appears to vary from practitioner-written to scholarly. Typically, what has been written by practitioners treats organizational, management and evaluation needs with a hands-on approach based upon circumstances specific to the nonprofit sector. The more scholarly research acknowledges differences between the two sectors but concludes by stating that there is a great deal in common between private and nonprofit organizations (Steinberg, 1987). Wortman (1979) concluded that nonprofit organizations, because of their failure to address long-term goals, can benefit from strategic management (long-range goal setting, strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation) even more than business organizations. The issues identified above and numerous others call for nonprofit organizations to adopt a strategic management posture (Hodgetts & Wortman, 1980).

It seems generally agreed upon that nonprofit organizations exist for the purpose of meeting public needs. Yet, what has provided a reason for their existence has also been the cause of their many management concerns. Left to wrestle with a turbulent environment, unstable funding, and needy and demanding constituencies, all under the direction of a group of volunteer policy makers, it is no wonder that these organizations are considered sloppily managed and lacking in everything from focus to evaluation practices. As additional information regarding Boards of Directors and strategic planning is presented in the following sections, the need for a study such as this will become clearer to the reader.

Boards of Directors

Perhaps the most frustrating experience for a competent executive is entering the Boardroom of a nonprofit organization. There, other hard-nosed, hard-driving executives, who serve meaningfully as

directors of profit-making firms, may perform ineffectively. . . .

Corporate executives seem to walk into the nonprofit Boardroom and immediately forget the fundamentals of superior organizational performance practiced in their firms--the knowledge that got them invited into the nonprofit Boardroom in the first place. (Mattar, 1985, p. 32.1)

In a basic primer for corporate Board Members and executives, Anderson and Anthony (1986) defined and described the world of the corporate Board of Directors. The literature on corporate Boards is growing. Anderson and Anthony are joined by many others (Mattar & Ball, 1985; Mueller, 1982; and Waldo, 1985; Loudon, 1982) who have contributed to the research on this specialized topic. The corporate Board typically relies on management to take the initiative, make the necessary analyses and bring recommendations related to corporate strategy to the Board. Subsequently, the Board exercises its responsibility and authority through decisions at regular Board meetings and at meetings focused specifically on corporate strategy.

In a nonprofit organization the Board of Directors may function similarly to a chief executive officer (CEO) of a private corporation which leaves the executive director of a nonprofit organization to perform the duties typically performed by a chief operations officer (COO) of a private entity (Anderson & Anthony, 1986). The nonprofit Board of Directors makes all policy decisions. In some other organizations the Board may serve in a smaller capacity thereby leaving more of the responsibility for the accomplishment of the organization's mission to the executive director. Typically, the Board's involvement in program planning is limited to evaluation and recommendations for specific changes in direction. However,

the line between appropriate and inappropriate involvement is difficult to draw.

Function and Responsibilities of the Nonprofit Board of Directors

The literature addressing the nonprofit Board of Directors is significantly smaller than that which covers the corporate Board and is less scholarly overall. Very little empirical research has been done in the nonprofit sector. Board Members and executive directors of nonprofit organizations may seek guidance on issues pertaining to Boards from how to do it manuals and application books (Anthes, Cronin & Jackson, 1985; Connors, 1980; Conrad & Glenn 1983; O'Connell, 1976; Trost & Rauner, 1983) or from more scholarly, research-oriented work which may be difficult to apply to the needs of a particular organization (Baughman, 1987; Bryce, 1987; Connors & Callaghan, 1982; Fenn, 1971; Herman & Van Til, 1989; Mason, 1984; Middleton, 1987; O'Neill & Young, 1988; Saline, 1982; Slavin, 1978; Tompkins, 1984; Unterman & Davis, 1984; Zald, 1969). Many authors agree that nonprofit organizations, and governing Boards in particular, are poorly organized and suffer from ineffective management practices (Conrad & Glenn, 1983; Mattar, 1985; Middleton, 1987; Saline, 1982; Unterman & Davis, 1984).

Middleton (1987) painted a dim picture of the literature on nonprofit Boards of Directors:

Only a meager amount of literature is available to help frustrated Board Members and managers. Material written by practitioners is typically prescriptive, focusing on the explicit internal functions of the Board. The scholarly literature derives primarily from researchers interested in Boards of Directors as a mechanism that organizations can use to deal with uncertainties in their external world. (p. 141)

Middleton's perspective accounts for the Board as part of both the organization and the environment. She concluded her work by showing how research data refuted three commonly held assumptions about nonprofit Boards. The first assumption, that Boards are policy making and goal evaluating, is contradictory to the data which hold that Boards ratify, not formulate, policy. The second assumption, that Boards are "noisy constituent Boards, characterized by bargaining behavior" (p. 152), is contradictory to the findings that Boards, especially those that are high status, are conflict averse and typically do not discuss controversial topics. The final assumption, that the relationship between Boards and management is trusting, congenial and based on effective communication, is not supported with the data which portray the board-management relationship as "dynamic", not always supportive, and highly dependent on individual, group and organizational factors (p. 152).

One very scholarly collection of writings on nonprofit Boards of Directors was compiled by Herman and Van Til (1989). The work was originally published in 1985 in journal form. Herman and Van Til's collection of studies emphasized Board composition, function, and effectiveness; Board Member expectations and motivation to participate; minority participation; intra-Board relationships and Board/staff relationships; and information usage. Savage (1984), as reported by Herman (1989, p. 1), suggested that Board practices are myths. These myths include notions such as:

1. There is, or can be found, a clear separation between the responsibilities of the Board and those of staff.
2. Trustees safeguard the public interest.

3. Trustees perform important decision-making as well as ceremonial roles.

4. A group of relative strangers, meeting only a few times a year, can adequately direct an organization.

Savage saw the gap between myth and reality becoming clearer. As scholars and practitioners contribute to the knowledge of nonprofit Boards of Directors through meetings, conferences, manuals and books, the gap will slowly close.

Weis and Wynn (1980), in an examination of the literature on the function and responsibilities of nonprofit Boards of Directors, found four major areas of responsibility: (a) determination of policy and the monitoring of performance against same; (b) allocation of resources, fiscal review and audit overview; (c) appointment and evaluation of executive director; and (d) public relations. The authors extended the policy formulation function with the addition of the Board's involvement in planning, to ensure that the organization's programs and services were in agreement with the mission statement.

In a comparison of profit-making organizations and nonprofit organizations, Mattar (1985) identified key questions which must be asked by the Boards of both organizations and which address the role of each.

1. What business are we in?
2. What are our opportunities, particularly in light of our strengths and weaknesses and the projected future of the organization and its field?
3. Where are we going in the next three years, and how shall we determine whether we are getting there? (Mattar, 1985, p. 32.5)

According to Mattar (1985), the responsibilities of the nonprofit Board of Directors include such areas as the organization's mission and objectives, major policies, hiring and compensation of an executive director, annual

budget approval, major capital expenditures, public image, fundraising, and approval of outside consultants for audits and legal matters.

"Board Membership no longer is just an honorary and ceremonial position. It is a complex, difficult, time-consuming, often frustrating task, with great responsibility and little recompense other than the satisfaction of involvement" (Zusman, 1982, p. 227). Zusman defined public agencies as "devoted to serving the general public" (p. 217). From the author's perspective, serving on the Board of a public agency is a unique experience. He noted that,

Service on the Boards of public agencies is becoming an issue of major concern to many individuals. As more and more Boards are established, more and more persons are invited to serve on Boards. With the growth in size, diversity, and responsibilities of public agencies, Board membership becomes more complicated. Service on a Board is no longer something that can be taken lightly. Board Members are expected to participate actively and to carry out their roles effectively. (p. 225)

Under the direction of an executive director, day to day operations are handled by agency staff. This leaves the responsibility for the leadership of the agency to the Board of Directors. Like authors addressing the function and responsibilities of Boards of institutional nonprofit organizations (Hartogs & Weber, 1974; Mattar, 1985; Weis & Wynn, 1980), Zusman viewed the responsibilities of the public agency Board to include the same things: upholding the purpose of the organization as outlined by the charter, representing a voice of the community, monitoring agency operations, policy making, providing a conduit for information to and from the public,

fundraising, public education, and supporting the agency executive (in the event of a political battle).

In closing comments discussing trends for nonprofit Boards of Directors Anderson and Anthony (1986) stated, "Members of Boards of trustees will play a more important role in nonprofit organizations Consequently, . . . nonprofits must become more businesslike in order to survive. Their Boards will emphasize the importance of sound business methods" (p. 226). Board Members serving nonprofit organizations must learn to carry the experience and expertise gained from profit-making organizations into the nonprofit Boardroom. The literature tells us that there exists enough similarity in the responsibilities of the profit-making and nonprofit Board that the hat worn by either director could nearly be the same.

Research on Nonprofit Boards of Directors

One comparative study by Unterman and Davis (1982) looked at the Boards of trustees of 100 nonprofit organizations and identified seven characteristics which made them different from the Boards of private organizations. The study found that nonprofit organizations have: (a) an executive director who manages operations, (b) limited internal support, (c) larger Boards, (d) fewer inside directors, (e) directors without extensive management experience, (f) fixed terms of service for directors, and (g) expectations for smaller time commitments from directors.

Although not a recent study, the work done in 1974 by Hartogs and Weber is the most comprehensive study of nonprofit Boards of Directors. Their study, which surveyed 296 Boards of Directors, reported extensive demographic information on the composition of Boards, the functions and responsibilities of Boards, the attitudes of Board Members toward their role, and Board operations. Pertinent to this study, Hartogs and Weber reported

that the major problems faced by Boards of Directors related to programming included establishing program priorities within the capabilities of available resources and trying to ensure that the organization's programs were meeting the needs of the community.

One of the oldest devices of democracy, Boards--those groups of volunteers giving themselves to a good cause--historically have been the conscience of the community and the architects of social policy, both in this country and abroad. Citizen participation in community affairs, which has been called the backbone of democracy has been a great tradition in the United States from its very beginning. Prompted by the belief that everyone has an obligation to contribute to the social good, Americans have not been content merely to work at a living, to serve their country and raise their families and remain in hot pursuit of knowledge and happiness. They have always done more. (p. xiii)

Questions asked by Board Members which may be a preliminary step to recognizing a need for planning were reported as frustrations felt by Board Members in Hartogs and Weber's (1974) data. Millions of individuals serve on nonprofit Boards and govern billions of dollars of expenditures. This is all voluntary time, alone worth billions of dollars. Boards are asking why so much time is spent on fiscal issues and so little time is spent discussing scope and delivery of services. The growing pressure on nonprofit organizations to meet the needs of their communities is causing Boards to reexamine their role. The business of delivering services to a community has changed and in order to remain in the game, Boards must change too.

The "served" are now "clients", according to Hartogs and Weber's (1974) survey data. Those who receive services from nonprofit organizations have a voice in the community and are asking (or demanding) better service

and representation. In 1974, when this survey was published, little was known about nonprofit organizations' Boards of Directors. Since Boards have been around for hundreds of years, this is not only odd but debilitating for today's scholars and practitioners who are wrestling with the complexities of the nonprofit sector in today's competitive business environment. "There is wide agreement among Boards of voluntary agencies that Board Members, agency Executives and staff who work with Boards need to take a critical look at themselves and the work they are doing" (Hartogs & Weber, 1974, p. xvii).

A more recent study of Boards of Directors in nonprofit organizations examined the composition of Boards, their activities and outcomes. Miller, Weiss and MacLeod (1988) sent questionnaires to a sample of executive directors of nonprofit organizations in the Philadelphia area. The participating agencies were traditional social service organizations. Respondents were asked to report on Board composition and to rate Board activities. Agency outcomes, or products, were reported using Provan and Stewart's (1982) "dynamic measures" (Miller, Weiss & MacLeod, 1988). Although results linked a number of Board characteristics with Board activities, it was not conclusive whether or not these relationships were causal or if possibly Board involvement in various activities influenced the recruitment of new members with specific kinds of experiences and/or expertise.

Role of the Nonprofit Board of Directors in Planning

As more attention is paid to the management of nonprofit organizations and their need for better planning practices, the role of the Board of Directors in such matters is being discussed with greater frequency. Zusman (1982); Mattar and Ball (1985); Miller, Weiss and MacLeod (1988); and Waldo, (1985) all covered the Board's role in planning for the future of

nonprofit organizations. Mattar and Ball (1985) noted that nonprofit organizations rely on a number of different forms of revenue (fee for service, endowment, fundraising, government assistance), the competition for which has grown fierce. The need for nonprofit organizations to become more bottom-line oriented, as discussed earlier in this chapter, means that Boards of Directors must accept the responsibility for clearly defined, quantifiable, and measurable goals for their organizations. The establishment of long-term goals and objectives must become second only to the selection of a chief executive, according to Mattar and Ball. Performance must be evaluated in much the same way it is in private industry. Profit can be discussed in a nonprofit Boardroom. First it must be defined. "When the trustees think in terms of profit, however it is defined, they can apply the tools of good management and governance from the profit sector" (p. 32.6).

A related finding from the Miller, Weiss and MacLeod (1988) study showed a relationship between decreased funding with a subsequent increase in the Boards' involvement with long-term planning. The authors suggested that Boards may see a greater need for planning during funding crunches. Also part of the findings in this study was that the Board activity most strongly related to outcome or product was the development of the organization's image within the community. This activity was significantly related to improvements in funding, the agency's reputation and image within the community and among other similar organizations, and private and corporate donations.

Waldo (1985) stated that many of the same issues are faced by profit-seeking and nonprofit Boards of Directors. In a discussion of the usefulness of a strategic planning committee being included in the Board structure, the author included distressing data reporting large surveys completed in 1982 by

Heidrick and Struggles and Korn/Ferry showed that none of the respondents had a permanent strategic planning committee. The same report included data which showed that 75% of the participating companies placed strategic planning in a listing of the top three functions of a Board of Directors. Waldo closed with a strong statement that a strategic planning committee "is at least as important—if not more so—than most of the other Board committees" (p. 77). The role of the full Board should be to ratify the work of the committee. Suggestions for the future included the addition of a planning committee to most Boards and increased involvement of Board Members in mapping strategy for the organization.

Waldo (1985) was in agreement with earlier work by Lorange (1980) which described two levels of responsibility for Board Members involved with corporate strategy. Lorange saw the Board Member having influence in strategic decisions impacting the direction of the organizations and being responsible for the maintenance of adequate levels of excellence and professionalism in corporate strategy. Both authors agreed that Board Members should be held responsible for understanding the strategic planning process.

Espy (1986), Wolf (1984), and Weis and Wynn (1980) also agreed on the function of the nonprofit Board of Directors in the planning process. Espy supported Board involvement so as to ensure "wholehearted backing when the plan is implemented" (p. 20). Wolf outlined the Board's involvement in the planning process to complement staff participation and responsibility.

Summary

In an effort to summarize the literature on nonprofit Boards of Directors, it is obvious that there are multiple, conflicting views on the role, function and responsibilities of these groups of decision makers. The

majority of the work done in this area reported that the Board of a nonprofit organization performs the duties "expected" of it within the overall framework of the management of the organization (such as policy making, etc.). However, if one is to believe Savage's (1984) and Middleton's (1987) findings that much of what is believed to be true about Boards of Directors is myth, then a tremendous gap exists.

Herman (1989) referred to the many conferences, meetings, handbooks, and manuals now available for educating Board Members of nonprofit organizations. With further awareness of the practical issues and with additional scholarly work being done to add to the currently small base of empirical knowledge that exists, more will be known about the role of the Board of Directors in the management and leadership of nonprofit organizations, how Board composition may affect efficiency or effectiveness, how Boards interact with staff, and what role they should, can and do play in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of organizational strategy.

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is part of the overall strategic management of an organization. Pfeiffer's history of strategic planning (1986) goes back as far as the 1800s. A more practical overview of the evolution of the concept begins with the use of strategic planning in World War II when governments were forced to address the long-range allocation and utilization of resources (Wortman, 1988). Postwar strategic planning centered on the business organization. Until the 1960s, interest in strategic planning in the nonprofit sector was minimal (Andreasen, 1982). The 1970s brought the movement from strategic planning to strategic management in the private sector (Ansoff, Declerck & Hayes, 1976). Increasing numbers of business organizations follow the practices of strategic management. Contrary to this, the rate of increase in

the number of nonprofit organizations becoming interested in strategic planning, a precursor of strategic management, is at a snail's pace (Wortman, 1988).

Definitions, Models, Processes, and Systems

Barry (1986) and Bryson (1988) agreed that strategic planning can help a nonprofit organization think and act strategically, clarify the future of the organization, set priorities, make forward-thinking decisions, solve organizational problems, improve performance and deal more effectively with an ever-changing environment. They also agreed that in order to be effective, the planning process should include decision makers (Board of Directors), top-level management (executive director) and external stakeholders (members of the community served).

Bryson's approach to strategic planning (1988) was uniquely designed for public and nonprofit organizations. Admittedly, he borrowed from private-sector approaches to planning to create his eight-step process. The eight steps are:

1. Initiating and agreeing on a strategic planning process.
2. Identifying organizational mandates.
3. Clarifying organizational mission and values.
4. Assessing the external environment: opportunities and threats.
5. Assessing the internal environment: strengths and weaknesses.
6. Identifying the strategic issues facing an organization.
7. Formulating strategies to manage issues.
8. Establishing an effective organizational vision for the future.

(Bryson, 1988, p. 48)

There have been other strategic planning models written for nonprofit and public organizations. Bryson (1988) claimed that Olsen and Eadie (1982),

Sorkin, Ferris and Hudak (1984), and Barry (1986) are "the most widely cited recent models of public and nonprofit sector strategic planning" (p. 30). Integral to each of these models is the attention paid to internal and external stakeholders. Particular emphasis was given to stakeholders in Bryson's approach: "Attention to stakeholder concerns is crucial because *the key to success in public and nonprofit organizations is the satisfaction of key stakeholders*" (1988, p. 52, emphasis in the original).

Looking at the overall benefits of strategic planning, King (1979) found that the implementation of a strategic planning process helps to link day-to-day choices made by an organization to the broader plan or strategy. The alternative to a commitment to strategic planning is the threat of the consequence of reactive decisions made in response to current dilemmas, independent of an overall strategy. Not only are such decision-making practices haphazard, they also may be contradictory.

As mentioned in Chapter One of this study, Grant and King (1982) described strategic planning as involving "an organization's most basic and important choices--the choice of its mission, objectives, strategy, policies, programs, goals, and major resource allocations," and defined it as "the organized process through which such strategic decisions can be systematically and rationally analyzed and made" (p. 3). Earlier, King (1979) wrote that strategic planning is a creative process which must be accomplished by a group (within a given organization). Professional planners can facilitate the creation of a plan but they cannot replace those individuals with on-going responsibility for the organization's operations.

King (1979) presented a system of plans which combine to describe the essence of strategic planning in sophisticated organizations. The seven sub-plans making up this system are interrelated and interdependent, reflecting

differing aspects (environment, opportunities, and stakeholders) of the organization as a whole. The seven plans are:

1. Mission Plan which outlines the broad mission, objectives and strategies of the organization.
 2. Organizational Development Plan which maps in greater detail the route toward the future as described by the mission plan and determines the activities necessary for future outputs.
 3. Divestment Plan which deals with the divestiture of major elements of the organizations.
 4. Diversification Plan which describes the development of new outputs, services or markets.
 5. Research and Development Plan which outlines research to advance or improve the outputs of the organization.
 6. Program or Project Plans which are basic to the system of plans in that they provide detailed descriptions of activities through which organizational change can be pursued.
 7. Operation Plans which are not an element of strategic planning but are directed toward the activities through which the organization serves its stakeholders such as marketing, production, administration and finances.
- (King, 1979, pp. 348-352)

If one is to accept King's (1979) work, fundamental to the planning process is the achievement of synergy, the importance of creating a plan that is greater than the sum of its parts. "For planning to truly achieve synergy, some mechanism must be developed for using these assessments [of organizational units and programs] as a basis for *taking advantage of the interactions and interdependencies* which exist between organizational units and programs" (p. 352, emphasis in the original).

Of course, the only truly effective way of creating a proper climate for strategic planning is to permeate the organization with planning, to demonstrate that it works, and to make use of it. When this pragmatic test of results has been passed, skeptics will be stilled and the organizational climate will be ripe for the institution of sophisticated strategic planning. (King, 1979, p. 361)

Another concept of a strategic planning system was proposed by Lorange and Vancil (1979). These authors asserted that strategic planning is based on a three-level hierarchy that "gives a useful starting position for the design of a planning system that provides adaptation to environmental opportunities and threats facing all or part of an organization" (p. 2). Lorange and Vancil stated that an organization will become gradually committed to the planning process with the participation of appropriate executives. The hierarchy they presented is divided into three cycles:

1. Objective Setting Cycle which involves determining overall portfolio objectives as well as appropriate charters and objectives for each division.
2. Programming Cycle which focuses on specific plans for each unit.
3. Budgetary Cycle which issues and arrives at detailed, short-term budget choices consistent with the strategic direction the organization has chosen. (Lorange & Vancil, 1979, p. 2)

Commentary on Strategic Planning in Nonprofit Organizations

Just like the research on Boards of Directors, the larger body of literature on strategic planning specifically addresses the private sector. Strategic planning and strategic management texts used in business schools often address the needs of the nonprofit sector but do so in a very cursory way (e.g., Gardner, Rachlin & Sweeny, 1986; Higgins, 1985; Higgins & Vincze, 1989;

Steiner, 1979; Steiner, Minor & Gray 1986; Wheelen & Hunger, 1986). The same issues discussed above are the focal point in the chapters which address strategy for nonprofit organizations: ineffective management practices; short-term organizational focus; and ambiguity of mission, goals and objectives.

The nonprofit sector has been left to borrow from the experience and the research of the private sector. Bryson (1988) does a thorough job of examining private-sector approaches to strategic planning and their applicability to public and nonprofit organizations. Bryson looked at the Harvard policy model, strategic planning systems, stakeholder management approaches, portfolio models, competitive analysis, strategic negotiations, logical incrementalism, and strategic planning as a framework for innovation. He concluded that,

1. Corporate-style strategic planning encompasses a range of approaches that vary in degree of applicability to public and nonprofit organizations.
2. Private-sector approaches to planning emphasize different aspects of the complete planning picture. This is an inadequate approach for nonprofit and public organizations which need a comprehensive planning model.
3. Any strategic planning approach applied to a specific organization becomes a "hybrid" (p. 43).
4. Strategic planning should be a standard practice for all public and nonprofit planners.
5. The strategic planner or planning team using a process approach should reflect various areas of expertise, including political and technical knowledge.
6. Further research is needed to advance the knowledge and practice of strategic planning in public and nonprofit organizations.

Bryce (1987), too, recognized that it is the wisely managed nonprofit organization which commits to the strategic planning process borrowed from for-profit industry. Just like the private corporation, nonprofit organizations need strategic planning to help them meet the challenges and opportunities of tomorrow. With the appropriate planning model or process, a nonprofit organization is able to identify needs that exist in a community, define the mission of the organization, evaluate its capabilities, assess the external environment, set objectives, choose the appropriate strategies, design programs, match program structure to fiscal capabilities, and evaluate performance.

Addressing the very practical concerns faced by many nonprofit organizations, Bryce (1987) encouraged organizations to commit to strategic planning as a way to promote participation and, most importantly, to focus on the mission of the organization. Bryce supported the amendment of for-profit models of strategic planning to fit the needs of the nonprofit community. Specific to public agencies, but also addressing more practical concerns, Moskow's work (1978) strongly supported the principles of strategic planning, operational planning, and program evaluation.

Specifically addressing strategic planning in public organizations, Ring and Perry (1985) and Rider (1983) made strong cases for the advancement of research issues related to strategic management processes. Ring and Perry concluded that private sector approaches have general applicability to government agencies. Rider found that planning may acknowledge and will accommodate multiple power centers. In local government, planning should be built around the existing power centers and should facilitate what naturally occurs as part of the political process. Strategic planning is

beginning to emerge in local government as cities seek more effective planning systems.

There are many, many examples of strategic planning models available for the use of nonprofit organizations, a number of which have been mentioned so far in this study. Tompkins (1984) advised practitioners to ensure a better fit between their organization and the chosen planning process by tailoring their choice to the specific needs of the organization. The authors acknowledged that although the concept of strategic planning is becoming more and more familiar, how to go about creating a strategic plan is not generally understood. There is no single system or model which can address the needs of all nonprofit organizations.

The creation of a planning committee, as well as constituent involvement on the committee, is recommended (Tompkins, 1984). Organizations risk opportunity costs and the possibility of never closing the gap between their potential and simple status quo results when they fail to plan. Planning, in its broadest form addresses the mission of an organization, the scope of services delivered, and the inclusion and exclusion of programs. More sophisticated planning (programming, planning, and budgeting) matches resource allocations to specific programs which address the mission of the organization. Finally, most specific and short-term, according to Tompkins, is the operations management plan which addresses short-term activities, roles, responsibility and motivation.

To date, a number of scholars have acknowledged the shift in attention towards better management of nonprofit organizations (e.g., Espy, 1986; Herman, 1989; Hodgetts & Wortman, 1980; O'Neill & Young, 1988; Unterman & Davis, 1982; Wortman, 1979, 1988). Complementary to this change in focus has been the readjustment from micro issues such as selection, motivation,

and leadership styles to the issues of planning, policy and strategy (Walker, 1983). Like Tompkins (1984), Walker cautioned nonprofit organizations against simply adopting strategic management strategies used in the for-profit sector. The author called for more research to provide an empirical base for organizational models in the nonprofit sector in order to support the further development of theories of strategic management.

Summary

The strategic planning literature provides numerous examples of definitions, models, processes and systems for strategic planning. Nonprofit organizations are cautioned against borrowing methods straight from industry and so are advised on how to tailor a model to the needs of the organization. Bryce (1987), Bryson (1988), Conrad and Glenn (1983), Espy (1986), Firstenberg (1986), King (1979), Tompkins (1984), Unterman and Davis (1982), and Wortman (1979, 1988) have made strong cases for planning in nonprofit organizations. With all of the work completed in this area, why are so few organizations practicing planning of any sort? One important factor which has contributed to this was referred to by Tompkins (1984). How to actually go about planning is still a mystery to most nonprofit organizations.

Wortman (1979) supported the implementation of strategic management principles in nonprofit organizations. Resulting from ambiguous practices of goal formulation, analysis and evaluation, nonprofit organizations are prime candidates for further study. In agreement with Wortman, Schendel and Hofer (1979) called for further research to provide more comparative analysis between private and nonprofit planning practices. Nonprofit organizations suffer from their political nature--but is this reason enough for organizations to have such a short-term planning horizon, or no horizon at all?

The second sub-heading in this section is titled *Commentary on Strategic Planning in Nonprofit Organizations*. The literature is missing first-hand accounts of nonprofit organizations attempting to implement a planning model which eliminates the possibility of reporting empirical data. What is available is theory-based commentary. Greater commitment to descriptive research in this area is needed to bridge the gap between theoretical application of strategic planning in nonprofit organizations and the reality of nonprofit managers and Boards of Directors attempting one of the models, processes, and systems available to them.

Conclusion

This review of the literature offers a critique of the current research on nonprofit organizations, Boards of Directors, and strategic planning. A few central themes became clear.

1. There has been little empirical research completed in any of these fields of study.
2. There is no consensus regarding the categorization of various types of nonprofit organizations, the role and function of Boards of Directors and the direct applicability of private sector models of strategic planning to nonprofit organizations.
3. There are few scholarly publications which address the nonprofit sector and issues related to it.
4. Nonprofit organizations exist in a competitive, turbulent environment that promises to become more challenging in years ahead.
5. Current management practices and strategies are neither competitive nor even adequate.
6. Nonprofit organizations need to adopt a more strategic management posture.

The need for strategic planning is clear and immense. The rationale for further study in this area is well argued by Middleton.

One may ask, what about planning in NPOs [nonprofit organizations] warrants research attention? First, it is an organizational process that has been relatively unexamined, and second, many contend that nonprofit organizations are facing an increasingly uncertain and complex environment that demands more sophisticated managerial skills Scholars, consultants, and managers have focused for some years on the strategic planning framework as one that enables the nonprofit manager to chart a clearer course for the organization. What makes this process different from other types of long-range planning is its recognition that factors in the environment are crucial to organizational survival and that strict adherence to the mission and current service or program mix may not be useful in a constantly changing world. (1988, pp. 1-2)

Key to causing change in this field is the ability of researchers to design and pursue studies which will increase the knowledge base, clarify issues of uncertainty, and encourage practitioners to adopt more professional, competitive, and strategic managerial systems and practices. A descriptive study such as this was intended to contribute to the literature, to inform both scholars, practitioners, and consultants and to provide empirical data which will help demystify the planning process.

Drucker claimed that nonprofit organizations have "discovered management". They must "manage *especially* well precisely because they lack the discipline of a bottom line" (Drucker, 1989, p. 62, emphasis in the original). This study examined and promoted the concept of strategic planning as one option nonprofit organizations have to become and remain

competitive. "As a strategy, planning is a powerful signal to the outside world, communicating how the organization wishes to be understood. Largely, the signal emphasizes the professionalism of the nonprofit's managerial systems (Middleton, 1988, p. 34)."

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Embarking on a qualitative study of this kind offered the opportunity to make a contribution to the literature as well as to the local institutional and public nonprofit organizations in the community. A great deal of preliminary research (primarily interviews) was done to narrow the focus of the study and balance what this Researcher saw as needed by practitioners, with personal academic goals and curiosities.

I wanted the experience of working with organizations that were interested in learning how to plan and were willing to participate in a study of this kind. To understand how organizations plan and to discover what influence the planning process had on the participants, I favored a hands-on, experiential approach to the research. I was not looking for proof or certainty but for knowledge, description and understanding. Qualitative methodologies offered me exactly that. Firestone (1987) captured the essence of the methodological decision.

Choosing methods then is not just a matter of coming at a single truth from different directions. Nor is it solely a pragmatic question of fitting research techniques to a problem as the pragmatists suggest. . . one's decision often expresses values about what the world is like, how one ought to understand it, and what the most important threats to that understanding are. The method selected encourages one to adopt

conventions of presentation that advance certain kinds of arguments for the credibility of one's conclusions. (p. 20)

Qualitative research

For Rist (1975), the definition of qualitative research is clear and simple, "direct observation of human activity and interaction in an ongoing, naturalistic fashion." What is meant by this is that qualitative researchers, appreciative of the complexity and subtlety of social phenomenon, understand that there exists "another way of knowing" that is separate from the scientific, quantitatively-based paradigm (Rogers, 1984). Qualitative methodology is based on a number of assumptions:

1. To understand a social phenomenon, intensive study over a significant period of time is essential.
2. People, organizations, and institutions must be studied as wholes.
3. The best way to study something is by direct contact and observation in a natural setting.
4. The researcher must try to understand the attitudes and beliefs of the participants in the study.
5. The purpose of the researcher is to describe.
6. Generalizable theory is generated from the study of participants in specific settings (Rogers, 1984).

Qualitative methodologies offer a variety of data collection and analysis techniques (Rogers, 1984). Qualitative researchers may be participant-observers (defined in greater detail in a later section); use interviews, field notes, audio and video taping, official and personal documentation; and may choose to combine any qualitative technique with others from quantitative research.

In the end, the goal of qualitative investigation is to search for meaning, to seek understanding (Smith, 1983). The generalizability of a particular study is in the form of working hypotheses, not conclusions, according to Cronbach (1975). "Research which has neither statistical weight nor experimental design, research based on qualitative descriptions of a small number of cases, can nonetheless play the important role of suggesting possible relationships, causes, effects and even dynamic processes" (Barton & Lazarsfeld, 1969, p. 182).

Duncan (1979), in an examination of qualitative research methods useful in the study of strategic management, stated that qualitative designs are the most appropriate for investigating strategy formulation. According to the author, answers to questions of how an organization develops a strategy, how strategic planning activity takes place, and what characterizes successful strategic planning activities, require the researcher to identify processes. This is best done with qualitative methods (Duncan, 1979).

My success at telling the story of how two organizations went about the process of strategic planning will not guarantee direct applicability to other organizations, but it will add to the understanding of how planning practices are implemented by a nonprofit Board of Directors and a public Commission. If I am able to help demystify the strategic planning process for leaders and managers of institutional and public nonprofit organizations and in doing so encourage them to initiate or support planning practices, this study will have been successful.

Research Design

As the purpose of this study is to document the strategic planning process used by a nonprofit Board and a public Commission, a planning model tailored to the goals and functions of such organizations was needed.

As the the review of the literature has illustrated, corporate strategic planning provides a number of models from which to choose. Bryson (1988) credited the Harvard policy model (Andrews, 1980) as the "principal inspiration behind the most widely cited recent models of public and nonprofit sector strategic planning" (p. 30). Bryson and Roering (1987) created a planning model, greatly influenced by the Harvard model, which borrows from the strengths of corporate strategic planning, public sector planning and nonprofit planning models.

To fulfill the purpose of this study and to collect data appropriate and sufficient to address the research questions previously outlined, I facilitated the strategic planning process in each of the two organizations, the City Heights Community Development Corporation and the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, using Bryson and Roering's model (see Appendix A). Strategic Planning Committees were formed and met regularly over a period of six months to accomplish the planning effort. The Committees reported to the full Board or Commission to ask for feedback and approval, when needed, at their regular monthly meetings. The result of this effort was the creation of a plan for each organization (see City Heights Community Development Corporation, *Strategic Plan, 1990 - 1993* and City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, *Directions for the Future*, Appendixes E and F).

Sorely missing from the literature are qualitative studies documenting the implementation of a system or model of planning in a particular organization, namely a nonprofit organization. Without the availability of the rich description presented in a qualitative study, practitioners are left without a true flavor for the strategic planning process

and thus how to go about creating a plan for their organizations remains a mystery.

To meet this need, the design of this study used a broad interpretation of action research and is enriched through participant observation. Observations and interviews were used to collect the needed data. Analysis techniques were loosely based upon Argyris' work with action science and action mapping. Specific assumptions were borrowed from action mapping principles to inform this work (Argyris, 1985; Argyris, Putnam & Smith, 1985). Upon completion of data analysis, a narrative of the study was compiled in the genre of story telling (Denny, 1983; Fisher, 1987; Polkinghorne, 1988). Each of the components of the research design (action research, participant observation, and story telling) will be reported in greater detail below.

Action Research

Lewin is credited with the term action research. His early death in 1947 precluded him presenting a cohesive model of his work (Ketterer, Price & Politser, 1980) which included action maps (Lewin, 1948a, 1948b, 1951). As it has been developed in the last 40 years, action research is based on a commitment to improve social practice and is guided by several themes. Action research involves: (a) change experiments dealing with real social problems; (b) repetitive cycles identifying problems, planning, acting, and evaluating; (c) the assumption that change involves reeducation; (d) democratic value orientation and (e) a contribution to the basic knowledge in social science as well as assist with everyday life (Argyris, Putnam & Smith, 1985).

An important feature of action research is collaboration between researchers and practitioners (Ketterer, Price & Politser, 1980). Lewin pushed for this collaborative relationship by observing that, "any research program

set up within the framework of an organization desiring social action must be guided by the needs of the organization" (1947, p. 152). Action research generates descriptive information and prescriptive feedback useful for practitioners (Ketterer, Price & Politser, 1980). It attempts to develop new knowledge and practical solutions to problems (Lewin, 1946, 1947).

Carr and Kemmis' (1986) interpretation of action research described the four phases (planning, acting, observing, and reflecting) as having two aims: (a) to improve understanding, practice, and a particular situation, and (b) to involve participants. In this study, each of the participating organizations had a unique set of problems. The implementation of a planning process became one potential solution to meet the needs of both groups. With the cooperation of the CHCDC's Board and the Commission, the four phases of action research--planning (preparing for the strategic planning process), acting (implementing a planning model), observing (data gathering and analysis) and reflecting (post-interviews and analysis)--were accomplished.

Argyris, Putnam and Smith broadly defined action science as "an inquiry into social practice . . . interested in producing knowledge in the service of such practice" (1985, p. 232). Action maps assist in the translation of knowledge into relevant practice. Maps have a dual function--to illustrate patterns of activity and to inform future action (Argyris & Schon, 1978). Argyris' work with action science and action mapping (1985) is based on the themes of Lewin's (1946, 1947, 1948a, 1948b, 1951) work outlined above.

Action science is based on the assumption that knowledge must be useful in action. As such, knowledge should relate to forming purposes, not just achieving them. Talk is data and a frame for understanding logic. In action research the researcher must:

1. Elicit judgements being made about self, others, and situational factors.
2. Regard causal explanations as hypotheses to be tested.
3. Explicate on the inferential steps going from the data to conclusions.
4. Focus on the emotional reactions of individuals.
5. Combine advocacy with inquiry.
6. Illustrate inferences with observable data.
7. Make reasoning explicit.
8. Seek disconfirming data and alternative explanations.
9. Design ongoing experiments to test competing views (Argyris, Putnam & Smith, 1985).

Participant Observation

The second component of the research design, participant observation, borrows from the early work of Gold (1958) and Gans (1962). Gans suggested that the participant observer as researcher must renounce the research role during a particular period of data collection and participate for real. After leaving the site, the researcher returns to the traditional role of data analyst which might include looking at the actions of the researcher as well as other legitimate participants. Gold pointed out that the participants understand the dual role of the researcher.

The observed are aware of the research functions of the participant observer, this role format is frequently used especially in community studies, observation may be done formally or informally and subsidiary techniques may be brought into use with the open cooperation of the subjects. (p. 39)

A concern for any researcher acting as a participant observer is maintaining objectivity throughout data collection and analysis. With the

researcher as part of the investigation, objectivity could be compromised (Duncan, 1979). To help preserve objectivity, the researcher should: (a) be aware of his or her own biases and how these may affect the interpretation of data, (b) be aware of the biases of participants, (c) be aware and sensitive to the complexities of the participant observer role, and (d) distinguish between actual data and his or her interpretation of it (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Bouchard, 1976).

Through most of data collection I participated alongside Board Members and Commissioners as the facilitator and another Member of the Strategic Planning Committees, but this change of roles from observer to participant was always known to those involved in the study. This dual role was not always easy. There were times when I wanted to stop a meeting and reflect upon what had just occurred. During the early part of data collection I found myself trying to view the setting as a third-party observer. With my role as participant solidly built into the study, this was impossible. In qualitative research data collection and analysis occur simultaneous (Guba & Lincoln, 1981), but not to this extent. Bassey (1986) quoted a passage entitled *Discoveries of the Obvious* by W. G. Perry which captures the essence of this frustration.

My fifth discovery was that I am not a watcher of the world, but an actor in it. I have to make decisions and some of them have to be made now. I cannot say 'Stop the world and let me get off for a bit, I want to think some more before I decide.' Given so many differences of opinion among reasonable people, I realise that I can never be sure that I am making the 'right' decisions. Yet because I am an actor in the world, I must decide. I must choose what I believe in and own the

consequences and never know what lay down the roads I did not take.

(Bassey, 1986, p. 18)

Story Telling

Polkinghorne (1988) claimed that narrative and story are interchangeable and that data analysis may be developed into stories. Goodson and Walker (1983) described story telling as "a kind of intermediate technology of research adapted to the study of practical problems in realistic time scales" (p. 29). In commenting on the variety of approaches to the case study methodology, Denny (1983) added story telling, a kind of journalistic documentation, to the traditional research methods. According to Denny, "a story documents a given milieu in an attempt to communicate the general spirit of things. A story need not test theory; need not be complete; and it need not be robust in either time or depth" (p. 2). Story telling focuses on directly observable phenomena, helps to define problems and attempts to provide the reader with some of the same feelings a traditional case study or ethnography creates. Good story tellers aim to clearly communicate the important dimensions of the phenomena being studied. They reveal the texture of an environment and the relationships within a given system.

To better understand the structure of stories, Mandler (1983) described the basic sequence of events readers have come to expect. Stories begin with details of the setting, (characters, locations and time) and proceed with numerous episodes, each developed from a clear beginning. From the start, the character is placed in a setting, identifies a particular goal, and sketches a route to success. Each segment or episode of the story describes an attempt to reach the goal. These attempts are understood by the reader to bring about the outcome of the story. After numerous episodes, the narrative shows how they combine to form one story. "There is an assumption on the part of the

reader that all of the parts of the narrative will form a coherent story (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 111)."

This study would be classified as a "progressive narrative" by Gergen and Gergen (1986, cited in Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 15). One of three types of stories (stability narrative, progressive narrative, and regressive narrative), the progressive narrative depicts the protagonist advancing toward a goal. Each type of story identifies the protagonist's action in relationship to a goal. The Strategic Planning Committees are the protagonist in Gergen and Gergen's scheme. The creation of a strategic plan is the goal.

Polkinghorne (1988) conveyed the essence of narrative in his statement:

Narrative involves the gathering together of events into a plot in which signification is given to the events as they relate to the theme of the story. The plot configures the events into a whole, and the events are transformed from merely serial, independent happenings into meaningful happenings that contribute to the whole theme. (p. 142-143)

Fisher (1987) found narratives to better enable us to understand human communication and action. Narratives acknowledge the social phenomena that make up the "human story" and provide for the presentation of data in a manner informed by the social sciences rather than the natural sciences (p. 20). According to Fisher, there are five presuppositions upon which the narrative paradigm rests: (a) Humans are storytellers. (b) Humans communicate and make decisions based on "good reasons". (c) Good reasons are based upon history, biography, culture and character. (d) The human ability to reason is based on the ability to understand narratives and to test

them against what is already known. (e) The world we know is a set of stories (Fisher, 1987, p. 64-65).

By reporting the data from this study in the form of a story or narrative, I hope to accomplish what Rothman (1974) encouraged researchers to do. Rothman stated that presenting findings in a "clear, unified, and unambiguous fashion" would increase the probability that the study would be used by others (p. 455). Rothman and Kolodny (1971) warned against taking this notion for granted. They asserted that researchers and practitioners function in different worlds and for the results of a study to be usable by practitioners they must be presented without unnecessary academic jargon. Story telling meets these requirements.

Atkinson (1978) identified three criteria a story must meet in order to be explanatory. Stories should: (a) be understandable in human terms, (b) bring the data together in a unified manner, and (d) recognizably relate to a purpose. Polkinghorne (1988) added that narratives should be "question-relative" (p. 172). The stories of how the two participating organizations went about the process of strategic planning should provide "complete and meaningful" answers to the research questions proposed in Chapter One of this study (p. 172).

Polkinghorne's (1988) comments best described the final research report and serve as a summary of this genre of reporting. Referring to the narrative,

It is an argued essay that conforms to the rules of a scholarly presentation. Alternative narratives and interpretations are recognized, and evidence from the interview text is used to argue for the conclusion the researcher has reached. The theme or point of the story is not usually directly presented by the text, for it requires

inference and interpretation on the researcher's part. Like formal science research, descriptive narrative research involves detection, selection, and interpretation of the data. (p. 169)

Methodology

Participant Selection

Participant organizations were chosen based upon two primary criteria which relate to the goals of the study. Supported by the literature review, these two types of organizations have a great many management concerns in common as well as a shared mission to meet the needs of a community. Secondly, the maturity of each organization was a factor. One organization, the Commission, was in its first year of operation when the study began and the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC) had been in operation less than ten years. The intent of this study is for the results to be applicable to a variety of organizations. Not directly related to the goals of the study but very significant to me was the type of organizations chosen. The nature of this study implied that a great deal of time was to be spent with the participating organizations and my genuine regard for their goals enhanced the experience.

The City Heights Community Development Corporation and the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture were chosen because they met the criteria mentioned above and offered diversity in subject matter. Each organization was treated as an individual case.

The City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC), founded in 1980, is a nonprofit organization committed to the overall improvement and economic growth of the City Heights neighborhood. Centrally located in the City of San Diego, City Heights is a culturally diverse, residential and commercial community with over 40,000 residents and more

than 300 businesses. The City Heights CHCDC is funded by the City of San Diego (Community Development Block Grant), County of San Diego, San Diego Community Foundation, and other private foundations in addition to paid Memberships from residents and businesses. At the time the study began, the organization had a nine-member volunteer Board of Directors, a full time Executive Director and a full time office manager.

The City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture was founded in 1988 by the Mayor and City Council. Commissioners were recommended by the City Council and later appointed by the Mayor to serve one to three year terms . This fifteen-member Commission is staffed by an Executive Director (who reports to the City Manager), a public art administrator, a two-member administrative staff (all full time) and part-time contract employees. The Commission was created to serve as an advisory Board to the Mayor, City Council and City Manager on "promoting, encouraging and increasing support of the arts" (SDMC Sec. 26.07 (A) as amended by ordinance number 0-17026, adopted on February 16, 1988). The Commission was also charged with the responsibility for all cultural arts granting recommendations for City funding (\$5.2 million in fiscal year 1989) and to act in an advisory capacity for all programmatic issues related to arts and culture throughout the city of San Diego.

I had been involved with each organization prior to the beginning of this study. The Board President of the CHCDC and I were once co-workers. I became familiar with the organization over a period of nearly two years before the study began. Approximately one year before the Strategic Planning Committee first met, I facilitated the annual meeting of the CHCDC which was organized as a summit conference for residents, business owners, elected officials, government representatives, CHCDC Board Members and other

interested persons. At that time I did a minimal amount of research into the history of the organization but had extensive conversations with the Board President about the current state of CHCDC business. All of this combined to give me more than adequate knowledge of the organization and acquainted me with some of the Board Members.

During the time I was developing the idea for this study I was completing my doctoral internship with the Commission for Arts and Culture. I specifically chose this site for my internship because it provided an opportunity to witness the early stages of formation and development of a public Commission and because I saw it as a potential participant in my study. I spent approximately eight months working with the Executive Director of the Commission. My responsibilities were mostly research and writing. I prepared a significant amount of their early documentation (Rules & Regulations, committee descriptions, City Council time table and procedures, etc.) and acted as liaison to the City Attorney's Office. I attended every Commission meeting and many committee meetings. I worked directly with the Commissioners and became acquainted with San Diego's arts and cultural community by facilitating quarterly roundtable discussions attended by Executive Directors of arts and cultural organizations. By the time I formalized my request for each of the organizations to participate I was knowledgeable about their history, their current operations, and was acquainted with staff members, Board Members, Commissioners, and constituents.

From the beginning, my primary contact with each organization was the President of the CHCDC and the Executive Director of the Commission. The President or Chairman, Executive Director and I were responsible for the composition of the Strategic Planning Committee for each organization.

Committee Members were chosen in a fashion similar to how many Board or Commission committees are organized. Typically, committees are composed so that they include a diversity in expertise and interests with all members sharing an interest in the particular issue and a willingness to participate on the committee level.

The Strategic Planning Committee for the CHCDC was composed of the Board President (who acted as Committee Chair), two additional Board Members and the Executive Director. The Strategic Planning Committee for the Commission was composed of two Commissioners (who shared the responsibilities of chair), the Executive Director, and a member of the local arts community. All members of both committees had equal voting privileges.

Instrumentation

"One of the most difficult concepts involved in naturalistic inquiry is that of the inquirer as instrument (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 128)." As the primary instrument in the study, the researcher is at once the "instrument administrator, data collector, data analyst, and data interpreter" (p. 128). Important characteristics of the researcher in this type of investigation include responsiveness, adaptability, and flexibility. My background in counseling and small and large group facilitation well qualified me for conducting this study. As Denny (1978, cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1981), "Good guys get better data. No sense leaving your humanness at home (Denny, 1978, p. 10)."

Additional instrumentation included pre- and post-interview guides. These interviews addressed the second research question regarding how Board Members and Commissioners experienced the process of strategic planning. The pre-interview guide (see Appendix C) was designed to elicit

background information from Board Members and Commissioners, in addition to their thoughts about the organization and strategic planning. The post-interview guide (see Appendix D) included questions concerning the experience of the strategic planning process. I chose an Executive Director and a Board Member from a nonprofit organization not involved with the study to assist in piloting the interview guides.

Data Gathering

This study was organized into five stages before data analysis was to begin: (a) pre-planning, (b) pre-interviews, (c) strategic planning committee meetings, (d) completion of the plans, and (e) post-interviews. During the pre-planning stage individual meetings with the primary contacts were scheduled to discuss the goals and purpose of the study, the proposed timeline, the role of the participants, the role of the Researcher, the committee structure and composition, the value and use of the planning document, and the procedure for obtaining formal authorization from the Board and Commission. Additional meetings were held with the Executive Director of the CHCDC and the Chairman of the Commission to discuss the same issues. Following these meetings, a brief proposal and outline of the study was presented to the CHCDC and the Commission. Formal authorization to conduct the study was granted to the Researcher at that time.

The pre-planning stage also involved a significant amount of reading and document research to increase my knowledge of the organizations as well as bring me up-to-date on current issues of importance.

The pre-interview guides were developed and piloted. Pre-interviews were conducted with the Board President; Commission Chairman; the Executive Directors; the members of the Strategic Planning Committees; and four additional, randomly selected Board Members and Commissioners.

Participants were asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix B) before the interviews were audio taped.

Strategic Planning Committees were to meet once monthly for three hours for six consecutive months. This schedule was not strictly adhered to. There were times when the Committees met more or less frequently. The meetings were held in the offices of each organization. An agenda was prepared by the Researcher, who conducted the meetings. All meetings were audio taped. Committee reports were made by the committee chair at regular Board or Commission meetings on an as needed basis. Towards the end of the planning process the Researcher began meeting with Committee Members individually and in pairs to prepare outlines of the planning documents.

Approximately eight weeks were spent preparing the plans for both organizations. Draft copies were sent by mail to all Board Members and Commissioners for feedback and approval. Near-final drafts of the plans were adopted at regular monthly meetings of the CHCDC and Commission.

Post-interviews guides were developed and piloted. Participants were interviewed for the second and last time following the adoption of the plans by each respective organization.

Audio tapes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings provided the majority of the data. Data collected during Committee meetings included verbal evidence fitting into four primary categories: (a) that which pertained to the actors, (b) that which pertained to initiating actions and transitions, (c) that which pertained to the dynamics of particular processes (information dissemination, brainstorming, discussion, consensus and voting), and (d) that which pertained to outcomes (decisions and policies).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) outlined the advantages and disadvantages to the researcher of using electronic data recording techniques. Benefits include the ability of the researcher to analyze the data at his or her leisure, to view or listen to the recordings repeatedly, and to create a permanent record to use for validity and reliability studies. The disadvantages of "time, cost, and obtrusiveness", in this case were outweighed by the advantages (p. 203).

Data Analysis

Interview data was transcribed using an interview log. Merriam (1988) suggested that interview logs would help to capture the main points of an interview and may be used to assist in written transcription when verbatim transcription was not feasible. Data was first analyzed for quality (the subjective perception of the Researcher regarding the validity of interview data). Comments regarding the interview milieu, the mood of the informant, and the informant's health may impact the quality of the data obtained and therefore should be acknowledged (Whyte, 1982). Interview logs, including direct quotes from informants and the Researcher's comments, were then coded according to recurring themes or categories of data. Excerpts from these logs are reported in later chapters.

Meeting logs were used to organize the data obtained during regular and Committee meetings. The logs were created based on the audio tapes of the meetings and the direct observations of the Researcher. Information from the logs was coded to identify recurring themes, which were supported with direct quotes, condensed dialogue, and reference to mode of expression.

Data collection culminates in a collection of stories, according to Polkinghorne (1988). This leaves the goal of data analysis to discover common themes or "plots" in the data (p. 177). Although narrative explanations are based on a collection of facts placed in chronological order,

the researcher is responsible for sorting through all of the facts and episodic stories to pull together a selection of information to convey to the reader the essence of the phenomenon being investigated. "The analysis of narrative data does not follow an algorithmic outline, but moves between the original data and the emerging description of the pattern (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 177)."

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability have always been considered a weakness of qualitative research. "Researchers often assume that 'naturalistic' investigative procedures are *naturally valid*, that they enable researchers to come closer to the true, natural behavior of their subjects than other procedures allow (Kennedy, 1984, p. 367, emphasis in the original)." All of the threats to natural validity are not avoided in qualitative research. Some of the concerns are: (a) the obtrusiveness of the inquiry itself, (b) greater reliance upon verbal accounts of behavior than the actual behaviors themselves, (c) investigators collecting a great deal of "hearsay evidence", and (d) the inherent ambiguity of language (Kennedy, 1984, p. 367-368).

Guba and Lincoln stated that the concepts of validity and reliability should be exchanged for credibility and auditability in naturalistic inquiry (1981). Polkinghorne (1988) stated "in narrative research, 'valid' retains its ordinary meaning of well-grounded and supportable (p. 175)." Polkinghorne (1988) and Guba and Lincoln (1981) were in agreement. In story telling, the researcher uses data as evidence of the conclusions drawn. The question of validity, in narrative research, refers to the strength of data analysis. "The argument does not produce certainty; it produces likelihood (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 175)." Strong arguments that can stand up to attack are valid arguments. "Narrative research, by retaining an emphasis on the linguistic

reality of human existence, operates in an area that is not limited by formal systems and their particular type of rigor (p. 176)."

Reliability, on the other hand, refers to dependability or in quantitative research, "consistency and stability of measurement". In a study of this kind, reliability refers to the dependability of the data (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 176). Care taken during data collection increases reliability. The researcher should continue to refer back to the original data (tape recordings). Researchers should devise and follow an exacting methodology for transcription of recorded data (Mishler, 1986). "Narrative studies do not have formal proofs of reliability, relying instead on the details of their procedures to evoke an acceptance of the trustworthiness of the data (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 177)."

I followed one of the options presented by Guba and Lincoln (1981) as a method to establish credibility of interview data. Phenomenon recognition is a procedure that involves presenting the researcher's interpretation of the interview to the participant. I selected excerpts from the interview data and presented them to participants for verification. A similar procedure for establishing validity and reliability of observational data was followed with the assistance of members of the Strategic Planning Committees.

Problems Encountered

A study of this kind is conducted over a relatively long period of time. The initial inquiries into the feasibility of this research project began in the summer of 1988. Actual data collection began with the pre-interviews in April of 1989. There were many problems, large and small, encountered over the 18 months of the research. Most significant to the research findings were: the inexperience of the Researcher, Researcher biases, the resignation of the CHCDC's Executive Director mid-way through data collection, and

coincidental poor attendance for Board and Commission meetings during which Strategic Planning Committee reports were made.

Qualitative research, by its nature, is unpredictable and challenging. This investigation, being unique in design, was ambitious for an inexperienced researcher. The literature reviewed provided no examples of studies with the same or similar methodologies. On several occasions the fragile participant observer role was challenged by the actions of individual participants and the development of events. The inexperience of the Researcher in some ways influenced the objectivity with which data was collected and analyzed.

As mentioned in a previous section of this chapter, the Researcher had previous experience with each of the participating organizations. In a role as consultant or intern, one naturally forms opinions about the operations, culture, and personnel of an organization. It was very difficult to leave these opinions behind once the research began. Although the original intent was to remain neutral throughout facilitating the planning process (to provide process input only) it became evident that the role of facilitator would need to be more active, contributing to the content of the meetings and subsequently to the plans themselves.

In the case of the CHCDC, this Researcher acknowledges having entered the study with a bias towards the President's vision for the future of the organization. This placed a burden upon the Researcher who understood the potential influence and persuasive power of having the two Committee Members with formal roles (facilitator and Acting Committee Chair) sharing the same opinions. Although committed to remaining impartial, the Researcher must acknowledge the potential impact of this situation upon group discussion and decisions made by the Committee.

Half-way through data gathering the Executive Director of the CHCDC left the organization. He was not replaced for the duration of the study. This meant that the Strategic Planning Committee, less one member, continued without input from staff. Secondly, the organization was faced with the loss of a day-to-day manager and this took precedence as an issue of concern for many Board Members. Thirdly, one post-interview was missing. And finally, the executive Directors are important to the planning process. Implementation of a strategic plan is the ongoing responsibility of an Executive Director. Lack of continuity in key personnel during an important time such as when a Board adopts a planning document can threaten the successful implementation of the plan.

Lastly, attendance was poor for meetings during which the Strategic Planning Committees reported their progress and asked for feedback and approval of recommendations. The final Committee report to the Commission, at which time the plan was adopted, was not attended by three of the four Commissioners randomly selected to participate in interviews. This impacted their familiarity with the plan itself as well as their knowledge and understanding of the planning process.

Conclusion

The research design and methodology of this study were selected for two primary reasons.

1. They are appropriately matched to the research questions.
2. The descriptive information obtained from this work will fill an existing void in the research as was previously described in the literature review.

The research questions for this study asked how a nonprofit Board and a public Commission create a strategic plan and what influence the planning

process has on the individual participants. To answer these questions with quantitative data would fail to provide the descriptive data needed to fill the void in the literature. The following chapters will tell a story of how each of these two organizations, the City Heights Community Development Corporation and the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, created a strategic plan. Each story is opened with an account of pre-interview data which addressed the individual participants' knowledge of strategic planning, thoughts about the organization, and ideas and concerns about strategic planning. This is followed by a descriptive account of the actual planning process. The stories end with the formal adoption of the plan by each organization and a reflective account of the strategic planning process obtained from individual participants during post-interviews.

CHAPTER FOUR

A NONPROFIT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Introduction

This chapter will report the data collected from the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC). The first research question in this study asked how a nonprofit board creates a strategic plan. The second research question asked how the planning process influenced the participants. The participants (Board Members) were divided into two populations--the target population (Strategic Planning Committee Members) and the remaining population (randomly selected Board Members who did not participate on the Strategic Planning Committee). The first question is addressed by the data collected during the Strategic Planning Committee meetings. Tapes of the meetings were transcribed and the data was put into narrative form to create a story of the planning process. The second question was addressed by pre-and post-interview data.

The data is presented in chronological order. The pre-interview data is presented first so that the reader will understand what the participants knew and thought about strategic planning before the planning process began. Interview data is separated into the two populations--the target population and the remaining population. I identified themes found within the data and compared and contrasted the data from the two populations.

Following the pre-interview data is a lengthy narrative describing the planning process. The narrative is divided into sections, each covering one meeting, (either a Strategic Planning Committee meeting or a regular Board

meeting). Board Members' names are not included in the narrative. Committee Members are either identified by their position (Board President and Executive Director) or are anonymously coded CM 1 and 2 (Committee Members 1 and 2--the two other Board Members on the Committee). True to the genre of storytelling, each meeting is presented as an episode. The players are introduced, the goals identified and the plot is developed.

Finally, the third section of this chapter presents the post-interview data. The post-interview data describes the participants' response to the planning process. It is presented in the same manner as the pre-interview data. The chapter closes with concluding remarks.

History of the CHCDC

In late 1979, the San Diego City-County Reinvestment Task Force was charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of "redlining" (the illegal action of lending institutions that identify neighborhoods or communities to which they will not loan money) in certain neighborhoods. While "redlining" was never specifically discovered, the investigators identified severe lender disinvestment in City Heights.

The Task Force, which included public officials and representatives of both lending institutions and neighborhood groups, held a number of public hearings in City Heights to determine potential solutions to specific problems facing local residents. After a lengthy process of assessing problems, goals, and strategies, the Task Force recommended that the residents form their own community development corporation to represent the community's interests and to work toward the community's goals. Thus was formed the City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDC), incorporated in June of 1981.

Early activities of the CHCDC included publishing *The VOICE of City Heights*, conducting a market survey, creating an economic development strategy, and forming relationships with private developers and businesses to support revitalization and redevelopment efforts in the City Heights commercial area. In more recent years, the programs of the CHCDC have grown in number to include community organizing, clean-ups, anti-graffiti campaigns, governmental advocacy, the initiating process to establish a City-recognized community planning group, regreening efforts, and capital improvement needs identification.

In 1989 the Board of Directors for the CHCDC agreed to dedicate resources to the creation of a three-year plan for the organization. The idea to begin a formal planning effort was prompted by this Researcher and presented to the Board by its President.

Composition of Target Population

For the purposes of this study, the members of the Strategic Planning Committee were considered the target population. The Board President and I were responsible for the composition of the Committee. Committee members with diversity in length of experience with the organization, expertise, and interests were considered. The President, two additional Board Members, and the Executive Director agreed to participate. Committee Member's experience with the organization ranged from a founding Board Member to a recently appointed Board Member. Expertise included significant experience with other nonprofit and public organizations (Board positions and staff), economic development, legal, and environmental issues experience. Interests ranged from community development activities to economic development. Three of the four Committee Members were residents of City Heights.

The Committee Members, as part of the target population, were interviewed prior to and after the planning process in addition to their participation in six months of Strategic Planning Committee meetings.

Composition of Remaining Population

Four additional Board Members were randomly selected to participate in pre- and post-interviews. These individuals, the remaining population in this study, had the same role as did other Board Members except for the interviews. The group of four included a business owner in the community and three residents of City Heights. All four individuals were committed to community development issues. One of the four was the Treasurer of the organization. They collectively represented professional experience with a number of nonprofit organizations including government. As a group they were less interested in economic development than community development activities.

Pre-Interview Data

Introduction

Eight pre-interviews were conducted from May - August, 1989. I met with Strategic Planning Committee Members and other Board Members at their convenience. They ranged from 20 minutes to almost an hour in length. All interviews but one were scheduled during working hours. I met with one of the eight participants in a restaurant, one in my home, two in my office, and all others in their offices or the CHCDC office.

The pre-interviews with the target population differed from the interviews with the remaining population in that the participants seemed to be aware that the interview was the beginning of a long process that they had agreed to be a part of. For the remaining population, the interviews seemed to be viewed as a special request. The tone of the pre-interviews differed

significantly between populations. The pre-interviews with the remaining population were more business-like overall.

The data indicated that the target population were more vested in the outcome of the planning process. Even though they did not have specific information as to what would be done as a Committee, they were more sensitized to the potential impact that planning might have upon the organization as a whole.

On the other hand, the remaining population was not thinking about the planning process as a process. I was inclined to believe that these Board Members were looking forward to the finished product—a product that the Strategic Planning Committee would deliver. They knew that the Board of Directors had agreed to participate in this study, but since they had been asked to be a part of the Committee, they seemed content to leave the burden of the commitment to their peers—the three Board Members on the Committee.

The interviews varied in length from individual to individual. The shortest interviews were with the Board President, the Executive Director, and one Board Member from the remaining population who was no longer active in the organization. The longest interviews were with the Board Member (Committee Member) newest to the organization and least knowledgeable about planning and the Board Member (remaining population) with a great deal of planning experience.

I found the data from the shorter interviews to be politically conservative and cautiously presented. Some of the longer interviews included information showing personal biases. On a few occasions the participants were uncomfortable having their words taped and so asked me to stop the tape so that they could freely explain their thoughts.

As a participant/observer, the information given to me off the record was still very helpful. The better informed I was about the organization and the thoughts and concerns of the individual Board Members, the better equipped I would be to facilitate the planning process.

The pre-interview guide included 12 questions. The majority of these questions were included for the purpose of collecting data pertinent to the planning process. The data from a select number of questions is reported in this section.

Question # 1: How would you define planning?

Responses to the first question were brief. There was no real difference between the two populations. For all participants, planning was goal oriented. All but one response were very action oriented, "setting goals", "defining priorities", "looking for resources", "looking ahead". One Committee Member thought of planning as a "thought process that's directed towards the future."

In all, the participants had a very rational, structured, linear view of planning. Two Board Members saw planning as a process.

Question # 2: How would you define strategy?

Committee Members viewed strategy as process or method oriented. As one stated, "strategy is. . . sort of the rhythm of planning." One Committee Member viewed strategy as specific tasks, "laying out ways to accomplish the steps that you had set out to accomplish the goal."

A Board Member from the remaining population referred to the military origin of the word strategy. He described it as, "the incremental steps that we're going to do to accomplish getting from here to there. They are discrete elements--the smaller the better." As rational as his response was, he did add that strategy could be viewed as a philosophy.

Question # 3: Do you have any specific concerns related to the process of strategic planning?

Responses from Committee Members were thoughtful. One pragmatic Board Member voiced concern for the required time commitment.

It's a time consuming process and for people on our Board it will require an additional commitment, an additional time commitment that's going to be tough to get out of people. I guess my main concern is really whether its all worthwhile in the end. I mean, if you don't have a commitment from the beginning to work on a plan and then see it through then the whole process is wasted.

The Executive Director was concerned about the Board Members' ability to reach consensus throughout the planning process in addition to the "ability of this Board to prioritize their projects being that each Board Member may have their own agenda."

Some of the same concerns for time and the Board's ability to be united were voiced by the remaining population. "They [Board Members] should respond well [to the planning process]. They know what has to be done—it's just a matter of doing it and finding the time", said one Board Member. Another commented, "I'd like [it] if all the Board Members got on track. If they wanted. . . the same thing. . . We have a tendency to go off on tangents. If the plan could be used to unite the Board, it would be great."

An interesting comment was made by one Board Member in the remaining population. He said,

It [planning] can become an academic exercise in which the planner has a great time and the staff has a great time and as soon as the thing's done you throw it on the shelf and forget about it. If the Board doesn't

buy into it 100% it can be used as a divisive tool by those who initially adopt it."

Question # 4: What are your thoughts regarding how this Board will respond to the strategic planning process?

One Board Member from the Committee articulated his concern for the Board's track record for following through.

They [the Board of Directors] recognize the need for a plan. . . a need for some kind of a blue print to show where we need to go. I don't think that they are a very process-oriented group and up to this point we basically have been operating on a reactionary basis. Whatever the problems are—we respond to them. We always talk about what we want to be but there's no real commitment to talking about how we're going to get there or making any plans. A concern that I have is once we [create a plan] I'm going to question the Board's ability to implement it [the plan]. We don't stick to plans. We can make goals and plans and something will come up and we'll go for it without any consideration of what we've done in the past or what we've decided to do in the future.

Another Committee Member warned me that I would be working with both ends of the spectrum in terms of the individual Board Members' experience with the programs of the organization. A mixed message was heard in his statement, "I anticipate a good process, product. I pray every night I'm not wasting my time."

Only one real concern was voiced by a participant from the remaining population. This Board Member and the Executive Director agreed that the Board Members' view of the organization varied from individual to individual. "The Board is divided", said the Executive Director. The Board

Member believed that if the plan encompassed what individual Board Members wanted then they will be supportive and "If it doesn't, then they'll probably ignore it."

Question # 5: What do you see as the primary goal of the organization?

Responses to this question were very similar from all participants. They included: to improve the area; advocacy and true economic development; social, physical, and economic revitalization of the community; redevelopment; revitalization of City Heights; survival; and to become financially independent and raise money for economic development activities.

Additional Data

Additional questions pertinent to the planning process addressed the role of the Board, the role of the Executive Director, and their relationship. Overall, what became clear from the interview data was that the Board had a relatively clear understanding of their role. They saw themselves as responsible for policy making, representation of the organization in the community, representation of the community (in the governmental process, etc.), and overseeing the programs of the organization.

The Executive Director role was primarily viewed as an implementor. This position was not credited with much creativity. The individual was seen as being responsible for carrying out the decisions of the Board of Directors. Information about the role and function of a Board of Directors and an Executive Director was presented to the Board during a retreat in April of 1989 (directly before the start of the planning process). Even though the answers are more or less accurate regarding roles and responsibilities, their practical application of this information was not consistent and was

sometimes unreasonable. Because of this, the relationship between the Board and the Executive Director was not always productive.

Comments made regarding the relationship between the Board and the Executive Director consistently reflected the organization's difficulty in this area. Some participants believed that the Board and the Executive Director had different agendas for the organization. One Board Member thought there was too much hostility at the meetings. A few participants were hopeful that the relationship would improve. These individuals looked forward to a more mature, professional, team approach to conducting the business of the organization.

Participants described the relationship between the CHCDC and the community as inadequate. There was not enough visibility or involvement, membership was small, public relations had not been a priority, and more outreach was needed. The responses were very consistent overall.

Summary

Clearly, there was not an abundance of rich, descriptive data obtained through the pre-interviews. For the most part, the remaining population was brief in their responses--resulting in data that was thin.

A few themes were visible however. Early on, Board Members began to voice concern for the Board's ability to unite, focus, and execute a plan of action. A concern for the personal agendas of Board Members was voiced as well as concern for the Board's ability to successfully complete the planning process and implement a plan.

The Strategic Planning Process

Introduction

As the consultant facilitating the planning process, I prepared the agenda and handouts and facilitated each meeting. A three-hour block of

time had been scheduled for each meeting. Meetings usually started late. Most of the business was conducted within a little over two hours with additional time taken for breaks.

Session One (June 1, 1989)

The first meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the CHCDC was attended by all members--the Board President (hereinafter referred to as President), CM 1 and 2, and the Executive Director.

The first agenda was lengthy and too ambitious for the time allotted. The agenda was: (a) Introductions, (b) Strategic Planning Process, (c) Strategic Planning Committee, (d) Stakeholder Analysis, (e) Organizational mandates, (f) Organizational objectives, (g) Creating a mission statement and purpose statement, (h) Organizational structure, (i) First report to the Board, (j) Preparation for June Committee meeting, and (k) Future meeting dates.

Handouts included in the agenda packet consisted of a copy of Bryson's (1988) strategic planning model and eleven pages of CHCDC goals and objectives which I had taken from a number of documents (articles of incorporation, bylaws, scope of services, project list, and corporation goals sheet).

From the start, this Committee maintained an informal, friendly atmosphere. Knowing from the beginning that our assignment would last six months, Committee Members settled into an easy, comfortable rapport. I began the first meeting with introductions and thanks to the Committee Members for their commitment to participate in the study. The agenda and handouts were introduced. The planning process was outlined using the model included in the handouts. I described each of the eight steps of Bryson's (1988) model.

1. Identifying and agreeing on a strategic planning process.

2. Identifying organizational mandates.
3. Clarifying organizational mission and values.
4. Assessing the external environment (opportunities and threats).
5. Assessing the internal environment (strengths and weaknesses).
6. Identifying the strategic issues facing the organization.
7. Formulating strategies to manage the issues.
8. Establishing an effective organizational vision for the future (pp. 69-70).

The tentative schedule for the next six months was outlined. The first meeting was intended to address steps 1, 2, and 3 of the model. The second meeting would cover steps 4 and 5. The third, fourth and fifth meetings would cover steps 6 and 7. And the final meeting in October was designated for step 8.

Part of my opening comments included a description of the overall purpose of the Committee—to create a three-year strategic plan for the CHCDC. I opened a discussion about the composition, structure and function of the Committee by asking each Committee Member to describe what skills or interests he or she brought to the table which would contribute to the planning effort. One Board member described his experience with strategic planning as both an Executive Director and Board Member of other nonprofit organizations. He had participated in previous planning efforts of the CHCDC and could bring with him the history of the organization as he had been a founding director. Another Board Member was a resident of City Heights and brought with him a three year history with the organization, organizational and management skills, legal knowledge and an understanding of how nonprofit organizations function. The third Board Member, new to the organization, was a resident of City Heights with sincere

concern for the community. Everyone agreed that her fresh perspective (being so new to the organization) on the organization was very valuable. The Executive Director described his unique perspective gained from his experience with the CHCDC as first a Board Member and then the Executive Director. He stated that this combination created a realistic view of the creation and implementation of policy. He also stated that he had more direct contact with residents of City Heights and therefore could represent and understand issues from their point of view.

The Committee was without a representative from outside the organization. The question of including someone to represent the resident population was discussed and the recruitment of an additional Committee Member was agreed upon. A subsequent attempt to bring in a community representative was unsuccessful. The individual called upon was not able to make the time commitment necessary to participate as a Committee Member.

I then asked for equal voting rights for each member of the Committee. This included the Executive Director. Although this was different from the typical committee structure of most nonprofit organizations, I described the need and importance for the Executive Director to have equal say in the formulation of planning recommendations to the full Board of Directors. The Committee agreed to the request, but felt that few issues would be voted upon. They believed that decisions would be reached by consensus.

When asked to select a committee chair who would be responsible for making the reports to the full Board of Directors, Committee Members drew straws and the newest Board Member won. It was decided that the role of chair (for the purposes of Committee reports at Board meetings) would alternate between the three Board Members on the Committee. The role of the chair for this Committee was less demanding than normal because I

would be fulfilling many of the typical responsibilities of the position. I would write all Committee reports and brief the acting chair before regular Board meetings. Other duties typical of committee chairs (calling the meeting, setting the agenda, and chairing the meeting) were all handled by me.

To begin a stakeholder analysis, I presented a definition for the term stakeholder. A stakeholder is a person, group, or organization that can affect the CHCDC's attention, resources, or output, or is affected by that output (Bryson, 1988). A stakeholder analysis was an opportunity for the Committee to ask themselves who their key stakeholders were. Generating this list was relatively simple and took only a few minutes of brainstorming. Each of the Board Members participated equally. The Executive Director was less involved. I frequently prompted the Committee by asking for clarification of terms. Once a sizable list was accumulated, I asked which stakeholders were important. A suggestion was made to classify the list into four categories (residents, business owners, funders, and government). This was quickly agreed upon.

A series of questions was then posed. I asked the Committee to respond to four questions (Bryson, 1988) regarding each of the categories of stakeholders.

1. What is their [stakeholders'] stake in the CHCDC?
2. What is their criteria for judging the performance of the CHCDC?
3. How well does the CHCDC perform according to these criteria?
4. How do these stakeholders influence the CHCDC?

These questions encouraged a lengthy discussion. The President and CM 1 were at first more contemplative. CM 2 and the Executive Director responded more frequently. Specific examples regarding community

residents were offered by the Executive Director. Overall, there was a willingness to be self-critical. The Executive Director had a more positive attitude than did Board Members about the performance of the organization and responded more passionately to questions.

I suggested that a rating system be used to answer the four analysis questions. It was easier and more concise to rate performance with a number (one to ten) than with words (good, very good, etc.). In working through each of the analysis questions to examine the four categories of stakeholders, it became clear that the Executive Director consistently had a different perspective from the Board Members. Discussion styles which were evidenced by this first meeting remained consistent (for the most part) throughout the entire planning process. The President introduced, clarified, instructed, described, explained and summarized. CM 2 asked numerous questions throughout the discussion which provided an excellent opportunity to discover each Committee Member's position on various issues. On a limited number of occasions these questions encouraged discussion off the subject. I allowed this to occur a few times so that a Committee Member would be forced to pull the discussion back to the matter at hand. I prodded, explained, and asked for clarification continuously.

I explained that a stakeholder analysis is important for a number of reasons. The Committee needed to decide who they wished to inform that the organization was creating a three-year plan. They also needed to decide who, inside or outside of the organization, would become involved with the process. And finally, a discussion of this sort is the beginning of the process of assessing the organization. The Executive Director took the lead in this discussion and wanted everyone informed. The President said that they shouldn't tell anyone. After the President's comment, the Executive Director

was then less enthusiastic about telling people. I explained that an organization might find it helpful (for community relations purposes) to tell certain organizations or individuals that the organization was in the process of planning. Also, other individuals and organizations might be involved so that the Strategic Planning Committee could receive feedback about how well the CHCDC was performing in the eyes of others. This kind of information becomes part of the external and internal environmental assessment that would be completed later.

It was agreed that I would interview key informants representing the different stakeholder groups. Additional information would be obtained from existing documentation (surveys and reports). The Committee discussed whether the information should be confidential. It was decided that it would be confidential only if necessary or requested by the informant. A list of people to be interviewed was generated. I completed the majority of these in preparation for the next Committee meeting.

According to Bryson (1988),

Before an organization can define its mission and values, it must know exactly what it is required to do and not do by external authorities.

These requirements are likely to be codified in laws, ordinances, articles of incorporation, or charters, and so may be easier to uncover and clarify than the organization's mission. (p. 93)

In this case, I asked the Committee if they chose to review documentation or if they preferred to carry on with the steps of the planning process and then examine the pertinent documents later. The Committee recognized that the bylaws would probably need to be revised upon completion of the planning process and so chose to postpone the discussion until afterward. One Committee Member stated, "we don't want to be influenced by them."

Following a short break I began a discussion of the CHCDC's organizational chart by drawing it on a chalk board and asking for clarification and confirmation of the staff and Board roles. The Executive Director made corrections and spoke with authority, referring to what mechanisms actually work. I described how the current organizational chart was related to the Board's concern about communication between Board and staff. This concern was focused on during the Board retreat held earlier in the year.

I encouraged the Committee to consider creating an Executive Committee which would reduce the length of Board meetings and formalize communication channels. To address the Executive Director's discontent with having to deal with too many Board Members giving him instruction and orders, I suggested that only the Board President and Committee Chairs should be able to make direct requests of the Executive Director. Even so, where the Executive Director may take direct orders from the Board President, his relationship with Committee Chairs should be more collaborative and less supervisory. All supervisory duties should be the responsibility of the Board President. I summarized these comments by encouraging the Committee to recommend a new organizational structure which was more formal and therefore less ambiguous and loose-ended. The recommended organizational structure should also help clarify the relationship between staff and the Board .

An open discussion followed which was the first of many, many discussions of the role of the Board and staff and the relationship between the two. Many different opinions were presented as the Committee attempted to create and understand an organizational structure which would fit the needs of the CHCDC. This was the first time that individual Committee Members pushed their own point of view. I tried to point out how certain options they

•

introduced did or did not relate to the needs of the organization. There was a significant difference in the views of the Executive Director and the Board Members. The majority of discussion related to the roles and responsibilities of the Board and staff. CM 1 remained quiet throughout the discussion and then presented a structure for the organization which addressed everyone's concerns. CM 1's suggestion was accepted by the Committee. This was a key discussion as it introduced a number of themes regarding Board and staff relations which were woven throughout the entire planning process. Consensus was reached in the end.

At this point the Committee was growing weary. Evening meetings were often easier to schedule, but Committee Members grew tired after the first couple of hours. A discussion like this one regarding the organizational chart was long, tedious, and emotional. To begin the important discussion of the organization's goals would have been useless with a tired Committee so I settled on introducing the topic and then sent everyone home with homework.

The handouts had included a number of documents which described the goals and objectives of the CHCDC. The articles of incorporation, the bylaws, a project list, the corporate goals sheet, and the scope of services statement all listed goals and/or objectives for the organization. Although many of these documents reported similar information, they did not state the same things. It would be the responsibility of the Committee, I explained, to sort through these lists and edit, condense, or eliminate certain statements. The Committee would then select a series of issues which would be addressed by the strategic plan. I requested that each Committee Member sort through all of the information and return prepared to create a brief list of goal recommendations.

Historically, the resources of the CHCDC had been committed to community development activities. Recently, there was a growing interest in focusing on economic development. A short discussion of these two topics was initiated by the President. This discussion continued at length during the next meeting of the Committee. Becoming very clear about the focus of the organization was of primary importance before goals could ever be recommended.

To close, I made arrangements with CM 2 to make the report to the full Board. I said that I would prepare a draft of a mission statement before the next meeting and promised to begin the stakeholder interviews. The Committee set a meeting date for the next month.

First Report to the Board (June 27, 1989)

CM 2 was scheduled to make the first report to the Board but felt uneasy about doing it. So, instead, I presented the written report that I had prepared and distributed to the Board. The report lasted less than ten minutes. I described what the purpose of the first Committee meeting had been, introduced the strategic planning model (a copy of the model was attached to the written report), identified the steps in planning and the tentative schedule the Strategic Planning Committee would follow for the next six months. Committee voting privileges and the rotation of the committee chair position were explained. Giving a vote to the Executive Director was cause for questions by one Board Member. This Board Member was interested in knowing if any other staff members were allowed to vote as part of the Committee level (I interpreted this question to imply reference to me and so I clarified that I did not have voting rights) and wanted to know if all decisions made by the Committee would later be presented to the full

Board for formal approval. This particular Board Member consistently questioned the rights, responsibilities and role of staff members.

I described the purpose of the stakeholder interviews. I explained that interview feedback would be given to Board Members at the next regular Board Meeting. The proposed organizational structure was presented. No action was to be taken until the next regular Board meeting. There was no discussion.

Session Two (June 29, 1989)

The second meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was two days after the first report to the Board. CM 1 was not present for this meeting. I began by reminding everyone that they had been sent home from the last Committee meeting with a series of goals and objectives previously adopted by the CHCDC. They were supposed to have sorted through the listings and created a short list of goals/topics/issues appropriate for the organization and the three-year plan. The Committee needed to reach consensus on a listing of strategic issues, present it to the full Board for approval and create the goals from there.

With the overall intent understood, I referred back to the agenda prepared for the meeting. The agenda included: (a) Meeting goals, (b) Goals for the CHCDC, (c) Feedback from stakeholder interviews, (d) Consensus on SWOT List (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats which combine to create an internal and external environmental assessment), (e) Discussion of how to implement a periodic SWOT Analysis, (f) Committee report at next Board Meeting, and (g) Date and agenda for the next meeting. Agenda item (b) was carried over from the previous meeting.

Handouts for this meeting included five pages of interview feedback from pre-interviews with Committee Members and four other Board

Members. This information included Board Members' thoughts on the primary goal for the organization, other goals of importance, strengths and weaknesses of the organization, the role of the Board, the role of the Executive Director, the relationship between the Board and the Executive Director, the relationship between the organization and the community, and what operational or programmatic changes they wished to see. Also included in the agenda packet was stakeholder interview feedback. This was neither confidential nor anonymous. I had been conducting interviews since the last meeting of the Committee. Notes from these personal and phone interviews were presented to the Committee for discussion.

Some Committee Members were prepared with their short list of goals/topics/issues for the organization. Others were unprepared. Each Committee Member was asked to sort through the listings and discuss what he or she marked as important, eliminated, etc. The information was quickly sorted through by everyone. They were able to eliminate, categorize, and prioritize. In the end, consensus was reached that the Committee should work with three categories of issues/goals--economic development, community development and organizational concerns.

I asked if our list should reflect the primary goals for the organization as were indicated by Board Members during pre-interviews or survey data which had indicated that residents were only interested in community development. I asked what kind of impact either of these should have. This marked the beginning of the economic development/community development debate. One faction of the Board was interested in moving into economic development activities. Other Board Members were interested in community development. Economic development attacked problems in a community. Community development addressed symptoms of those

problems. One was short term and the other long term. Some Board Members believed that they are compatible in the same organization. Others did not agree. The President commented that in the end this issue shows how unfocused the organization truly was--always trying to do too much.

The Committee grappled with the definitions of economic development and community development and the wisdom of changing the organization's focus from community development to economic development. The President was strongest in the discussion. His knowledge of the organization helped us as he drew parameters and synthesized information. I tried to integrate interview data into the discussion. This discussion was not limited to program issues. Staffing, structural, and resource issues were included. The discussion was very good. New and old Board Members tried to mesh their perspective with the perspective of staff.

Staffing and resources were addressed by the President when he outlined the advantages of hiring project specialists or consultants. In his view, the Executive Director can't be responsible for all programs and the administration of the organization. Program specialists can be hired on a temporary basis to complete a project. This would provide more focus. Resources are allocated specifically to a program and if new program ideas are brought before the Board then Board Members can get involved. This change would also help eliminate the possibility of the Executive Director being stretched in too many directions at the request of different Board Members. For the Board to accept a new project, either resources must be allocated to personnel, or volunteers (including Board Members) must be assigned to the tasks.

This Committee was grounded in organizational structure and the breakdown of roles and responsibilities. I reminded the group that programs

could be eliminated quickly or phased out slowly. Since there would be programs under each strategic issue and each program has budgetary impact, the resources may be traded around. A program which costs the organization \$7,500 to administer each year may be eliminated and replaced with another program or project costing the same. Similarly, if the Executive Director spends 15% of his time on a program which is being phased out by the end of the first year of the plan, those six hours per week may be channeled to another program. In this manner, decision making becomes quantitative.

Through discussions like this one I took opportunities to teach the Committee about strategic planning. Even though the organization was locked into a budget for the next year, change could come about by working with the future allocation of resources. The Executive Director was asked to prepare realistic figures quantifying and qualifying the time he spent on specific programs. This information would help the Committee select the programs of importance and those which they would eliminate.

The discussion began to move towards the allocation of resources (primarily staff time). This raised the subject of the political constraints associated with having the greatest portion of the organization's funding tied to a political process (City of San Diego Community Development Block Grant was allocated by the City Council.). The Committee stayed focused on how these program decisions related to the role of the staff and the composition and role of the Board. I pushed for the Committee to narrow the focus of the discussion. Each Committee Member was asked to estimate how much programmatic time was currently dedicated to economic development and community development. These figures were compared to the Committee Members' goals for how much time should be dedicated to the

two issues after at the completion of the three-year plan. Consensus was not reached on either point.

I then asked the group to identify what kinds of programs would fall under economic development and community development. The Committee brainstormed a listing of current community development activities and a listing of current and potential economic development activities. I reminded the Committee that a real concern of the Board was their inability to remain focused. I wanted the Committee to agree on an end-goal for percent of programmatic time spent in each area. The three-year plan would describe how the organization would reach that end-goal. This was an important discussion, one that needed a great deal of monitoring so that it stayed on topic. A second check for consensus regarding how much time should be allocated to community development activities versus economic development activities was unsuccessful.

A discussion of the feasibility of the CHCDC separating into two organizations, one for economic development and one for community development, followed. This idea was soon given up. Further arguments regarding the split of programmatic time were presented, compromises were struck, but an impasse still existed. I called a break. This discussion had been going on for nearly two hours. After the break I reminded the Committee that the end-goal could be flexible. What couldn't be accomplished in three years may take four. CM 2 gave in to the President's viewpoint. The Executive Director, very interested in the impact of this decision on staff but left with the minority viewpoint, was then willing to look at things differently and began to see that the end-goal proposed by the President was realistic. The Executive Director finally agreed with the President and CM 2. The President then voiced his willingness to cooperate if the Board insisted

on some different split of programmatic time allocations. The final decision was accepted by all three Committee Members present.

I reminded the Committee that a number of agenda items had not been addressed. The Committee was asked to read through all of the interview data in preparation for the next meeting. The President was asked to make the report to the Board . When he voiced concern that the Board may not accept the proposed programmatic end-goal in relationship to the proposed organizational structure, a last minute change was made to the organizational structure to strengthen it for Board approval. The President summarized the events and outcomes of the meeting. Last minute discussion was related to how the organization would make the proposed changes work. I asked if Board Members should be lobbied before the meeting. The President said that the Board would agree to the recommendations as long as they didn't get bogged down with the organizational structure. The meeting closed with future meeting dates being set.

This second session of the planning Committee was the most important. The decision made during this meeting to reverse the split of program time from 90% / 10% community development/economic development to 75% / 25 % economic development/community development would be the impetus for major change in the organization. It would create factions among the Board Members and would be the basis for the content of the three-year plan.

Session Three (July 27, 1989)

The third meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was difficult and less productive. I was sick and had lost my voice. Due to this, the meeting was short and I was not as effective at monitoring the discussions

and keeping the Committee Members on task. CM 2 was not present for the meeting.

I summarized the progress made to date by the Committee and went over the agenda. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Progress Report, (c) SWOT Analysis (internal and external environment assessment), (d) Discussion of how to implement a periodic SWOT Analysis, (e) Report to the full Board, and (f) Date and agenda for next Committee meeting. Agenda items (c) and (d) were carried over from the previous meeting and were intended to utilize the pre-interview data not fully discussed. The handout consisted of one page of notes transcribed from the previous meeting when a program outline was developed for economic development and community development.

I explained that even though the proposed changes had not been formally accepted by the Board (the July Board meeting had been postponed), the Committee could move ahead with a discussion of the feedback received from pre-interviews.

Committee members found the pre-interview data to be succinct and accurate overall. CM 1 commented that the structural things can change—it would be the group dynamics that will be difficult to change. I opened a discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the organization. There were 21 different weaknesses mentioned in pre-interview data. An informal discussion had started before CM 1 asked that we stop and figure out the best way to handle this amount of data. I suggested that the Committee should try to separate weaknesses into two categories—those that are changeable and those that are inherent to the organization. CM 1 suggested that we categorize the information into groups and then deal with the categorized list.

The 21 weaknesses were grouped into four headings: funding, lack of focus, participation (Board and volunteers), and internal dynamics (Board and staff roles and relationships). The 14 strengths of the organization were categorized into 5 headings: (a) committed individuals (Board and staff), (b) do-gooders (good people doing good things for a good cause), (c) financially stable, (d) good relationship with City government, and (e) diverse programs. I added some of the information obtained through the stakeholder interviews to this list. I made the point that the stakeholder interviews matched the Board Members' assessment of the organization and this was very important. The outsider analysis matched the inside analysis.

We began to discuss the condensed lists of strengths and weaknesses. I asked if the Committee truly saw them as strengths and weaknesses and if so, which strengths could be capitalized on and which weaknesses could be addressed. I commented, "Balance your greatest strength against your greatest weakness and you've got a lot of caring, committed people who can't get a focus—which is not so surprising." The President replied, "Especially when you add Board dynamics being people with different agendas." CM 1 added, "The only thing we have in common is that we care." Regarding the strength of being do-gooders, the President stated, "It's a hell of a strength. Remember when you were a little kid and you wanted to beat up the do-gooders?" CM 1 synthesized the information by stating,

We're seeing our strengths in moral terms versus practical concerns.

That's probably a guarantee for a weakness. . . . In a way we're forced to define ourselves in moral terms, you know, good. . . what's good?

Good is when we get along with the powers that be and bad is when we don't. As soon as we start defining ourselves in technical terms—technical competence—funding becomes stronger, stable.

Whether or not funding could be both a strength and a weakness was further discussed. CM 1 stated that all the weaknesses listed were truly weaknesses but that the list of strengths was incomplete. The President said, "It feels like we never get anything done but when I look back at old documents which said what we intended to do—we have accomplished things. We just never look back and so we don't have anything to guide us. Referring to the lack of focus, the President added, "[at] every Board meeting we've got another [new] agenda. There's no flow from each agenda to another agenda." He closed by stating that the strategic plan will help the organization check where it is. "It's a map", he said. I added that it also provides a built in evaluation system.

I mentioned, hoping to begin a new discussion, the importance of initiating a periodic SWOT Analysis and a periodic Stakeholder Analysis. CM 1 wanted to add to the list of strengths, "That we get things done." We never did complete the discussion of ongoing analysis of the organization.

The discussion of internal dynamics being a weakness for the organization opened the staff/Board role and relationship debate. The organization had some very real problems in this area. One Committee Member commented that this issue was inherent in an organization with limited resources. Another commented that one of the problems is that once they find a good volunteer they immediately ask that volunteer to sit on the Board. The Executive Director stated that he wanted Board Members to take responsibility for projects. The President replied that he did not want that kind of responsibility because he was in an advisory role. The discussion retreated to the safety of structural issues. There were real problems that needed to be discussed but the Committee would not grapple with these.

The President reminded the Committee that the structure agreed upon by the group during the last strategic planning meeting would help with this problem of role clarification. The organization needed to begin acting under this new structure. The Executive Director reminded the Committee that the staff's role with the Board Committees and project groups needed to be clearly defined. While some Committee Members focused on organizational structure as the cure-all for the problems with internal dynamics, the President wanted to know if the organization would continue to "put out fires" (referring to the organization's lack of a focus and reactive style of program design and management), or did the group want to "bite the bullet and narrow the focus."

The group turned back to a discussion of the role and responsibilities of the Executive Director, then back to a discussion of program issues. I was not doing a very good job of monitoring the discussion. Committee Members rambled and the discussion was not very focused. I reminded the Committee that structural changes would not eliminate the problem. The President essentially closed the discussion of communication and internal dynamics by stating that there was one individual who contributed greatly to this problem and that they were unable to change the situation. "We just live with it", he stated.

The topic of participation was introduced. The discussion went back to structure. I told the group that they had not reconciled the communication issue as yet. The President stated that when he tells the Executive Director to not take on any new projects, the Executive Director takes them on anyway. CM 1 wanted to know if program and structure issues will solve the communication problems. The President led a discussion of how the Executive Director spent his time. The President believed that the number of

hours the Executive Director spent in meetings was a waste of time. The Executive Director became defensive. One problem identified was that the Executive Director mixed the work of the organization with his own personal community involvements. The Board Members reminded him that when he acted on his own in the community it would still be perceived that he was acting on behalf of the CHCDC. CM 1 wanted the organization to move away from "representation" at meetings and "transition to product . . . away from process." He said that for as long as the Executive Director was sitting in meetings representing the organization he was not producing anything tangible.

Following this was a brief, heated discussion of how the Executive Director acts without Board authority. This again brought up the discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the Board and staff and the impact of these on the strategic plan. I closed the meeting with a comment that possibly we were belaboring the internal assessment. The Committee needed to move on to a discussion of strategy.

Meeting dates were set. There was no need to prepare for the report to the Board. That had been accomplished at the last meeting.

Second Report to the Board (August 1, 1989)

July's regular Board meeting had been postponed from a week earlier. Because of this, the Strategic Planning Committee had met twice since the last report to the Board. The report to the Board was written by me and presented by the President. A phone conversation with the President to discuss the report took place prior to the meeting.

All Committee Members were present at the Board Meeting. Two new Board Members were to be formally appointed. The Executive Director was present. Four other Board Members were absent (all four of the remaining

population). The Strategic Planning Committee report was the last item on the agenda. The President presented the report. He named the members of the Strategic Planning Committee as well as explaining the Researcher's role in facilitating the planning process.

The President reminded the Board that the Committee had met three times. I had prepared a handout for the Board which included the action items, a rough sketch of the organizational chart and a two-page progress report which outlined the steps of the planning process and what had been accomplished so far by the Strategic Planning Committee. The President encouraged the new Board Members to read the progress report carefully. He highlighted a few points (stakeholder interviews, strengths and weaknesses of the organization) and then went on to begin the presentation of action items.

The first action item was the adoption of the end-goal to reverse the program split between community development and economic development from 90/10 (community development/economic development) to 75/25 (economic development/community development). The President presented the Committee's recommendation, described the current status of programs and explained that the strategic plan would be written in order to accomplish this goal over the next three years. He did acknowledge that the situation was awkward since the only Board Members attending this meeting that were not on the Strategic Planning Committee were brand new. He then opened the discussion for this action item.

When discussion did not begin, the President took more time to better explain the Committee Members' thoughts behind this proposed program change. He acknowledged the debate about the program split that had taken place at the Committee level, but explained how the Committee reached the conclusions that it had. Other Committee Members made comments during

this presentation. Few comments and questions came from the new Board Members. One new Board Member had a difficult time with the idea of an end-goal. She was concerned that the community was not ready for a change like this. It was explained that this was the reason that the three year plan was being written—to create a strategy for the accomplishment of the end-goal. The community and the organization would prepare for the program change during the three year period.

The discussion improved offering an opportunity for the President to sell this recommendation and also to describe some of the history and culture of the CHCDC to the new Board Members. Much of the discussion developed into the philosophical and practical differences between community development and economic development. One new Board Member joined in the enthusiasm for the change. The other new Board Member remained reticent. A little salesmanship from the President was necessary and in the end proved successful. The motion passed unanimously.

The proposed organizational structure was then introduced. The President briefly described the current structure. He then slowly went through the proposed changes and explained how the changes would impact the role of the Board and staff. The explanation was very clear. The handout included a diagram of the proposed structure. There was very little discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Session Four (August 31, 1989)

The fourth meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by all members but CM 1. The agenda for the meeting was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Progress report, (c) Outlining a strategy for the end-goal, (d) Date and agenda for next meeting. Handouts included a copy of the program

outline (economic development and community development) and a three-page project list from the Executive Director.

I opened the meeting with a reference to the successful adoption of the recommendations taken to the July Board meeting. As mentioned during the last meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee, the assessment process had carried on too long. The creation of the strategic plan would provide focus (addressing the major weakness of the CHCDC) for the organization and other weaknesses could be addressed specifically in the plan as long as Committee Members made it a priority to do so.

It was time to move towards devising a strategy for the accomplishment of the end-goal (to change to a program split of 75% economic development and 25% community development). There were four areas to discuss in relationship to change: programs, funding, Board and staff. I asked where they would like to begin. The Executive Director suggested that the group begin by looking at the funding sources or the composition of the Board. The President suggested that the Committee start with programs since they dictate Board and staff needs and drive the funding base. He noted that in the past the organization allowed funding to drive the programs. The President explained,

Determining what kinds of programs we want to be involved in helps you focus your funding as opposed to what we've been doing. We drive our programs based on where we get our money. . . kind of like, well there's money out there to do this so why don't we just do it.

CM 2 wanted to start with the Board. A discussion followed about the composition of the Board and how it aligns with current programming (heavily weighed toward community development). No conclusions were drawn.

The President suggested that the group make some decisions about what kinds of programs they were interested in--then they could better see what kinds of expertise was needed from Board Members. To begin, I suggested that the Committee edit the program outline. Programs were added, some information was corrected or amended and definitions were included for clarification. What was important during this exercise was that in order for me to adequately understand each of the programs in the outline, the Committee had to be very clear about the parameters of the community development and economic development categories and all programs listed under each heading. Eventually this discussion developed into a discussion of the role of the CHCDC in relationship to other organizations.

The next step was to see how each program fit into the overall strategy. Once the program outline (listing of current and potential programs) was reviewed, the Committee edited it to match the proposed program structure. The Committee tried to picture how specific programs might develop over time. Throughout the discussion reference was made to Board, staff, funding and organizational structure issues. This discussion also provided an opportunity for Board Members to better understand how the Executive Director spent his time.

Once the program outline had been thoroughly examined, it was compared to the Executive Director's project list (a listing of projects currently being addressed by staff). I asked about the inclusion of sacred cows (pet projects of the Board or specific Board Members that would not be eliminated). Current projects were discussed. The group needed to understand that certain programs would be completed, some would remain part of the organization's purview and others should be eliminated now or at some later date.

Suggestions were made for how to narrow community development over the next three years. Each Committee Member contributed. I had to remind the group not to simply rename what already existed. They were there to eliminate. I summarized the progress being made by the group and explained that the responsibility for many of the smaller programs could become the responsibility of neighborhood organizations that received technical assistance from the CHCDC. This way, instead of eliminating the many small successful community development activities, the organization was proposing a way to transfer the responsibility to volunteer community leaders. The CHCDC would spend their resources developing leadership potential in residents and providing technical assistance to volunteer groups. This strategy was agreed to by all Committee Members.

The organization would not be able to jump directly into economic development activities until the Board and staff worked together to transfer some of the burden of community development to neighborhood organizations and volunteer community leaders. Therefore, the economic development activities needed to be prioritized. I asked each Committee Member to prioritize the four economic development activities (housing, redevelopment, capital improvements and business development). After some discussion a priority listing was completed. The Executive Director was often the lone voice in these discussions. The order of priority originally proposed by the President was accepted in the end.

I wanted to become more familiar with economic development activities. The President suggested that I schedule an interview with the Executive Director of the San Diego Economic Development Corporation.

The meeting closed with the Committee setting the next meeting date.

Session Five (September 19, 1989)

The fifth meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by all Committee Members but CM 2. The President brought his 18 month old son with him. This may have contributed to the meeting lasting less than two hours. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Discussion of program outline, (c) Completion of strategy, (d) Date and agenda for next meeting. Agenda item (c) was carried over from the last meeting. The handouts were limited to a revised copy of the program outline (revised during the last Committee meeting).

I opened the meeting by summarizing what had been accomplished during the last Committee meeting and outlining what needed to be accomplished that evening. Since the program outline had been accepted by the Committee (the community development strategy was to eliminate programs and the economic development strategy was to create and implement new programs), what remained to be done was expanding program descriptions--strategizing staffing needs, board involvement and composition, and funding issues.

The opening discussion was a waste of time as the group got off on a tangent about a specific kind of funding. I moved the discussion back to the agenda by asking how much education current Board Members needed in order to be prepared for the organization's involvement in economic development activities. The Committee then put definition to the economic development activities which had been prioritized during the last Committee meeting. I grew impatient as issues were glossed over. The Committee explained that defining strategies was not difficult--it was the easy part. The decision to move in this direction (the program split) had been the difficult task. In the end I realized that what was important to this particular group

was the value of discussion--airing views and opinions before strategies were set forth.

In defining each of the economic development programs, I questioned whether any of the programs could fund their own staff. For now, funding was not troublesome they explained. The funding base for the organization was largely directed towards community development activities which would continue for some while as the shift took place. The highest priority economic development programs, housing and redevelopment, were either able to fund staffing (funding for staff support would be built into housing projects) or were process oriented (redevelopment was essentially an advocacy role) and could be accomplished with minimum staff support as long as Board Members were actively involved.

Every valuable discussion throughout this entire meeting addressed program definition or the role of Board and staff. Lengthy discussions were necessary to hear from each participant so that the group could come to some consensus regarding the parameters of each program. Understanding of each program varied a great deal from individual to individual.

Woven throughout the discussions was mention of the current status of specific programs. This gave an opportunity for the Executive Director to explain a good deal of his work and it was also an opportunity for Board Members to update their knowledge of the organization. Both of these were very valuable. In this way the strategic planning process provided an excellent opportunity for communication and information sharing between Board and staff.

The Executive Director left at this point during the meeting. Discussion moved back to community development. I reminded the Committee that they may be overly optimistic with some of their ideas. I

continually asked the Committee how they intended to accomplish what they wanted. Committee Members needed to see that a planning document did not only say what the intent of the organization was but also how the organization foresaw achieving the desired goals. Time factors were considered. Staffing concerns were brought up again. Professional staff spent too much time on administrative functions someone said. The organization was described as being top-heavy. The suggestion was made to separate administrative functions away from the professional staff. This brought up other organizational structure issues, reporting relationships, and the role of staff. I suggested that instead of immediately hiring additional professional staff, they might consider hiring more administrative staff and make better use of the professional staff members' time. They decided to discuss this with the treasurer of the organization. The President said that the current budget would need to be accepted for now but the following year it could be written to complement the strategic plan.

The meeting closed with a discussion of the use of the strategic plan and setting strategy for the next Committee report to the full Board.

Third Report to the Board (September 26, 1989)

The third report to the full Board was written by me and presented by the President. The report lasted for approximately 30 minutes. The meeting was attended by two of the Committee Members. Three of the four Board members who were part of the remaining population were not present. The Committee report was a two page description our progress since the last report to the Board. Feedback was requested as well as approval of the proposed program concepts.

The President reminded the Board that the Committee had been meeting regularly. He then reminded them of the last action taken by the

Board in relation to the plan. A brief description of how the Committee developed the proposed program descriptions followed. Through the process of explaining the work of the Committee, Board Members (especially new Board Members) were able to learn more about the programs of the organization. The President made an effort to make the report more understandable to new Board Members by adding more descriptive information and background rationale.

A new Board Member questioned the rationale of eliminating some of the community development activities. He wanted to know why the organization could not simply expand and accomplish all of it (community development and economic development). The President explained that the goal was not to eliminate activities but instead to transfer the responsibilities of certain programs to neighborhood organizations. He also explained that if the organization expanded and tried to accomplish everything they would not address the immediate need to gain better focus of their activities. Other Strategic Planning Committee Members helped support their recommendations. The President tried to make it very clear that a great deal of thought had gone into these recommendations. None of it was taken lightly by the Committee and the best interests of the community and the organization were constantly considered.

The Executive Director joined in the discussion and was able to ground the discussion in realistic terms that the Board could grasp. Funding was discussed. The President explained that the strategic plan would help the CHCDC obtain funding. The discussion digressed a number of times to personal agenda concerns. It seemed as if the Committee Members were hesitant to push too hard for their recommendations. They were very

patient--waiting for other Board Members to air all of their questions and concerns--defending the Committee's position along the way.

The President focused the group. The discussion digressed again. The President raised his voice to gain control of the discussion but still had to wait for individual comments to die away. He went on to discuss the role of the Board in realizing some of the proposed changes. The President cut off the discussion when the topic of business development digressed to comments on the prices at Vons Supermarket. He asked the Board to carefully read the handouts. He said that the Strategic Planning Committee would move forward with the preparation of the plan. He encouraged Board Members to call any member of the Committee if they had any questions.

Further discussion ensued regarding the plan, organizational structure, the role of the Board and the role of staff. In all, participation in the discussion was unequal. Strategic Planning Committee members and the new Board Members were the most vocal. Other Board Members were less involved.

There was unanimous acceptance of the program concepts presented in the Strategic Planning Committee report.

Session Six (November 27, 1989)

The final meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was held over lunch during the business day. Only two Committee Members attended. The President was on vacation and the Executive Director had resigned from the organization (to pursue other opportunities) since the Committee had last met. The treasurer of the organization was asked to attend this meeting to assist the Committee with funding issues. He did not respond to the request. CM 1 and 2 met with me to edit the draft of the strategic plan that I had written based on all the data collected during the first five meetings of the

planning Committee, outlines prepared by Committee Members and other organizational documents which. There was no written agenda prepared for this meeting. Committee members were asked to walk through the 25 page draft. Additions, corrections, amendments, and suggestions were proposed by the Committee.

Both Committee Members present at this meeting were aware that the President would also be reviewing the draft and would make recommendations at a later date. Once the revisions were made the second draft would be distributed to the Board for approval at the next Board meeting.

Certain elements of the draft demanded closer scrutiny than others. The history of the organization, the mission statement, and the goals demanded a good deal of attention. I found the input from CM 1 and 2 to be very helpful. Gaps were either filled during this working session or I was directed to the appropriate source for the information.

The meeting lasted less than two hours. The group was very task oriented. The Committee Members thought that the plan was in good shape and would not need a great deal of work before it was ready for the full Board.

CM 1 volunteered to assist me by drafting some of the narratives still needed for the plan. I explained how we should proceed so we could be ready for the next Board meeting. The final Strategic Planning Committee meeting closed with a few sighs of relief.

Fourth Report to the Board (December 7, 1989)

The strategic plan was presented to the Board by the President. The report lasted approximately 40 minutes. All three Committee Members were present. Three of the four participants in the remaining population were also present. Prior to the meeting, a copy of the draft had been sent to Board

members with a memo from me which explained that the Strategic Planning Committee would be requesting the Board to adopt the plan. During the meeting, the President explained that the content of the plan was emphasized. Final editing would be completed afterwards.

The purpose of the plan was explained by the President:

The purpose of this plan is simply to provide us a guide or road map letting us know where we are heading during the next three years. It will hopefully focus our activities, the use of our resources and will help us prioritize the projects and activities that we want to be involved in.

The President went back to the rationale behind the end-goal and the intentions of the planning Committee in recommending the program shift. He explained how the strategic plan would help the organization try to reach their end-goal in a three-year period. He did a very good job of presenting the key points of the plan in an orderly manner. He walked through each part of the document and described how it supported the accomplishment of the end-goal. Less description of specific programs was necessary during this meeting because so much discussion had occurred previously. Changes in current programs and the development of new programs were emphasized. The President reminded the Board how much time was spent developing this document. He also described what the plan did not include and why certain sections were less developed than others.

An overall statement was made which emphasized that the goal of the organization was to support the community. The role of the organization in relationship to other organizations was mentioned as was the role of the Board of Directors and staff. The President closed his presentation by asking if

the other Committee Members had further comments. CM 1 expanded on the comments made by the President.

Specific requests for changes were made by Board Members during an open discussion. Some related to content, some to format issues. One Board Member wanted the plan to read better—more interesting reading. This same Board Member also wanted the plan to say what the organization was not going to be doing. Some of the questions and requests did not relate to the strategic plan but instead created tangential discussions. The President reminded the Board Members that their involvement in implementing the plan was essential if the organization was to realize its goals. He asked everyone to give further thought to their personal involvement. He also asked the Board to think about how active board committees might allow the Board to meet less frequently.

One significant point of discussion was raised. Two Board Members wanted another program idea included in the plan. The President explained his position on the issue and the position of the Committee (the issue had been discussed at during a Committee meeting). The opinions of other Board Members were solicited. After some discussion, the Board agreed upon how to include the local schools in the plan.

The motion to adopt the strategic plan was unanimously accepted. I informed the Board that the final edited version of the plan would be mailed to the Board for any minor, last minute editing.

Preparing the Final Draft

I was responsible for writing the plan. I worked with the Committee to create an outline of the various sections of the plan and then used a number of CHCDC program documents for background information. A near-final draft of the plan was mailed to Board Members prior to the final Committee

report when the Board was asked to approve the content of the plan. The plan was accepted by the Board during the December Board meeting. At that time the Board was assured that they would be mailed a final version of the document before it was printed. They would be able to make last minute, minor editing comments if any were necessary.

Many, many versions of the plan were prepared prior to one being sent to the Board. I worked closely with the President as I prepared the draft for the Board's approval and afterwards as I finalized the format and language use. The draft that was sent to the printer was produced with the help of a graphic artist.

In January I mailed the final version of the plan to the Board. They were encouraged to call me with any changes. The CHCDC's Office Manager carefully read the document and recommended minor changes pertaining to the proper names of programs, the accuracy of funding information, misspelled names, incorrect acronyms, etc. Two Board Members called me with feedback. One, to tell me that his name had been misspelled, and the other to go over some suggested language changes. All changes were cleared through the President before the plan was printed.

On February 1, 1990 I made a brief presentation to the Board of Directors. They were presented with a copy of their plan and some encouraging words from me regarding successful implementation and evaluation practices. We discussed the uses of the plan and the importance of monitoring the organization's follow through efforts. I suggested that a brief addendum be written every six months or yearly as an update and progress report.

A copy of the City Heights Community Development Corporation's *Strategic Plan for 1990 - 1993* is included in the Appendices (see Appendix E).

Post-Interview Data

Introduction

The post-interview data was much cleaner than the pre-interview data. On the second time around I was much better at focusing the participants on the interview questions. The interviews were more uniform in length, ranging from approximately 20 to 45 minutes in all cases but one which was longer. There were eight pre-interviews and only six post-interviews. The Executive Director had resigned from the organization during the planning process and one Board Member from the remaining population became completely inactive and subsequently dropped off the Board.

The post-interviews were held during business hours. Three interviews were held in participants' offices, two in restaurants, and one in the home of a Board Member. All six post-interviews were conducted between January and February of 1990.

The post-interviews with Committee Members were very successful. The data was thoughtful and rich with description. In stark contrast to this was the data from the remaining population. Board Members in the remaining population were exposed to the planning process during Strategic Planning Committee reports made during the regular Board meetings. The Committee made four reports to the Board over the course of a seven month period. The attendance record of the four Board Members in the remaining population was very poor during this period. One Board Member (the one who subsequently left the organization) did not attend any meeting during which a report was made. Two others were present for two of the four reports and the last participant was present for three Committee reports.

The data from the three Board Members in the remaining population was thin, lacking in substance and description, and poorly focused to the

interview questions. I found that when a participant did not know much about the question, he or she talked about what they did know. A strict comparison between populations would be inconclusive due to the limited involvement of the remaining population.

Question # 1: How would you define planning?

There was no significant change in responses to this question. Again, all participants described planning as a linear, rational, structured activity involving a great deal of decision making. Some of the comments included, "identification of goals", "organize your thoughts", "solve a particular problem", "technique to accomplish objectives." One Board Member from the remaining population viewed planning as similar to "making a map."

Two minor changes came from the remaining population. One Board Member defined planning as "thoughtful" rather than "reactive." Another Board Member mentioned the need to define the role of the group before you begin.

Question # 2: How would you define strategy?

Thoughts on what strategy is ranged from those who defined it as a verb and those who defined it as a noun. The majority favored defining it as a noun, "the product of the planning activity", "a formula or a plan or a goal". The two members of the remaining population who defined strategy as a noun claimed that it was "the specific steps used to accomplish whatever your overall goal is", or the "means of achieving the goals."

Those who defined strategy as a verb (one of the remaining population and one Committee Member) included ideas such as, "getting into the details of figuring. . . identifying how you're going to get between one point and another", and "setting your route."

Question # 3: What is the purpose of creating a strategic plan?

When asked the purpose of creating a strategic plan, four participants believed that it would help to focus the group—provide direction. Again, the metaphor of a road map was used. One Committee Member viewed the purpose as helpful in solving dilemmas or problems.

Two Board Members from the remaining population thought that it would help unite the group, "provide an opportunity to coalesce and come to a common purpose." One included the evaluative component built into planning.

Question # 4: How successful was the strategic planning process we just completed?

There was consensus among Committee Members that the success of the planning process lay in the implementation of the plan. They did have other comments that were noteworthy. One stated,

That [the success of the process] remains to be seen. The process isn't over until we see the results of the plan unfold. The jury is still out Mary. I'll tell you in six months. The methodology wasn't bloated. It was pretty close to the bone for product for time spent. The sessions were productive. They got to the point. They didn't last too long. What remains to be seen is how deeply it trickled to the rest of the Board. It did what I had been trying to do for four years and hadn't been able to get done. It congealed. It put into cogent format, stuff, ideas that were kind of woven into all of our activities and discussions. It was very useful in terms of what I saw as the primary focus of the organization."

From another Committee Member,

The success of it [the planning process] is really going to be determined by how well the group follows through with it [the plan]. It's the implementation of it that's going to make it successful. For my organization it was successful in that we've never taken the time to sit down and actually identify what our goals are. We've never made some of the decisions that we had to make in terms of prioritizing or eliminating some the things we've been doing in the past or that people want to do in the future. It's helped us focus."

Two of the remaining population were openly optimistic about the process. They seemed to have taken it on face value. One commented that bringing in a consultant and creating a strategic plan was the best thing they could have done. The other commented that the process helped to define "some of the City Heights interpersonal things [referring to internal organizational issues]."

The last participant from the remaining population began to voice discontent with the execution of the process. This theme was carried through the remainder of his post-interview. His statement was,

It's as successful as most strategic planning processes. I have higher expectations for strategic planning than the average person because I have experience and for that reason I'm disappointed with the results. I'm disappointed because the plan focused too much on the limited input of selected members and it may have something to do with the Committee selection process. The plan was a little too general and not as specific as I would like to see. I would have liked to have seen measurable items. There should have been timelines. It was weakly

tied to the real strategic planning tool of an organization--[the] allocation of resources.

Question # 5: If we were to do this over, what changes would you make to the process? What would you leave the same?

The major theme in the responses to this question was the importance of increasing the Board's involvement in the planning process. As one Committee Member stated,

It would be really tempting with a Board the size of ours to set aside a portion of each Board meeting during this process for creative thinking about strategic planning by the whole Board. It would have gone a long way toward buying in and educating [the Board]. No conclusions--just everybody talk.

The importance of open discussion was mentioned again by another Committee Member in his statement, "The initial part of it where we did a lot of discussion about philosophies and agendas that each of the individuals brought to the table [during Committee meetings] was particularly helpful."

Similar sentiments about greater involvement from other Board Members were echoed by another Member of the Committee in his statement that,

The major change would be we'd probably set aside a day with the entire Board to do the whole first part, the assessment. . . trying to get some global assessment on goals and priorities. I think [that by] having the entire Board involved in that you could get them more bought into the process. The Committee can begin hammering out the nuts and bolts. They [would then] have some guide lines from the Board.

And from a participant in the remaining population, "I would in some way try to probably force the Board to be more active in it. You can't follow something that you haven't been involved in."

Two participants, one Committee Member and one in the remaining population, said that they were happy with it the way it was. The final participant wished to see a number of changes. He believed that unless planning was "grounded in the pocketbook" it could become more frustrating than it was useful. He added,

I would drive it on finite resources. It [the planning process] went very typically. It followed all my past experience with strategic planning. Here's the way I would look at it--the President of the Board wanted a strategic plan. The President gets what he wants from me and that [hiring a consultant, selecting a Committee and creating a plan] was the way he wanted to attempt to approach the problem. I saw that as a discretionary thing that he could do with his resources. If I was allocating resources towards [a planning effort] I don't see enough bang for the buck [from this planning process] to spend either Board energy or money on it when a budget process results in a more effective immediate strategic plan than the paper one we've got now.

Question # 6: What did you learn from participating in the planning process?

Two Committee Members learned about the viewpoint of other Board Members. One commented,

The part that was most helpful was learning what everyone's agendas are--seeing how important it is to have a Board that has some common goals or common interests. It was helpful in determining how you move this group forward.

Another Committee Member claimed that her understanding and perspective was broadened by being exposed to the viewpoints of others.

Half of the participants commented on having learned more about planning.

[Strategic planning] is an effective technique for focusing an organization and [I learned] that a similar kind of thing maybe should occur in the early terms of new officers [Board officers]. . . . It is strategic to do this when an organization is in a point of transition. There are some very strategic points at which to implement this project [strategic planning]. . . . If you do it it will reduce a lot of chaos of community-based organizations.

A member of the remaining population claimed, "That it's probably better to have a plan, to write things down and define things even when you don't think you need to right now."

Question # 7: What did the group as a whole learn?

There was a range of answers in response to this question. Two Committee Members referred to the content of the plan. They believed that the plan educated some Board Members. The third Committee Member commented,

One thing that everybody learned was that we need to focus our activities. We're trying to do too much and we can't do everything. To that extent they really began [to understand] just how broad or how many facets we had our hands in and just how difficult it was to achieve anything as long as we continued to go that route.

This concern for focus was echoed by another Committee Member, "Their need to focus was sort of reinforced."

The remaining population included one Board Member who believed that, "Especially the new members learned a lot.", another who commented, "Some people didn't learn anything. Some people refuse to." This same Board Member closed with a more positive statement that she hoped that "they [the other Board Members] learned the same thing that I did--the value of becoming more professional [as an organization] and no matter how small you are, to set a plan and go with it." And one Board Member who felt concern for the consequence of planning said,

For some they learned that you could write all this stuff down. The Board kind of realized that there was a division amongst the Board as far as what might be important and what might not be important. We may have exposed ourselves to some dissention and differences that we didn't know were there and they may not be curable.

Question # 8: As a result of the planning process, do you think that the role of or the relationship between the Executive Director, the Board of Directors or your constituents will change?

A new Executive Director had not been hired before these interviews were conducted. Overall, the participants were hopeful in this area. The emphasis was on the relationship between the Board of Directors and the Executive Director. Some commented that they believed future relationships would improve. Others claimed that some steps were already being made towards improvement.

Question # 9: Is strategic planning useful for problem solving only or is it worthy of the ongoing attention of the organization?

The Committee Members each voiced a unique view in response to this question. One believed that planning is best used in response to a need. "It's valuable for anyone who needs to move forward. It is more effective

when there's a sense of confusion of purpose." Another found planning best used in cycles. "I don't think that you should always be in a planning mode because what ends up happening is you're always planning and you end up doing nothing." He added that an organization must stop and concentrate on implementation and evaluation. And finally, the last Committee Member believed that planning must be ongoing.

The remaining population was closer to consensus. Two agreed that planning efforts should be ongoing in an organization. One of them did comment that planning is typically considered when money is tight. The third member of this group commented, "Depends on short term or long term goals. Depends on funding. Guess it could be used for both."

Question # 10: Should strategic planning be the responsibility of the Executive Director or the Board ?

Five out of six participants were firm in their belief that a Board is responsible for planning. One Committee Member viewed planning as a collaborative effort.

One Committee Member and all of the remaining population made statements which accurately reflected the difficulty this organization had in dealing with staff. The Committee Member commented, "The Board--because the Board oversees what the Executive Director does."

The comments from the remaining population were telling. "The Board. The Executive Director just does what the Board tells them to." This individual added that the Executive Director may decide how but not what.

"The Executive Director is a tool of the Board . He belongs to the Board . . . and that's another problem with these Executive Directors--they often forget who signs their paycheck--and that's a problem.", commented another Board Member.

The last statement was, "The Executive Director works for the Board . The Board should not get so lax that they are taken advantage of." This participant added that the plan is generated by the Board and they can't be in competition with staff.

Question # 11: Describe or compare the functions of the Strategic Planning Committee and the remainder of the Board of Directors through the planning process.

This was a difficult question for a number of participants. The responses were very diverse--based on personal experience and the individual's perspective. Comments from the Committee were very descriptive.

The Committee had the more involved role and had the luxury of chewing on the subject. They looked at the ins and outs and therefore became more familiar, more imbued with the conclusions. [They] internalized it more. Participation versus lecture. The others sensed that they were receiving this [the content of the plan] by lecture whereas the strategic planning members were receiving it by participation so therefore it kind of sinks [in] and there's more ownership.

Another Committee Member stated,

The planning Committee were the little worker bees and the rest of the Board kind of sat on high and were asked to approve or not approve what the planning Committee came up with. I think that in reality the planning Committee was the one that created the document and had the ability to [make decisions comfortably at the Committee level]. We filtered a lot of information which in a sense was bad because we learned a lot from the initial assessment and I don't think that the rest

of the Board got a good feel for that as well as the Committee did. I felt as though the rest of the Board was simply a rubber stamp to what the worker bees put together.

The words of this Committee Member showed some confusion over who was responsible for the plan.

[The Committee's] function was to help you [the Researcher] put it together and then we were to take this plan that you [the Researcher] created and convince the rest of the Board what we need in order to solve our problems. So it was up to us on this Committee to get the others to accept the plan. Their role was to give us feedback, to tell us if what we were doing is right or wrong, maybe suggest things we hadn't even thought of.

Of the remaining population, one stated, "The Committee did the majority of the decision making and work and the remainder of the Board seemed to have very little to do with it. This may be because the rest of the Board did not become involved."

Another commented, "I didn't see the Board ever get real excited." He added that he had to watch the Committee to see that the things he felt strongly about were included in the plan.

The Committee's function was "to keep the Board informed and to make recommendations." The function of the remainder of the Board was "to either approve or suggest changes that they saw necessary in the plan.", stated one Board Member.

Question # 12: Should the person or persons responsible for planning within an organization be trained in strategic planning or should a consultant be brought in?

The Committee Members all saw value in hiring someone to assist with planning. However, two Members commented on some of the disadvantages of the situation.

There's some benefits to somebody from the outside doing it because presumably they can be more objective about what they see. The problem is that it takes a lot of time to educate the planner in the intricacies of each business--so a strategic plan can only go so far. . . It doesn't reach too deep because it is limited by the ability of the planner to assimilate all the intricacies of the [organization]. It's helpful to have somebody from the outside do the work because you don't interrupt work, you don't interrupt regular organizational process and it's a good use of resources.

Another believed that the decision should be based on the size of the organization.

Depends on the size of the organization. There's a benefit to both. If you've got somebody in the organization [and] they understand the organization and they know how it works--they know its history. . .so they can therefore plan in a more realistic environment. The downside is that they're blinded. They don't have the perception that someone from the outside would have. Therefore, I think that in-house you end up perpetuating some of the downsides to your organization. Whereas if you get an outside consultant--they come in with a fresh perspective. They can be objective. They can help you see your organization for what other people see it.

In the end, this participant stated that small organizations should hire a consultant and large organizations should use a combination of both.

The others saw value in bringing in a consultant--for expertise and for mediation.

Summary

Overall the post-interviews were difficult to judge because the data from the remaining population was so thin. Had participants in the remaining population attended Board meetings regularly (less than 50% attendance for this group), there would have been a greater likelihood that comparisons between the two populations would be fair. As it was, it was difficult to draw many conclusions from that portion of the data.

However, the Committee Members' interviews were thoughtful and descriptive. The following themes were found overall:

1. Planning is rational and linear.
2. The organization needed focus and unity.
3. The Committee Members believed that planning is not successful without implementation while the remaining population considered the process successful since there was a product.
4. There is value in discussion.
5. The Board of Directors needs to be more involved in the planning process.
6. Planning is a responsibility of the Board of Directors.
7. It is preferable to hire a planning consultant.
8. Strategic planning is equally useful in the all three sectors.

Conclusion

Generally, the planning process was executed very smoothly by the CHCDC. From my perspective it never became very political. The

Committee Members were open to the planning model I chose and cooperated fully with the direction I took during most sessions. This is not to imply that as a Committee they were not competent and effective. On the contrary, I found their ability to conceptualize programs and formulate strategies to be very impressive.

The content of the plan was based (for the most part) on the input of two key individuals, the President and CM 1. This was a criticism voiced by one Board Member. However, the President was by far the most actively involved with the planning process. Without these two individuals, I don't believe a plan would have been created.

The problems encountered were associated with the organization and not the planning process itself. The Executive Director's resignation mid-way through the process certainly had impact on the Strategic Planning Committee. However, the impact of this on the organization and the Board of Directors was much greater. The need to fill the vacant position was of primary interest to a number of Board Members. I was aware of the significant amount of Board energy dedicated to this issue (instead of planning). In the end, the position was not filled until the plan was completed. Their selection of a new staff member was based on the recommendations in the plan and so was very affirming of the organization's intent to implement the planning recommendations.

Poor attendance from the remaining population, the loss of one Board Member (resignation due to noninvolvement) during the planning process and overall lack of Board Member involvement in the creation of the plan (beyond the Strategic Planning Committee) were typical examples of the organizational problems discussed during Committee meetings. These additional problems impacted the study more than the creation of the plan.

The plan was given strong support by the Committee. Had the two greatest supporters of the plan, the President and CM 1, been less influential with the group overall, the programmatic and structural changes recommended by the Strategic Planning Committee may not have been accepted as easily.

I saw this organization as being primed for change. They had a strong President who shared a vision for the organization with another very influential Board Member and together with the planning process as their vehicle, their recommendations for significant changes were accepted by an otherwise unfocused Board of Directors lacking unity and direction.

The CHCDC's Strategic Plan 1990 - 1993 (see Appendix E) illustrates bold programmatic changes and focuses the organization on a scope of services better defined and delineated than ever before. The Strategic Planning Committee spent hours discussing organizational issues related to policies, practices, roles and relationships. If the recommendations set forth by the Committee are instituted many of the barriers to the organization's success will be eliminated or at least minimized.

CHAPTER FIVE

A PUBLIC COMMISSION

Introduction

This chapter will report the data collected from the Commission for Arts and Culture. The first research question in this study asked how a public commission creates a strategic plan. The second research question asked how the planning process influenced the participants. Participants were divided into two populations--the target population (Strategic Planning Committee Members) and the remaining population (randomly selected Commissioners who did not participate on the Strategic Planning Committee). Data collected during the Strategic Planning Committee meetings addressed the first question. The tapes of the meetings were transcribed and the data was put into a narrative form to create a story of the planning process. Pre-and post-interview data addressed the second research question.

The data is presented in chronological order. Pre-interview data is presented first so that the reader will understand what the participants knew and thought about strategic planning before the planning process began. Interview data is separated into the two populations--the target population and the remaining population. The Researcher identified themes and compared and contrasted the data from the two populations.

A lengthy narrative describing the planning process follows the pre-interview data. The narrative is divided into sections, each covering one meeting (either a Strategic Planning Committee meeting or a regular Commission meeting). Commissioner's names are not used. Committee

Members are anonymously coded CM 1 and 2 (for Committee Member 1 and 2). Other members of the Committee are identified by their title or role in the Committee (Executive Director or Community Representative). True to the genre of storytelling, each meeting is presented as an episode. The players are introduced, the goals identified and the plot is developed.

Finally, the post-interview data is presented following the planning narrative. The post-interview data described the participants' response to the planning process. It is presented in the same manner as the pre-interview data. The chapter closes with concluding remarks.

History of the Commission for Arts and Culture

In February of 1988 the City Council of the City of San Diego created the Commission for Arts and Culture. It was the purpose and intent of the City Council to establish the Commission to serve in an advisory capacity to the Mayor, City Council, and City Manager on promoting, encouraging, and increasing support for the arts.

The Commission was assigned the responsibilities of making all cultural arts granting recommendations for City funding to the City Council and promoting art in public places throughout the neighborhoods of San Diego.

The duties and functions of the Commission included: (a) advocacy for arts funding; (b) developing, coordinating, and evaluating City cultural arts policy; (c) advocacy for cultural arts locally, nationally and internationally; and (d) serving as the State/Federal local arts program partner.

The 15 member Commission is appointed by the Mayor. Commissioners serve for terms of 1-3 years. The Commission staff reports to the City Manager's Office.

Composition of Target Population

For the purpose of this study, the members of the Strategic Planning Committee were considered the target population. The Executive Director and I were responsible for the composition of the Committee.

Commissioners who had demonstrated a strong and unbiased interest in a wide range of arts and cultural issues were considered. Two Commissioners, the Executive Director and a representative from the arts and cultural community agreed to participate. The Commission Chairman was considered an ex-officio member of the Committee. Since the Chairman did not attend any of the Committee meetings, his interviews were included as part of the remaining population.

Collectively, Strategic Planning Committee Members had significant experience with other nonprofit and public organizations (board and staff roles in arts, cultural and other types of organizations), community organizing experience, legal knowledge, and arts administration experience. Interests ranged from community and neighborhood arts and culture to public art and advocacy issues. Their range of experience with strategic planning went from almost no experience with planning to involvement with consultants hired to create cultural plans, needs assessments, and community master plans. No committee member had direct experience with strategic planning.

The Committee Members, as part of the target population, were interviewed prior to and following the planning process. These interviews were in addition to their participation in six months of Strategic Planning Committee meetings.

Composition of Remaining Population

Four additional Commissioners were randomly selected to participate in pre- and post-interviews. These individuals, the remaining population in this study, were interviewed as a comparison to the Strategic Planning Committee and had the same role (except for the interviews) as did other Commissioners who did not participate on the Strategic Planning Committee. This group of four (to which the Commission Chairman was added to total five interviews) included a physician, a professor and artist, an arts administrator and actress, a former actress and active board member and patron of many large institutional nonprofit organizations, and an attorney with a long history of experience with public advisory boards. All five individuals had extensive experience working with nonprofit organizations (board and staff roles). Their experience with strategic planning ranged from no experience to participation in and/or exposure to informal planning efforts.

Pre-Interview Data

Introduction

Pre-interviews were conducted from April through July, 1989. I met with the participants at their convenience. Nine interviews were conducted. They ranged from 20 minutes to over an hour in length. All interviews but one were scheduled during working hours. I met with two of the nine participants in their home, one in my home and all others in their offices or the Commission office.

The pre-interviews with the target population differed from the interviews with the remaining population in that the Committee Members seemed to be aware that the interview was the beginning of a long process that they had volunteered to be a part of. For the remaining population the

interviews seemed to be viewed as a special request. This difference between populations was evidenced by the responses and the tone of the individual interviews.

The target population was thinking about the prospect of beginning the planning process. Already they had a vested interest in the outcome. Even though they did not have specific information about what we would be doing as a Committee, they seemed more sensitized to the potential impact that planning process might have upon the Commission as a whole and themselves as individuals.

On the other hand, the remaining population seemed not to be thinking about the planning process. They knew that the Commission had agreed to participate in this study, but since they had not volunteered to be a part of the Committee, they seemed content to leave the burden of the commitment to their peers--the two Commissioners in the target population.

The interviews varied in length from individual to individual. However, the shortest interviews were with the Executive Director and the Commission Chairman. Each seemed to be very cautious and unwilling to say too much. The longest interviews were with the two Commissioners in the target population. This was most likely due to their interest in and commitment to the newly formed Strategic Planning Committee and their willingness to speak with me more informally.

I found the data from the shorter interviews to be politically conservative and cautiously presented. Some of the longer interviews included information showing personal biases. On a number of occasions the participants were uncomfortable having their words taped and so asked me to stop the tape so that they could freely explain their thoughts.

As a participant/observer, the information given to me off the record was still very helpful. The better informed I was about the Commission and the thoughts and concerns of the individual Commissioners, the better equipped I would be to facilitate the planning process.

The pre-interview guide included 16 questions. The majority of these questions were included for the purpose of collecting data pertinent to the planning process. The data from a select number of questions is reported in this section.

Question # 1: How would you define planning?

The responses to this question were very similar between the two populations. Almost every participant looked at planning as decision making--a very neat, rational, structured, linear process. Planning was, to them, the way to achieve a goal, an idea, a vision. The plan was the road map, formula or course.

The response which best reflected the essence of Bryson's (1988) idea of planning came from a participant in the remaining population who said,

My Chinese way to explain planning is you set a goal and you realistically--I say realistically, you have to know what really is the task and what is your strength and weaknesses, how you can go about doing that [achieving the goal]. Is it realistic? If it is, how can you do it most efficiently without running around the circle a lot. What is the best way to do it--the most efficient way to do it.

Responses from the target population described planning as "an idea of what you want to accomplish", "a road map of how you want to make your idea a reality". The Executive Director saw planning as getting to a vision. One Commissioner saw it as "organized and documented".

The remaining population used the words "map", "formula", and "course". One participant mentioned research and evaluation.

Question # 2: How would you define strategy?

Whereas planning was decision making according to most participants, strategy acknowledged the thought involved in the planning process.

Strategy was the method—the how of planning.

The political nature of strategy was intimated by a number of participants. One Commissioner in the target population saw strategy as learning how to get something done, doing something for someone (quid pro quo) building a coalition to get something passed. Another Committee Member saw part of strategy as "just being aware of whose toes you might step on." One Commissioner in the remaining population saw strategy as a "planned approach." "It's manipulated really, a calculated approach to how you want to get things done", she said.

Other ideas from the target population included: bringing together everything you know to accomplish what you want, knowing how to use information, and carefully orchestrated maneuvers. One Commissioner saw strategy as "subtle."

One participant in the remaining population mentioned looking for the "least hurtful way", another said it was figuring out the "wisest way" to get somewhere. One Commissioner said that sometimes it was asking, "What are you willing to give up?"

Question # 3: Do you have any specific concerns related to the process of strategic planning?

There was no real difference between the populations in response to this question. The answers were varied and diverse. Two Commissioners in the remaining population had no concerns.

One Commissioner in the target population was concerned about people becoming "personally offended." "Everybody gets so angry at these things", she said. The Executive Director was interested in having an evaluation mechanism built into the process. The other Commissioner on the Committee was concerned that not enough Commissioners were able to see the "broader picture",

In other words, it's fine for us to sit and 'blue sky' all we want but the facts of the matter are we have to go through the existing system no matter how difficult or how many road blocks there are and we have to do it as well as we can in order to come out with a satisfactory result and I think that's where the strategy will be extremely important.

The remaining population was interested in the political nature of the Commission's position. There was some discussion of the importance of the planning process being "fluid. . . not static", "Although we can plan generally . . . the Commission needs to be in a position where we can change our plan on a regular basis.", said one Commissioner.

Another Commissioner in the remaining population was concerned for the Commissioners' ability to act as a group, to "have one strategy . . . a single mind so to speak. . . . So I think that it's important that we also have the same vision and that we try to implement the same strategy."

Question # 4: What are your thoughts regarding how the Commission will respond to the strategic planning process?

The responses to this question were split between positive and negative comments. Both populations were split down the middle. However, for both populations, this question raised a number of related concerns regarding the Commission and individual Commissioners.

One Commissioner on the Strategic Planning Committee was concerned about how the personal agendas of individual Commissioners might impact the planning process. The Executive Director saw the Commission as mixed. Some would find planning important and some "won't understand why we're taking the time", she said. But in the end, she believed, "they'll be very appreciative."

A few Commissioners in the remaining population were concerned about the political environment in which the Commission functioned. Narrow agendas and the need to see the big picture were again mentioned. On the positive side, one Commissioner saw the planning process as a way to help "a group of people so busy" get things accomplished. Another said, "the Commission is ready and willing to implement some very progressive plans but it's going to have to come with the support of a lot of different kinds of people", referring to the political environment.

Question # 5: What do you see as the primary goal of the organization?

There was a range of responses to the question of the primary goal for the Commission. In general, there was consensus although the specific responses were very broad based. Responses included: being recognized as a primary advocate for arts in San Diego, building coalitions within the city and every neighborhood, enhancing the level of culture in the community, providing a climate of support for artists and arts organizations of San Diego, and funding artistically worthy institutions, organizations and artists of San Diego for the benefit of the entire community of San Diego.

Additional Data

Additional information obtained through pre-interviews addressed the role of the Commission, the role of the Executive Director, and relationships

between the Commission and others. The role of the Commission was not clearly seen as the same for the individuals interviewed. While some believed that the role of the Commission was to advocate for arts and culture, others found the role as being responsible for the allocation of City funds to arts and cultural organizations. Still others saw the role of the Commission as a link in the political process or a programming arm of City government. The pre-interviews were completed before the Commission had completed its first year and the confusion over role issues was somewhat predictable.

The Executive Director's role was seen, by a number of those interviewed, as the professional who assisted the Commission. This position was seen as providing a service to the Commission. Some individuals saw the role of the Executive Director as being more creative than others did. The Executive Director saw herself in the role of educating the Commissioners about the role of a local arts agency. More specific duties which were named by Commissioners included fundraising, supervising staff, representing the Commission on a state and national level, developing programs, and providing continuity between Commissioner turnover.

Comments regarding the relationship between the Commission and the Executive Director were split between those individuals who perceived the relationship as good and those who were still unclear as to what kind of relationship should exist. Those who were unclear believed that the current relationship could be better defined and improved.

The Commission's relationships with their constituents, the City Manager's Office, and the City Council were the topic of the last few interview questions. The Commission's relationship with the City Manager's Office was viewed in a positive light for the most part. The Commission's relationship with the City Council was a concern for almost everyone

interviewed. Comments made about the Commission's relationship with their constituents clearly indicated there was no consensus on who their constituents were. This was a concern for the Strategic Planning Committee.

Summary

The pre-interview data was, for the most part, consistent between the two populations. Collectively, the participants represented very little experience with strategic planning.

There were a few themes found in the pre-interview data. Most visible were the direct comments, references and intimations regarding the political nature of the Commission's work. Being part of a public commission, especially during the City's budget process (the interviews were conducted during the budget process), Commissioners were dismayed at the complexity of trying to exist in such a complex political environment. The first year was a learning experience for many of the Commissioners. Some considered the political arena a challenge while some considered it a nuisance.

Individual Commissioners having personal agendas posed a concern for a number of the Commissioners interviewed. The Commission's ability to see the big picture of how impact arts and culture in San Diego had real importance to some of the interview participants. These two related themes and the political nature of a government-appointed commission played a major role in the planning process.

The pre-interviews allowed me to build a rapport with a significant number of Commissioners and helped educate me regarding their individual ideas, interests, and concerns. A good deal of data was collected which was helpful during the planning process.

The Strategic Planning Process

Introduction

As the consultant facilitating the planning process, I prepared the agenda and handouts and facilitated each meeting. A three-hour block of time had been scheduled for each meeting. Most meetings started late. Most of the business was conducted within a two hour time frame with additional time taken for breaks.

Session One - May 30, 1989

The first meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by all Committee Members except one. In addition to myself, CM 1, the Executive Director and the Community Representative were present. CM 2 was absent.

The first agenda was lengthy and too ambitious for the allotted time. The agenda was: (a) Introductions, (b) Strategic Planning Process, (c) Strategic Planning Committee, (d) Stakeholder Analysis, (e) Update and overview from the Executive Director, (f) Organizational mandates, (g) Organizational objectives, (h) Mission and purpose statements, (i) Organizational goals and objectives, (j) First report to the Commission, (k) Preparation for June Committee meeting, and (l) Future meeting dates.

Included in the handouts were a copy Bryson's (1988) strategic planning model, the Commission's statement of mission and purpose, eight pages of Commission goals and objectives which had been taken from a number of documents (1986 Arts Plan, recommendations made to the City Council before the Commission was established, the Commission's enabling ordinance, a preliminary work plan from the Executive Director, input from the arts and cultural community, etc.), and the results of a brainstorming session held during the first Commission meeting when Commissioners and

staff members discussed their expectations for the Commission and created a vision for the future of arts and culture in San Diego.

I opened the first meeting with introductions and thanks to the Committee Members for their commitment to participate in the study. Committee Members were very quiet and reserved. The agenda and handouts were introduced. An example of a strategic plan from the St. Louis arts commission was passed around and briefly discussed. Goals for the meeting were set (to explain the planning process and to begin the first phase of it). The planning process was outlined using the model included in the handouts. I described each of the eight steps of Bryson's (1988) model.

1. Identifying and agreeing on a strategic planning process.
2. Identifying organizational mandates.
3. Clarifying organizational mission and values.
4. Assessing the external environment (opportunities and threats).
5. Assessing the internal environment (strengths/weaknesses).
6. Identifying the strategic issues facing the organization.
7. Formulating strategies to manage the issues.
8. Establishing an effective organizational vision for the future.

I stopped periodically to define terms unfamiliar to Committee Members.

The tentative schedule for the next six months was then outlined. The first meeting was intended to address steps 1, 2, and 3 of the model. The second meeting would cover steps 4 and 5. The third, fourth and fifth meetings would cover steps 6 and 7. The final meeting in October was designated for step 8. Following this, we had a brief discussion of how to take advantage of a Commission retreat that was scheduled for July (6 weeks away).

Part of my opening comments included a description of the overall purpose of the Committee—to create a three-year strategic plan for the Commission. I opened a discussion of the composition, structure and function of the Committee by asking each Committee Member to describe what skills or interests he or she brought to the table which would contribute to the planning effort. Before they began, I explained my role, as both facilitator and researcher. One Committee Member described his experience with the arts community of San Diego. He hoped that his long history with the San Diego arts community, paired with his background as an actor and his experience as an arts administrator would contribute to the efforts of the group. The Executive Director described her experience with arts planning efforts in other cities. She had a great interest in seeing the arts and cultural community become involved with other community interests. CM 1 was dedicated to cultural pursuits. She had strong ties with City government and the community and hoped that her love for arts and culture would support the efforts of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Other issues related to the Committee included my interest in each member of the Committee having equal voting rights. I explained that this would include the Executive Director and the Community Representative. I described the need and importance for the Executive Director having equal say in the formulation of planning recommendations to the full Commission. The Committee agreed to the request but believed that few issues would be voted upon. Instead, decisions would probably be reached by consensus.

I also explained that the Commission Chairman would be an ex-officio member of the Committee but that he had informed me that he would not be attending meetings unless it was specifically requested. The Mayor's

Assistant for Arts and Cultural Affairs had also been invited to join the Committee. I did not know whether or not he would attend any meetings. The chair for the Strategic Planning Committee would be one of the two Commissioners. Since CM 2 was not present we decided to name the chair next month. I explained that the chair's role was less demanding for this committee because of my involvement. I would write all Committee reports and brief the committee chair before she presented our report during a full Commission meeting. Other duties typical of committee chairs (calling the meeting, setting the agenda, and chairing the meeting) were all handled by me. I outlined the role of the Committee and the role of the remaining Commissioners as they pertained to the planning process. The Committee would formulate recommendations and take them to the full Commission for feedback and approval. The real work of planning would be accomplished on the Committee level.

We moved ahead to agenda item number four, stakeholder analysis. Before beginning, I presented a definition of the term stakeholder. A stakeholder is a person, group, or organization that can affect the Commission's attention, resources, or output, or is affected by that output (Bryson, 1988). A stakeholder analysis is an opportunity for the Strategic Planning Committee to ask who the Commission's key stakeholders are. Generating this list of stakeholders was relatively simple and took only a few minutes of brainstorming. The Executive Director and the Community Representative participated equally. CM 1 was less involved with brainstorming. Little prompting was needed from me to keep the discussion moving. Once a sizable list was accumulated, I asked which stakeholders were important. Which were the key ones? I read through the list and suggested we prioritize them. This started very slowly. CM 1 suggested that

we break the list into groups. This was agreed upon and accomplished quickly and easily.

The groups were identified as funding groups, arts and cultural organizations and individual artists, and consumers. I asked the Committee to respond to four questions (Bryson, 1988) regarding each of the categories.

1. What is their [e.g. funders] stake in the Commission?
2. What is their criteria for judging the performance of the Commission?
3. How well does the Commission perform according to these criteria?
4. How do these stakeholders influence the Commission?

These questions encouraged a lengthy discussion that started quite slowly with each Committee Member interacting directly with me but not as a group. After a significant amount of discussion had occurred, Committee Members warmed up to the topic and began talking more among themselves. The Committee Members avoided criticism of the Commission.

The Executive Director jokingly suggested that a rating system (1-4) should to be used to answer the four analysis questions [This was done very successfully with the CHCDC but the idea was not taken seriously by this Committee.]. In the end, the analysis was entirely qualitative. As the group progressed through the stakeholder analysis, the Executive Director and the Community Representative presented a great deal of information. CM 1 was significantly less talkative on the whole, but listened very intently and remained the most analytical participant in the discussion—questioning the accuracy and completeness of responses. I questioned, asked for clarification of issues and comments, repeated significant points, and summarized information. The Executive Director stated that what was lacking with many of the groups of stakeholders was a clear understanding of what a local arts

agency is and is supposed to do. This point was made by her on a number of occasions. What became clear to me after a significant period of discussion was that the one participating Commissioner (CM 1), by virtue of the newness of the Commission, was just not as familiar with the issues being discussed as were the Executive Director and the Community Representative (both arts administration professionals). As we progressed, the Committee Members loosened up some and began to interact better with one another but the discussion remained polite.

I explained that a stakeholder analysis is important for a number of reasons. The Committee would need to decide who they wished to inform that the Commission was creating a three-year plan. They also needed to decide who, inside or outside of the organization, should become involved in the process. The Commission might find it helpful to tell certain organizations or individuals (for community relations purposes) that they were in the process of planning. Also, other individuals and organizations might be involved in order to obtain feedback about how well the Commission was performing. And finally, a stakeholder analysis is a preliminary step in the process of assessing an organization.

The Executive Director explained that some data from the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations was already available. The Committee discussed how to obtain and utilize data. CM 1 suggested that the Commission sponsor a forum for individuals and groups to speak directly to the Commission and offer feedback regarding the Commission's performance during its first year, the participants' ideas for the future, etc. The Executive Director explained that that too had already been done (meaning the mechanism for bringing together arts and cultural organizations was in place). The Community Representative suggested that it was too early to ask

for that kind of feedback. He suggested that the Commission had not been around long enough. The arts and cultural community needed more exposure to the work of the Commission before this sort of feedback should be sought. The Executive Director described the mechanism for feedback that was already in place and expressed concern for the risk involved in asking representatives from organizations how they felt about the work of the Commission so soon after the completion of the Allocations Program (the Commission was responsible for making recommendations to the City Council regarding the allocation of millions of dollars to nonprofit arts and cultural organizations), but agreed to it in the end. CM 1 said that the Commission should take the opportunity to see how the organizations responded to the first year's work.

I summarized the discussion by stating that there were two key stakeholders that had been referred to numerous times so far. The arts and cultural organizations would be involved in the planning process by asking for their feedback during a roundtable discussion. I asked how the Committee wanted to involve the other stakeholder—the City Council? Did the Committee want any feedback from Councilmembers during the planning process? Since the budget process for the next year was not completed, we decided to wait until final decisions were made before any interaction between the Commission and the City Council would occur. I asked how we might involve City Councilmembers. We discussed preparing interview questions for individual Commissioners to use with individual City Councilmembers. We strategized how best to approach the City Council. The Executive Director suggested that this issue should be placed on the next Commission agenda to seek input from other Commissioners.

To complete the stakeholder analysis discussion I brought us back to the last category of stakeholders (consumers). By this time, interaction among Committee Members had greatly improved. The Executive Director continued in her role of offering information. CM 1 remained more analytical than the others. I facilitated the discussion by summarizing, drawing conclusions, reviewing, and checking for the accuracy and consistency of the Committee's interpretations.

The outcomes of the stakeholder analyses were that I agreed to facilitate a roundtable discussion with representatives from arts and cultural organizations and also that Commissioners would be asked to meet with members of the City Council to obtain feedback useful to the planning process, and 3) additional information would be obtained from existing documentation (surveys and reports). I made the point that the three-year plan would coincide with what remained of the Mayor's term in office. The implementation of this plan could be a tool to help secure the Commission's future under a new Mayor.

I then suggested that we move to the next agenda item, a progress report and overview from the Executive Director. The purpose of the report from the Executive Director was to bring everyone up-to-date on a number of organizational issues which had not been given much attention during the allocations program (the work of the last few months). The Executive Director briefly covered budget and program issues.

According to Bryson (1988),

Before an organization can define its mission and values, it must know exactly what it is required to do and not do by external authorities.

These requirements are likely to be codified in laws, ordinances, articles

of incorporation, or charters, and so may be easier to uncover and clarify than the organization's mission. (p. 93)

In this case, I laid out the documentation which would be included in this category (enabling ordinance, Rules & Regulations, Conflict of Interest Code, etc.) and suggested that since the Commission was not even a year old, these documents would probably be very current and need not be examined too closely. Regarding budgets, I explained that the 1990 fiscal year budget would be accepted as a finished product which we would work with. Budgets for 1991 and 1992 would be discussed as the planning process continued. A rest break was called.

When the meeting resumed, the Community Representative wanted to discuss the Mayor as a separate stakeholder. Further discussion ensued which identified the Mayor, the media, and private contributors as stakeholders. If and how these stakeholders might become part of the planning process was also discussed. It was agreed that the Mayor's Assistant for Arts and Cultural Affairs would represent the Mayor in the planning process and that the media would be involved when the plan was released. Also, the plan could be used as a tool in working with potential contributors. I reviewed the new information added to the stakeholder analysis and asked for acceptance of the final decisions (listed above). The decisions were agreed upon.

Throughout this discussion and the earlier ones, my job was to stay on top of all the information that was presented through discussion and from the handouts. I continually tried to assimilate new information as it was juggled and examined by the committee so that I could summarize, clarify, and review. The Executive Director showed great interest in the internal organizational issues. The two other Committee Members, CM 1 and the

Community Representative, contributed more information related to the larger political process.

The mission statement and statement of purpose were introduced for discussion. Bryson's exercise designed to help create a mission statement provided a guide by which to check the adequacy of the Commission's mission statement. This exercise included a series of questions:

1. Who are we?
2. In general, what are the basic social and political needs we exist to fill or the social and political needs we exist to address?
3. In general, what do we want to do to recognize or anticipate and respond to these needs or problems?
4. How should we respond to our key stakeholders?
5. What is our philosophy and what are our core values?
6. What makes us distinctive or unique? (Bryson, 1988, p. 105).

I introduced and explained the exercise and then asked the Committee to review the mission statement. The Executive Director's suggestion that, "maybe we should not let this [the mission statement] drive us but [instead] let the planning process drive us," was accepted by the Committee after some discussion and clarification. The decision was made to put the current mission statement aside until the plan was completed. Because the Commission was established by the Mayor and City Council, the duties of the group were outlined by an enabling ordinance. The language of the mission statement was up to the discretion of the Commission but the content was mandated by the Mayor and the City Council.

In discussing the request to bypass the mission statement and purpose statement until further along in the planning process, Committee Members voiced concern as to whether or not they could alter any part of the planning

process. Their concern was related to the fact that the planning process was the essence of my study. They wanted to know if a change would alter the study. I again explained that although I was the facilitator of the planning process and also conducting research, the primary goal was the successful creation of a strategic plan. One of the research questions in this study asked how a public commission creates a plan. I did not intend to manipulate or control the evolution of the planning process. I was interested in depicting a realistic account of it.

We were running short of time and the last agenda item of importance related to the Commission's goals. I explained that I would be sending everyone home with an assignment. Each committee member would need to read through the remaining handouts from the agenda packet. The handouts included a number of documents which described the goals and objectives of the Commission. The 1986 Arts Plan for the City of San Diego, the recommendations from the Cultural Arts Task Force (1987), the Commission's enabling ordinance, the Executive Director's work plan for 1988, feedback received from the Arts and Culture Roundtable, results from the first Commission brainstorming session, the Fund for Art Summary objectives, and pre-interview data from Commissioners all included goals and/or objectives for the Commission or for arts and culture in the City of San Diego. These documents reported goals and objectives which were broad, diverse and contradictory. It would be the responsibility of the Committee to sort through these lists in order to edit, condense, or eliminate certain statements. The Committee would then select a series of issues which would eventually be addressed by the strategic plan. I requested that each Committee Member sort through all of the information and return prepared to create a list of goal-topic recommendations. This list of goal-topics would go the the

full Commission for approval. Once approved, they would become the headings for the major components of the plan.

The Executive Director asked whether or not we should present a list of goals to the Commission during the Commission retreat (scheduled for six weeks later). I explained that the Committee might want to present a list of issues or goal-topics to the Commission. This kind of list would describe topics but would not state specific, measurable goals. The Committee would later develop a specific goal or goals under each heading.

We walked through each handout. Some of the documents were unfamiliar to the Committee so I explained their origin and presented a brief analysis of each document. I explained that in sorting through the lists, the Committee must decide upon a list of topics to "own" so that they could move forward. Each Committee member was asked to return to the next meeting with a short list of topics they were willing to adopt and develop.

To close, I asked the group if they wanted to report anything at the next Commission meeting. The Executive Director suggested that the Committee report include that we had met, what was discussed and the request that Commissioners make appointments to see City Councilmembers as part of the stakeholder analysis. This raised the question of how we would create the questions for Commissioners to use with the City Council. One Committee member believed that we must have questions to show the Commissioners at the meeting in order for them to agree to the interviews. The discussion went back and forth regarding this issue. In the end the Committee agreed that the Executive Director and I would work on a draft of questions. The Commissioners could either accept, revise, or reject them during the June Commission meeting. The Executive Director reminded the Committee that

CM 1 would have to make the Committee report at the next Commission meeting because CM 2 was not present. CM 1 agreed to do this.

I closed the first meeting by describing the agenda for the June Committee meeting. The Committee would discuss goals and begin to look at internal organization issues. The Arts and Culture Roundtable would meet prior to this and I would prepare stakeholder data along with a report on pre-interview data. Committee Members were reminded to work through the goals and objectives in preparation for creating a list of goal-topics at the next meeting. A tentative June meeting date was agreed upon and would be confirmed by CM 2.

First Scheduled Report to the Commission (June 24, 1989)

The June meeting of the Commission was cancelled because there was not enough business to warrant a meeting being called. The first opportunity for the Strategic Planning Committee to report to the full Commission was postponed until July.

Session Two (July 5, 1989)

The second meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by all Committee Members. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Report on stakeholder feedback, (c) Re-evaluating planning strategy (coming up-to-date on budget issues), (d) Recommendations of end-goals, (e) Consensus on SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats), (f) Periodic SWOT Analyses, (g) Commission report, and (h) Date and agenda for next meeting. The only handout for the meeting was nine pages of pre-interview feedback from the Strategic Planning Committee Members and other Commissioners.

The meeting started with laughter and friendly conversation. The atmosphere was significantly lighter than it had been during the first

meeting. The addition of CM 2 seemed to make a difference. I presented the goals for the meeting. As each goal (agenda item) was explained, its value in the planning process was described. I introduced the term end-goal to the Committee. The idea of end-goals was appropriate and successful with the CHCDC and I thought that it would be for the Commission. Working with end-goals meant that the organization would decide upon a set of goals attainable by the end of the three-year planning period. The plan would describe how the organization would reach the goal within the allotted time. In the end this was not a successful strategy for the Commission. The concept of goal-topics was better utilized. Goal-topics describe topic areas which would later become the components of the plan. Once goal-topics are agreed upon, specific goals are created and objectives and strategies are devised for each one.

While re-evaluating the planning strategy, CM 2 raised the point that the Commission will suffer financially because they were not fast enough in spending the money that was already in the budget. The City Council chose to take back a significant amount of money that had been allocated for a particular program but not spent. This raised the point of whether or not careful planning and thoughtful decision making would pay off when the fiscal operations of the Commission were ultimately controlled by the City Council. We discussed what could be done without any program money and whether or not there was value in spending time planning when there was no guarantee that the Commission would ever be allocated additional program funds.

This discussion was important and introduced two themes in the meeting. The first was how the Commission could accomplish anything without program funds. Too many people already considered the

Commission to exist only for the purpose of recommending the allocation of City funds to arts and cultural organizations. Without program funds, this assumption could become a reality. I explained that this issue was linked to an issue raised by the pre-interview data. Not all of the Commissioners agreed as to who their constituents were. This and the question of how to plan for programs when there was no funding and no promise of future of funding were key issues. The former was tied directly to the Committee's concern about the public's perception of the Commission. The Executive Director explained that the current mission statement does not mention the citizens and it should.

The issue of how to show programmatic accomplishments without program funds or additional staff was discussed. CM 1 explained that she was very familiar with this kind of situation because she worked with a County commission that had no money and no staff. She explained that getting out into the community may not look like a product but it was a valuable accomplishment. The Community Representative added that service to the people needs to be translated in a way that shows product. CM 1 was concerned that their actions may backfire if the Commission went out into the communities. CM 2 explained that they had tried this before and it had backfired but they had not done it properly. They would not make the same mistakes again.

The addition of CM 2 at this meeting seemed to really impact the atmosphere. She created a lighter, more informal tone that encouraged more laughter and easy rapport. The Executive Director continued to ground everything in organizational terms and issues. CM 1 and 2 were much more idea and problem solving oriented. CM 1 was the most analytical of the

group. CM 2 the most chatty. The Community Representative was still relatively quiet. He tended to support the comments made by others.

Community outreach was further examined by CM 1 and 2. They expressed the importance of community outreach and involvement as a means to provide services, share information and create plans for future programs.

I wanted to discuss the public's impression of the Commission. I polled the Committee Members for their perspective on this. There was agreement that the public had no real understanding of the Commission and its work. What the Commission is and what it is supposed to do were not publicly known. CM 2 described how even some Commissioners did not know the answer to those questions when they were appointed. I suggested that this was something to keep in mind as we continued the planning process. I allowed this discussion to progress for over 30 minutes. I thought that the group was raising some very pertinent issues that would be foundational to the philosophy behind the plan. I did not push ahead until the Committee was finished with their discussion.

During a lunch break I began the discussion of the goals for the Commission. Only one committee member had come prepared. The Executive Director wanted to simply adopt the work plan she had begun in 1988. She said that it would be a good basis from which to work. Her idea was passed over by the other Committee Members. I asked the group to identify what issues stood out as they read through the material. The list of goal-topics was generated this way. The discussion continued for about 30 minutes. The Executive Director and CM 2 presented ideas and CM 1 and the Community Representative remained more analytical as each idea was thoroughly examined.

The discussion digressed while the Committee ate lunch but moved back on track as soon as we were finished. After all committee members had contributed and each topic was discussed, I summarized the discussion and reviewed the list of goal-topics. The original list of goal-topics was arts and cultural organizations and individual artists, policy issues, relationship with City Council, community outreach, public art, and funding.

I asked the committee to compare this list with the list of primary goals included in the pre-interview data. I asked if the committee believed that the list of goal-topics addressed all of the primary goals. All primary goals had been addressed. CM 2 said that the Committee needed to do a better job of including culture and cultural diversity issues in our work. Commissioners who participated in pre-interviews had been asked about other goals related to the Commission that were of importance to them. Three of these were not addressed by the list of goal-topics. One was a staffing issue considered by the Committee to be impossible to attain in three years, another was a policy issue regarding the allocation of funds and the last was not viewed to be in the purview of the Commission as far as the Committee Members were concerned. All other goals were included. I asked if the Committee would be willing to recommend this list of goal-topics to the Commission. Agreement to do so was quickly reached.

This reference to the Commission meeting raised the discussion of future meetings of the Commission and the Executive Committee. The group moved off on a tangent. I wanted to wind up the meeting. As homework, the Committee was asked to review the interview feedback and begin thinking about an assessment of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The Executive Director commented that she believed that the Commission did not understand her role. CM 2 made some suggestions and

it was decided that this confusion would be discussed along with the other internal weaknesses.

Returning to the discussion of the coming Commission retreat, I asked how the Committee felt about requesting the Commission to discuss how much programmatic time should be spent with each of the goal-topics. The Committee made positive comments about this suggestion. CM 1 wanted to know what the end product of the retreat was to be. The Executive Director described the intent. The day was intended to provide the opportunity to discuss the first year of the Commission--what had gone wrong and what had been successful. The Community Representative wanted to know if I would be facilitating it. I said that I would have some small part but that I wondered if someone else would not be more persuasive with the Commissioners. I was reluctant to present any information on behalf of the Committee for fear that it would not be perceived as important coming from a non-Commissioner. The Community Representative explained that an outsider would be the best choice to facilitate a discussion of the internal dynamics of the Commission. CM 1 agreed and said that whoever does make the presentation must be accepted by the Commission and must be convincing.

I wanted the Commission to have a productive discussion of the pre-interview data during the retreat. CM 1 suggested that discussion questions could be created. I offered a few suggestions.

1. What are the roles of the Commission and the Executive Director?
2. What should their relationship be?
3. How can the Commission improve their relationship with the City Council?

I explained that this discussion was separate from the the Strategic Planning Committee Report.

CM 2 said that she was confused. It seemed to her that the Commission Chairman didn't want the Committee to make a report. The Executive Director explained that the Chairman did not want the day to be structured but she did not want to miss the opportunity to discuss strategic planning. The Executive Director also thought that CM 2 needed to push for the Committee's report at the next Executive Committee meeting. CM 2 wanted to motivate the Commission through the discussion at the retreat.

I outlined what could be done by suggesting that before the retreat I would speak to the Committee Members and hear from them now they felt about the percentage of programmatic time allocated to each goal-topic. Then at the retreat the list of goal-topics would be presented for discussion with a recommended time allocations. Through the discussion of some questions (e.g., What is the Commission capable of accomplishing in three years and how should that list be prioritized?), the Commission can decide upon what strategic issues they would like to tackle during the next three years. The goal-topics and the strategic issues would become the foundation of the plan.

I went on to say that this discussion was important because not all of the goal-topics were straight forward. The Executive Director was concerned that if we gave them recommendations it would seem like we were giving them the answers. I explained that that was the role of the Committee. The Committee made recommendations and the Commission gave feedback and approval. What we needed from Commissioners was recommendations for strategic issues falling under each goal-topic heading. CM 2 supported this and wanted confirmation that she was to bring this up during the next Executive Committee. Who should present the Committee report at the retreat was discussed. I said that it shouldn't be me but that I would send all the information out to the Commission prior to the retreat. A cover letter

would explain the information mailed, how it had been obtained, the conclusions and how they were drawn, and what Commissioners could expect to discuss during the retreat.

During the meeting I explained that I had entered this study with the intention of remaining in the facilitator role but was finding it hard not to offer feedback or ideas. The meeting closed with the group setting the date for the next Committee meeting.

Commission Retreat (July 24, 1989)

As promised during the second Strategic Planning Committee meeting, prior to the retreat I sent out a packet of information to all Commissioners. The packet included a cover letter describing what the Committee had accomplished so far, how they had reached their conclusions and recommendations, and what they would be presenting during the retreat for the Commission's approval. The letter also outlined specific instructions for the Commissioners to read the collection of goal, interview feedback, and list of goal-topics included in the mailing. I included my phone number for anyone with questions. I received no calls.

At the retreat, Commissioners were given three handouts. The first was a two-page overview of the planning process which described each of the steps of planning and how the Committee had addressed them or how they intended to address them. A copy of the planning model was also attached. The third handout was a report on the feedback received during the Arts and Culture Roundtable held the week before the retreat. During the Roundtable four questions regarding the Commission, its performance and its relationship to the arts and cultural organizations were posed to the participants. As the facilitator of the Roundtable, I charted all responses and created a report of the data.

The retreat was attended by all but three Commissioners, the Executive Director and her secretary, the Mayor's Assistant for Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Deputy City Manager (briefly), and the Researcher. The afternoon was split between a discussion of what went right and what went wrong for the Commission during its first year (generally, and specifically related to the Allocations Program) and the report from the Strategic Planning Committee. There was no facilitator for the morning discussion. In the end, only two topics were discussed (the Allocations Program and the issue of culture). The Strategic Planning Committee report was begun by CM 2 but eventually I was called upon to explain the data in the mailing and the handouts. In the end, nothing was accomplished. The Commissioners got hung up on the idea of allocation of time. Only a few had read the handouts. There were not enough informed people present to carry a discussion. The only progress that was made was that I had the opportunity to explain the planning process in more detail by going over the two-page description and the model. The Commissioners were not interested in discussing the interview feedback or the results of the Arts and Culture Roundtable. The Strategic Planning Committee left with no more than they had entered with.

Session Three (July 31, 1989)

The third meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was held one week after the retreat. All Committee Members were in attendance except CM 2. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Retreat de-briefing, (c) Progress report, (d) Consensus on SWOT (utilizing interview feedback and roundtable results), (e) Periodic SWOT Analyses, (f) Expansion of goal-topics, and (g) August Commission meeting. Agenda items (d) and (e) were carried over from the previous meeting. The Handouts were eight pages of interview feedback and a one page listing of the goal-topics.

I began the meeting by going over the goals for the meeting in more detail and describing the handouts. CM 1 was the first to comment on the retreat after I introduced the topic for discussion. "I was disappointed in the way they [the Commissioners] dealt with it as a topic on the agenda. That would be the very least I would say. I'm not convinced that they understand what the end product really is going to be." CM 1 went on to explain her interest in having the Commissioners receive a copy of another strategic plan so that they would become more familiar with the intent of the planning committee and would be able to see how a finished product could be used. "I felt it was really given short shift.", she explained.

The committee agreed that having been ignored was preferable to being given a lot of negative feedback. The discussion continued, mostly between CM 1 and the Executive Director. The Executive Director made excuses for the disinterest of the Commissioners in the strategic planning report. CM 1 thought that the information had gone straight over their [the Commissioners] heads. I agreed with CM 1 and said that I was tired of the Commission wanting to put things off to another time. I said that I would send everyone another letter before the next Commission meeting. The letter would include a pep talk and would be attached to a copy of an example of another Commission's strategic plan.

I also suggested that we gain more exposure for the strategic planning committee's issues by piggybacking on the soon to be discussed topic of public relations. This idea introduced the subject of the next regular Commission meeting. I realized that I would not be able to attend and inquired if I should arrange a lunch meeting between the Commission Chairman, the Executive Director and CM 2. I strongly believed that the Chairman needed to buy into the planning process to enable the Committee to move ahead properly.

In response to this, CM 1 thought that the failure of the strategic planning report at the retreat was largely due to the Chairman's disinterest. The Executive Director agreed. She explained that his goal was to have people talk to one another but that he was not good at encouraging that kind of interaction. CM 1 suggested that Commissioners may have found it very difficult to have a truly open discussion with a member of the Mayor's staff in the room. She said that the environment was not relaxed. The Executive Director claimed that there was some spirit of teamwork evidenced at the retreat. CM 1 agreed but said that there was no real good discussion and certainly nothing one would describe as a free for all. The Executive Director and CM 1 together exclaimed that the real free for all was included in the interview feedback received from Commissioners.

This was a good transition into the interview data. I quickly inquired if it would be appropriate for me to call Commissioners to follow up on the goal-topics and allotment of time. The Executive Director said that it would be alright. I also wanted to confirm the lunch meeting with the Chairman to be scheduled for sometime before the August Commission meeting. This was agreed upon.

I moved the discussion to the interview data and explained that the Committee should begin by looking at strengths and weaknesses and trying to categorize them so that they could create a short list that we could address. The discussion that followed was very good. Everyone participated. CM 1 remained more analytical than the others. The list of strengths (by category) agreed upon were: a strong financial base (large Allocations Program), diverse and dedicated Commissioners and Chairman, and support from the Mayor's and City Manager's Offices. The Community Representative stated that what was missing was any statement as to what the Executive Director

had accomplished during the first year. I added that most everyone judges the Commission on the Allocations Program and they don't think of other Commission programs.

The Community Representative related this same problem with a similar one heard during the Arts and Culture Roundtable (Roundtable participants also did not know what the Commission had accomplished during the first year other than the Allocations Program). CM 1 said that one of the other Commissioners indicated that she too was unaware of programs other than the Allocations Program. She added that there is no public relations program, no press releases and no annual report. How are others to know what the Commission accomplishes? She asked about the possibility of producing an annual report. I encouraged it as being appropriate as a follow-up document to the planning document.

Some brainstorming of ideas followed with agreement to using an annual report. The Executive Director commended the Committee for doing a great job of examining weaknesses and addressing them as we moved along. I suggested sending a monthly Executive Director's report (sent out with monthly Commission agendas) to keep Commissioners informed of the work being accomplished. The Executive Director did not seem pleased about the idea of preparing a monthly report. CM 1 supported the idea. No definite decision was made.

I decided to move forward with a discussion of weaknesses. The Committee began to review the list of weaknesses reported in the pre-interview data and tried to categorized them into a smaller list. CM 1 and I were the most active. The categorized list of weaknesses included: biases, prejudices and personal agendas of Commissioners; limited resources (administrative/operations) and lack of staff; the Commission's relationship

with City Council; dissention within the group and the perception of an imbalance of power between different Commissioners; working within a political system and the Commissioners' lack of knowledge of City process; and the organizational structure.

The Committee found the responses regarding the roles of the Executive Director and the Commission and their relationship to be relatively consistent among Commissioners. I asked the Committee Members for their interpretation of the responses. CM 1 expressed concern that too many Commissioners were only familiar with the role and function of nonprofit boards and were very unfamiliar with City process and the role and function of a public commission such as this one.

The Executive Director reported on feedback received from one City Councilmember who said that the Commissioners made mistakes (political errors made out of ignorance of the community) while presenting to City Council. She wanted to know how we could get the Commissioners to become more savvy about these things. Everyone agreed that this was important. I suggested that a speaker be brought before the Commission to discuss governmental process. The Strategic Planning Committee could sponsor an outside speaker who would be knowledgeable and respected by the Commissioners. I made a suggestion of who to ask to speak which was agreed to immediately. The Executive Director and I agreed that this Committee was developing some excellent ideas. After a brief discussion of when to bring in the speaker, the Community Representative reminded the group that all of these issues are related to the education of Commissioners and that these needs were predictable considering the newness of the Commission. CM 1 agreed. The discussion digressed off the topic.

I pulled things back on track by returning to the roles of the Executive Director and Commission and their relationship. This developed into a discussion of how the relationship between the two was perceived by Commissioners. I suggested that the Commissioners may be looking for a stronger relationship--more interaction. CM 1 reminded the group that when you make information available to Commissioners, they don't read it anyway but that maybe their request for a clearer understanding of roles and relationships could be addressed by this Committee. This was tied to the perception of there being a power elite made up of a few Commissioners and the feelings of some Commissioners that their opinion was less valued. Some of this was tied to the organizational structure.

A discussion followed during which a number of alternative strategies to address this weakness were examined. In the end, the group agreed that although the Executive Director was not responsible for hand-holding with individual Commissioners, she may choose to schedule yearly meetings with them to discuss their interests, schedules, thoughts and concerns. This may serve a number of purposes. It strengthens the relationship between the Executive Director and individual Commissioners, and concerns may also be addressed. The Community Representative reminded the committee that this was a low level priority with Commissioners but a high level priority with the arts and cultural community. That kind of interaction was the Executive Director's job.

The Executive Director said that she needed to leave the meeting early. I closed the meeting by saying that we had been very productive but had not completely moved through the agenda. The Committee would have to meet again soon to make up for lost time. A date was set.

Session Four (August 10, 1989)

The fourth session of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by everyone but the Community Representative. The agenda carried over the majority of the items from the previous agenda: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Consensus on the SWOT List, (c) Periodic SWOT Analyses, (d) Expansion of goal-topics, and (e) August Commission meeting. There were no new handouts.

I opened the meeting with a discussion of the upcoming Commission meeting that I would not be able to attend. I reminded the Committee that movement on the goal-topics and feedback on the assessment data was essential. The Chairman's support was also essential. CM 1 asked if someone would be meeting with him. CM 2 reminded the group that if the Chairman does not believe that something is important, he cuts it short. CM 1 asserted that we could at least let the Chairman know that it is important to us. A meeting with the Chairman was discussed. CM 2 said that she would call him. I said that I would be calling the Commissioners during the next week and that I would also try to gain support for the Committee. CM 2 wanted to know what would be covered in the Committee report and whether or not she would have it before the meeting. I told her that I would meet with her beforehand to go over the report.

As I explained, the report would include a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the Commission and the Committee's recommended strategies to address them. These strategies included the meetings between the Executive Director and individual Commissioners, and their meetings with City Councilmembers. CM 2 would need to present our list of goal-topics and get the Commission to come to some agreement regarding the time allotment to each topic. CM 2 questioned what this meant. I explained

that the Committee was trying to get feedback from the Commissioners regarding how much time they believed should be allotted to each topic area. When this information was agreed upon the Committee would be better able to predict how much work could be accomplished in three years. Budgetary concerns would be made more clear also.

I explained that sometime during the meeting we should address how to institute a periodic assessment of the Commission. During the last meeting it was agreed that the Executive Director could meet with individual Commissioners annually to get a reading on the "pulse of the Commission". The Executive Director reminded the Committee that there had been a debate as to whether this was hand-holding or politicking. The Committee chose to look at it as politicking. The Executive Director reminded the group that an Executive Director Report mechanism was also agreed upon (it really had not been agreed upon). CM 1 agreed that Commissioners could be informed of what occurs between meetings this way. Further discussion of the Executive Director's Report followed. CM 2 typically expanded the ideas presented by other Committee Members. CM 1 clarified and analyzed.

We moved to a discussion of the imbalance of energy expended by different Commissioners. CM 2 commented that if the Commissioners don't know what is going on, you can count on the City Council not knowing and the public not knowing either. CM 1 went on to say that the Commissioners' lack of knowledge meant that they would not be able to lobby for the interests of the Commission. This was a serious concern.

I summarized the information and asked what the Committee could do about it. We were dealing with inactive and uninformed Commissioners and an uninformed City Council. The Executive Director said that this is where we develop strategies. The discussion digressed to a discussion of

overall Commission strategy in working with one of the City Council Committees. I let the discussion go for a while and then pulled it back by commenting that this Committee was very unique because it did not turn its back on internal issues. They were doing a great job addressing specific problem areas. CM 1 said that she was looking for quick resolutions to some of these problems so that they could get back on the right track and start accomplishing some things the Committee wanted to do. The discussion digressed again.

I pulled it back again and moved directly to the final parts of the interview data. I reminded the group that they were to try to identify strengths and weaknesses—and in doing so, decide upon what strengths could be capitalized upon and what weaknesses could be addressed. In summarizing the pre-interview data regarding the Commission's relationship with the City Manager's Office, I described that the Commissioners did not seem to understand what kind of relationship it should have with the City Manager's Office. It was decided that this issue should be taken up during the governmental process presentation.

In discussing the Commission's relationship with the City Council (one of the last remaining sections of interview data), I summarized what the Committee had previously agreed upon. CM 2 suggested that the Commissioners be asked what they wanted to discuss during their meetings with City Councilmembers. The strategy for doing this was discussed at some length. I suggested that nine (one per each Councilmember and the Mayor) Commissioners be asked to meet separately to develop a platform and interview questions. This group of nine Commissioners would get the Commission's approval for their recommendations and follow up by

scheduling meetings with City Councilmembers. Within two months they would report back on the results. CM 2 thought this was a great idea.

The strategy for dealing with the Mayor was discussed further. I asked for the Committee's recommendations. They felt that there should be a different strategy for the Mayor. It was agreed that we would ask for nine volunteer Commissioners to prepare for and conduct the meetings with City Councilmembers and the Mayor. The Mayor would be handled separately from the City Council. The exact strategy for how to work with the Mayor was not decided upon.

The final piece of interview data addressed the Commission's relationship with their constituents. As was mentioned before, the Commissioners did not agree upon who their constituents were. CM 1 and 2 said that this was a public relations issue. In the end, the decision was to address this confusion by properly naming the constituents in the mission statement, promoting community outreach efforts in the strategic plan, and promoting the Commission's work through a public relations program. For immediate clarification, one of the goal-topics should specifically state who the constituents were.

Moving on to the results of the Arts and Culture Roundtable (the final category of assessment information), I asked what the Committee would like to do with my report of the data. CM 2 said that she thought the information was important. The Executive Director reminded the Committee that the Commission Chairman was interested in holding a meeting between the Commission and the Roundtable participants (this was a request made during the Roundtable). The Executive Director wanted to discuss how this should occur. Agenda and format suggestions were made by me and other Committee members. The discussion digressed again.

The final subject addressed during this meeting was the goal-topics. I reviewed them and the Committee made editing suggestions. I said that I would send the revised goal-topics to the Commissioners before the next Commission meeting. The meeting closed with the agreement that the Executive Director, CM 2, and I would meet with the Commission Chairman before the Commission meeting to encourage him to support the planning process.

First Report to the Commission (August 18, 1989)

I prepared a written committee report was for CM 2 to present during the Commission meeting. It was a four-part report covering a brief presentation of an example of a strategic plan, the revised goal-topics, time allocations, and strengths and weaknesses. CM 2 was to describe the importance of all Commissioners participating in the planning process. She was to emphasize the Committee's interest in hearing from each of them. The goal-topics had been revised from the retreat but needed further feedback and acceptance. Time allocations needed to be agreed upon. Strengths and weaknesses needed to be discussed. Two specific strategies to address weaknesses were to be recommended, (a) inviting a speaker to address governmental process, and (b) scheduling individual interviews with City Councilmembers.

Since I could not be at this meeting, I asked one of the Committee members to tape the committee report. This was unsuccessful. Only the first 30 minutes of the report were taped. The final portion is missing from my tape and from the official tapes kept by the Commission office. Two Commissioners were absent for the meeting. One was an interview participant in the remaining population.

During the meeting CM 2 introduced the example of a strategic plan from another city. She encouraged the Commissioners to read through it and begin thinking of ways in which to utilize their plan once it was completed. She reminded the Commission that this was the first formal report from the Committee. The goal-topics were brought up for discussion. The Chairman said that the Commission would not make any decisions regarding the allocation of time. He did not want any public statement of priorities. He acknowledged that this information may be useful for internal purposes but after his strong statement against collecting this information, the issue was dropped.

The Commissioners edited the goal-topics. In general, they took the information provided to them much too literally. One Commissioner spoke up and reminded the group that they were dealing with topics—not the actual language that would become part of the planning document. Most of the comments addressed the choice of words and the structure of the statements.

There was a call for a stronger committee structure by one Commissioner. The Chairman cut off CM 2 a few times. Why he had done so was not evident to me. He made a strong plea for adding advocacy as a goal-topic. CM 2 helped clarify the information being presented. Ownership of the progress made by the Committee was continually given to me. Rarely did CM 2 express that what was being presented represented the work of the Committee. Over and over she stated that the work was the researcher's ("Mary's"). This became a theme and a problem throughout the entire planning process.

To begin the discussion of strengths and weaknesses, CM 2 introduced the condensed list prepared by the Committee. She did not encourage discussion. She downplayed sensitive issues (e.g., the belief of some

Commissioners that their opinion was less valuable than others, etc.) and moved directly to the strategies proposed by the Committees. Instead of presenting the strategies (speaker on governmental process and meetings with individual City Councilmembers) as recommendations from the Strategic Planning Committee, CM 2 presented them as recommendations from me-. This was very problematic.

The tape cut off at this point. There was no action taken at the meeting and there was no follow-up on either proposal. Even the minutes reflected the problem with the Commission not taking ownership of their own planning process. The minutes of the this meeting stated, CM 2 "asked the Commission for input on Mary Powers' [the researcher] August 15th, 1989 Strategic Planning Report. Comments were provided on the goals."

Session Five (September 25, 1989)

The fifth meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was attended by all Committee members. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Discussion of Commission meeting, (c) Revised goal-topics, (d) Expansion of goal-topics, (e) Assignment of goal-topics to Committee members, (f) Preparation for next Commission meeting, and (g) Date and agenda for next Committee meeting. The handout was a two page listing of the revised goal-topics.

I opened the meeting by explaining that a great deal of time had been spent assessing the current state of affairs for the Commission and that work must begin on expanding the goal-topics into sections of the plan. First the Committee needed to accept the goal-topics as headings for the sections of the plan. I explained that after this meeting it would be more efficient for me to work with individual committee members once we outlined each goal-topic as a group. In twos or threes we would expand the outlines into sections of

the plan. I would prepare them for the next meeting at which time the full Committee would edit, amend, or expand each section.

I explained that I did not have the final part of the Committee report on tape. I asked how the discussion ended. CM 2 reported that the Chairman liked the idea of bringing in a speaker on governmental process. When asked how the Commission responded to the idea of meeting with City Councilmembers, CM 2 reported that they discussed the meetings. The Commission was interested in meeting with the City Council for allocations purposes--not planning purposes.

Too much time was spent during this meeting strategizing other issues not directly related to planning. I encouraged the group to look at the goal-topics. I explained how I had collected all of the feedback received from Commissioners during the last meeting and then had revised the descriptions to reflect their suggestions and requests. I reviewed the comments made by Commissioners during the last meeting.

The agenda for this meeting listed five questions (Bryson, 1988) to be asked to help expand the goal-topics. I thought that the Committee could address the first three questions during this meeting. The last two questions would need to be covered during individual meetings. The questions were:

1. What are the practical alternatives we might pursue to address this goal-topic?
2. What are the potential barriers to these choices?
3. What major proposals could we pursue to overcome the barriers?
4. What major actions must be taken (with existing staff) over the next three years?
5. What are the specific steps that must be taken over the next six months to one year to achieve the goal?

We worked under the assumption that additional staff would not be forthcoming anytime soon. The financial position (referring to the administrative budget) of the Commission was not favorable at the time of this meeting nor were there any signs that it would improve. I went on to explain that I was having second thoughts about working with a three year time frame. The Commission was very young. Administrative funding was never going to be stable or secure and the Committee might not want to be so precise in saying three years. They might be better off leaving it open ended for now. Nothing was agreed upon.

I then asked for feedback on the idea that we work in twos or threes for the next step (expanding the outlines we would be creating during this meeting) of the process. I explained that I was willing to pull in additional Commissioners if someone was knowledgeable in a particular area. The Committee Members volunteered to work with me on specific goal-topics. Some suggestions were made for me to invite others Commissioners to participate in the next phase.

As a reminder to the group, I asked them to please speak up if they did not like the direction I was taking. As Committee Members they were very much a part of the planning process and I would tailor it to meet their needs.

We began outlining each of the goal-topics. I asked a lot of questions, trying to draw out Committee Members. The two Commissioners and the Executive Director were more active in this discussion than the Community Representative. The discussion followed a similar pattern for each goal-topic. We discussed what was needed in the future and what should be included in the plan to make sure that the document was as useful and valuable as possible.

Each outline set parameters and described ideas on very broad terms. Much of the discussion was directed at clarifying definitions. Each issue had more than one definition. It took quite a bit of time to reach consensus on how to define each area. I reminded the group not to be too idealistic. Sessions like this could be too much like brainstorming when they needed to be oriented to strategy.

Each Committee member remained in what had become their accepted roles. CM 1 was more analytical and provided a reality check. CM 2 offered lots of ideas and support for others' ideas. The Executive Director grounded most everything in organizational terms and the Community Representative was less involved but helpful by representing the community's needs and providing the history in which to base a number of issues.

Throughout the discussion the Committee contemplated the status quo before moving on to ideas for the future. Questions like 'Who are we?' and 'What is our role?' were considered many times.

To wind up the meeting I asked how much work could reasonably be accomplished before the next Commission meeting. CM 2 said that she would not be at the next meeting to make a Committee report. This left the responsibility to CM 1. The Executive Director clarified that I would be flushing out the outlines. She did not mention the Committee Members being involved in this process. I suggested that we complete the expansion of the goal-topics in small groups and then meet again as a Committee. We would try to have well developed outlines prepared for the Commissioners to read before the next meeting.

This meeting was closed with comments about the date and agenda for the next committee meeting.

Session Six (October 24, 1989)

The sixth meeting of the strategic planning committee was very brief (less than one hour) and not very productive. All Committee Members were present. The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Review outlines, (c) Strategy for next Committee report, and (d) Date and agenda for the last meeting. The only handout was eight pages of expanded outlines I had prepared after meeting with Committee Members in twos and threes to expand the brief outlines created during the last Committee meeting. For one particular subject (advocacy), I had met with another Commissioner not on the Committee. The outlines were at varying degrees of development.

After choosing an outline which would provide a good example for editing purposes, I began reading it aloud while Committee Members discussed changes, corrections, and additions. The Executive Director made a lot of corrections. I made additional suggestions that had been discussed at the individual strategy sessions. The atmosphere at the meeting was lighter than usual. There was a lot of laughter and joking. As we went along I asked numerous questions to make sure I was clear as to what the Committee wanted. The majority of the comments were made by CM 2 (the committee member I met with to expand the preliminary outline).

CM 2 had to leave after the first 40 minutes. I explained that the original intent of the meeting was to work through each of the outlines and prepare them to be sent to the full Commission for feedback. Since we were not going to get beyond the first outline during this meeting, this strategy needed to be rethought. I asked the Committee what they wanted to do. I also explained that the outlines could not go to the Commission without being thoroughly reviewed by the Committee. It became evident that we would not be able to report during the next Commission meeting. Another

option was to meet again to prepare the outlines for the Commission's approval, send them by mail and ask for written feedback in return. We would miss the October Commission meeting but would prepare a second draft for the November meeting.

I asked how I should proceed. Committee members said that they would prefer to bring me feedback by the end of the week. I would then incorporate it into the outlines and send them to the Commissioners. The second draft would be prepared by the November Commission meeting.

I identified some specific problem areas needing their attention. We entered into a discussion of the difference between size and completeness. I explained that I was not aiming for each outline to be the same in size but I was interested in having them be at the same level of completeness. The Executive Director said that she felt that the outline edited during this meeting was acceptable "for now"

The meeting closed with confirmation of the direction we had chosen and a tentative date for the next meeting.

Session Seven (November 7, 1989)

The last meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was unlike any of the others. Present at the meeting were myself, the Executive Director, the Community Representative (arrived late) and CM 1(arrived very late). Also present as guests were two new staff members (one full-time professional staff member who had started working the day before this meeting and one part-time independent contractor who had been with the Commission for a few weeks). The agenda was: (a) Goals for the meeting, (b) Feedback on the first draft of the plan, (c) Preparation of the second draft, (d) Format of the plan, (e) Content of the preliminary pages, and (f) Preparation for the next

Commission meeting. The only handout was a vision statement created by the Commission during their first meeting over a year before.

Clearly, the goal for this meeting was to prepare the plan for final draft stage (content) so that it could be sent to the Commission for them to read before adopting it during the next regular meeting. The first draft of the plan had been sent to the Commission on October 31st. In a cover letter attached to the plan I had requested each Commissioner to send any corrections, revisions or additions to me by November 6th. I brought those changes with me to this Strategic Planning Committee meeting so that they could be discussed and the sections of the plan could be expanded and prepared for final approval by the full Commission.

I received feedback from four Commissioners prior to coming to this meeting. I had initiated discussion with one of the four. Three others (including the Chairman) called me with their feedback. The question I posed to the Committee was, considering the comments made regarding the first draft, what needed to be done in order to bring this to final draft stage? My concerns with the plan, as it was at that time, was that the sections were not consistent (stage of development and formatting) and that there were many "holes" where more decisions were needed to be made. The goals were ambitious and the strategies to achieve them were inadequately defined.

I explained that if we decided what we wanted the plan to do and who it should serve, we would be able to identify the holes more easily. The Committee did not understand why I thought the plan was incomplete. They continually insisted that the only changes needed were related to format. In discussing who the plan would serve and what it should do we went back to the many examples I had shown them of other plans. This caused a discussion of how different plans varied in size and depth. I explained that I

thought a number of the smaller documents were public relations pieces that had been prepared after a strategic plan or a cultural plan had been created. If we were to decide to create a public relations piece--more in the line of a Commission brochure--it could be done only after the plan was complete. We did not have the planning document completed. This is where the meeting started to disintegrate.

We entered a discussion of whether or not the plan should be considered a work plan for internal use or printed to use as a tool for funding purposes and community relations (the latter was the original intent of the Committee). The question was--how complete should it be and how should it look.

One of the reasons that this meeting was so difficult was because the two guests participated along side the other Committee members. They did not have the history of working with the Committee or the Commission. The staff member remained as active or more active in the discussion than any Committee member for the remainder of the meeting.

The Executive Director agreed that we did need a public relations piece. CM 1 reminded her that it was stated in the plan to create a Commission brochure. No one was arguing about that. The Community Representative explained that we needed something larger than a brochure listing goals. We needed something that would show people what we were trying to do. I jumped in and reminded them that they were not giving me the information that I needed to complete the writing of the plan. They had not answered my questions. I told them that I did not believe that the document we were working with was a plan. I thought that it was a series of outlines and I would not be able to make the decisions necessary to create the content which would turn the outlines into a strategic plan.

Again, I asked the Committee what they wanted the document to say. Each person in the room had a different idea of what a plan was and should be. CM 1 did not want the document to be binding. The staff member, present as a guest, wanted a work plan for staff and a brochure for public relations (two separate documents). The message was that the document we were working with was "ok" the way it was. We could create a brochure from it.

The Executive Director stated that she did not think that we needed to "spend hours over goals and words." The group believed that the only changes necessary were very mechanical ones. I told them, "you're far more agreeable to this than I am. I'm the one saying that this is incomplete, this is inadequate." The guest staff member replied, "It's the beginning. It's the first step. Right now the most important thing is just to get on track and have a focus without a lot of detail because that would become cumbersome." She went on to say, "the point of view may change on this end and we'll say 'Gee, that is thin.', and you'll say, 'You know, this is really adequate.'" She went on to say that she did not believe we should say too much about 'how' to accomplish the goals. This was precisely what I believed was needed. She suggested that we not go into too much depth about the future. What we needed was a political statement saying that we were committed to something.

I explained, hoping to initiate discussion about the content of the plan, that some of the sections did nothing more than state the status quo. But the group only wanted to discuss formatting issues. I was told that the document could be expanded later with more goals and strategies. They suggested that I insert information from the Commission's enabling ordinance and reformat

the document. It would be fine with those changes. They thought that my expectations were too high. They were happy with it as it was.

We did have a successful discussion of the preliminary pages of the document (values, vision statement, etc.). By this time I had mentioned that I was concerned that the Commission thought that they were going through this exercise in order to help me complete my dissertation. I thought that as a group the Commission felt no ownership of the content of the document. The Community Representative suggested that the addition of the preliminary pages would show the Commissioners whose document it really was. I asked the Committee if they agreed that the issue of ownership was a problem. CM 1 agreed with me. I reminded everyone that it would impact the successful implementation of the plan if this idea did not change.

Some time later we were again discussing my concern for the completeness of the work. I reminded the Executive Director that earlier she had said that she would go over the plan very carefully and really spend some time with it. She had never done this and now all of a sudden she thought it was fine. I asked her what this meant. I really believed that she was simply tired of dealing with it. She responded that the content was fine. Her only concerns had been regarding the format.

CM 1 jumped ahead and suggested that I prepare the next draft (incorporating any changes from this meeting) and again send it to the Commission for written feedback. The Executive Director jumped in and said that it wasn't important. I told her that if the Commissioners were ignored the document was useless. She told me that it would not be useless because she would use it to go after grants, to send to people interested in the work of the Commission and to work with City Councilmembers.

CM 1 again asked for me to get the Commissioners' feedback in writing. The guest staff member said that when the Commissioners don't respond they are deferring to staff or the Committee. She asked me if I was concerned about the Commissioners making a lot of changes. I said that I was far more concerned with the value of the planning process. I wanted the document to be used (to be implemented) and so we needed the Commissioners' support. The Executive Director told me that I was too close to it (the document). I told her that I felt that it was part of my job to increase the possibilities that the plan would be useful and used. With the Commission I was concerned that it may be just another document they approve and forget about.

CM 1 told me that I couldn't expect for the plan to be a Commission document. The guest staff member believed that the plan was for the staff.

There was some quibbling over language. We went over the changes requested by other Commissioners. The results of this meeting addressed the format of the document and the preliminary pages. The title *Directions for the Future* was selected when I expressed my discomfort with calling the document a strategic plan. The strategies were incomplete and would not be developed further.

Third Report to the Commission (November 17, 1989)

The final report to the Commission was made by CM 1. She and I had met prior to the meeting to discuss the content of the report. I prepared a written report that she was able to read from directly. Four Commissioners were absent from this meeting. Three of the four were interview participants in the remaining population.

The Commissioners had been sent a second draft of the document on November 9th. Between November 9th and the Commission meeting on

November 17th, I did quite a bit of editing. A third draft of the plan (printed and spiral bound) was distributed at the meeting.

CM 1 started to read the report. She reminded the Commissioners of the members of the Strategic Planning Committee, how often we had met, how many drafts of the plan the Commission had seen, when our last report to the full Commission had been and what had been discussed, and which Commissioners had given feedback regarding previous drafts. She also indicated that a good deal of editing had occurred between the second draft they had been sent in the mail and the third draft which they had before them.

Final editing and some format decisions had yet to be completed she told them. It was promised that the Commissioners would see the document before it was sent to the printers. No formal action would be taken after today but the Commission would have one last opportunity to correct any minor problems.

The issues identified for discussion by CM 1 were three minor decisions not related to content, two policy issues, and the question of who the document should be sent to after it was completed. It was interesting to note that other than Committee members and the few Commissioners who had already given feedback, only two others spoke up during the meeting (one commented that he would like to read the plan during the coming week and call someone with his feedback). All the others remained silent.

CM 1, the Executive Director, the Chairman and I all fielded questions. Of the six discussion items, two were never addressed by the Commission. They did not discuss one policy issue and they never addressed who should receive the plan once it was completed. The Chairman drew the discussion to an abrupt end and called for a motion to adopt the document with the few

amendments which had been itemized through the discussion. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

Preparing the Final Draft

As described above, I met with Committee Members individually and in small groups to expand the brief outlines that we created as a group. During these working sessions we developed the specific goal and strategies for each goal-topic agreed to by the full Commission. Once these outlines had been expanded, I was responsible for writing the planning document. The Committee reviewed one expanded outline during a Committee meeting and submitted written feedback for all others.

CM 1 and I worked together during a two-hour editing session at compiling the feedback received from the other Committee Members. We further expanded and developed each section of the plan. I then prepared a draft to be sent to the full Commission. The first draft was mailed to the Commissioners on October 31, 1989 with a cover letter that included my phone number for Commissioners to use if they had feedback. I explained in the letter that the second draft would include all of their suggestions.

After receiving feedback from four Commissioners, I returned to the Committee for the final Committee meeting. The November 17th meeting, at which time we chose *Directions for the Future* as the title for the document, was described in detail above.

The second draft of the plan was mailed to Commissioners after I spent many hours creating the preliminary pages and editing and formatting the copy. A cover letter attached to the plan informed Commissioners that they would be asked to adopt *Directions for the Future* during the next Commission meeting (one week later). My phone number was included if anyone had questions or comments.

Before the November Commission Meeting I spent three hours combing through the document with a friend who was knowledgeable of City politics and policy. Many recommendations for change were taken from that meeting to a strategy session scheduled with CM 1.

CM 1 and I met to discuss the November 17th Committee report. We decided to prepare a third draft of *Directions for the Future* which would be handed to each Commissioner during the meeting. The third draft was adopted by the Commission. After the meeting a Commissioner gave me her copy of the plan which she had edited. Her suggestions were included in the final draft.

The fourth and final draft was prepared in January and mailed to each Commissioner for any last minute, minor changes. The Commissioners were asked to call me by a specific date with any feedback they had. I received one call from the Commission Chairman. Just prior to the plan being turned over to the typesetter I was informed that a few of the Commissioners were interested in forming an editorial board for a final review of the document. This request was discussed in an ad hoc Commission strategy session. My involvement ended at this point. A copy of the fourth draft of *Directions for the Future* is included in the Appendices (see Appendix F).

Post-Interview Data

Introduction

The post-interview data was much cleaner than the data from the pre-interviews. On the second time around I was much better at focusing the participants on the interview questions. The interviews were more uniform in length, ranging from approximately 20 to 45 minutes. Again, the Executive Director's and the Chairman's interviews were the shortest. The longest interviews were with the other Strategic Planning Committee Members.

Overall, the post-interviews were very successful. I had built a rapport with each participant and so was at ease conducting the second round of interviews. The post-interviews were held in the office of four participants, the home of two participants and in restaurants with the remaining three participants. All nine were conducted during January and February of 1990.

Question # 1: How would you define planning?

The responses to the first question did not vary significantly from the pre-interview data for seven of the nine participants. Two Strategic Planning Committee Members described the planning process as they had recently experienced it. The major difference in their responses was that instead of viewing planning in rational and linear terms, they viewed it in qualitative terms. One Commissioner talked about people as resources, "things would evolve through conversations and through ideas." The Community Representative emphasized the importance of keeping a holistic view of the issues and going in-depth into each area.

For the other participants in the target population and the remaining population the essence of their responses to this question did not vary from the pre-interview data. They still viewed planning as linear and rational--the process to reach a goal.

Question # 2: How would you define strategy?

The responses to the second question did not vary at all from the pre-interview data. The participants continued to view strategy in the same terms that they had nine months earlier--before the planning process began. The only new information was received from the Community Representative who again emphasized the importance of maintaining a global perspective (just as he had when defining planning). More often than during the pre-interviews, the participants used the term process in their

definitions. When speaking and writing, I always described planning as a process. My terminology seemed to have made an impact.

Strategy was seen as the method, the how of planning. The same participants who viewed strategy in political terms during the pre-interviews did so again.

One Commissioner in the remaining population referred to having changed the way she felt about strategy when she commented, "I don't prescribe to the wing-it theory. . . . You can't soft shoe it. . . . The strategy is much more important. I feel that it's much more important now than I originally did and I thought it was important then."

Question # 3: What is the purpose of creating a strategic plan?

Two members of the Strategic Planning Committee believed that the purpose was to create a tool to use for working within City government, to help raise funds, to "develop friends and advocates for the work of the Commission." One Commissioner saw it as making a public statement, "it's a very public action and that is something that I don't think ever occurred to me before." Another Committee Member thought that the purpose was to "develop a long-range working plan that can be changed, that can be flexible."

A few of the participants in the remaining population defined planning again in response to this question. The concept of providing focus was introduced in one response. This would become a theme in the post-interview data.

One Commissioner in the remaining population was very articulate about the value of a strategic plan.

I think that from a pragmatic standpoint, one can get bogged down with the exigencies of daily work and what you need to do to survive

. . . . The strategic plan goes beyond what you need to do to survive. The strategic plan develops the process by which your organization needs to grow, flourish and go in the right direction. So it's very, very important and germane to any organization.

Again, there was some mention of political concerns. One Commissioner believed that a strategic plan provided a useful tool in the political arena. "If you don't have a plan I don't think that you stand a chance at all." She was referring to surviving the political process.

Question # 4: How successful was the strategic planning process we just completed?

The responses to this were divided three ways between those who found the process to be successful, those who believed that the answer lay in the successful implementation of the plan, and those who believed that the success of the process would be known after the plan had been distributed.

Two of the Committee Members were interested in the immediate response to the plan once it was distributed. Two Commissioners in the remaining population found the process successful specifically because it provided focus—for individuals and for the group.

Two Commissioners in the remaining population specifically responded to the success of the process. One stated that the Commissioners who were involved with this first planning effort, "probably have some understanding of how maybe the process is as important as the plan itself." The other said, "I think that the process is a very effective one. I wish every organization could be so well thought out in terms of what they want to do—and so from that standpoint I think that it's very effective and very useful and even very successful."

Finally, one Commissioner in the remaining population voiced concern that the Commission had not taken full advantage of the process. This reference to their lack of involvement became a theme seen throughout the post-interview data.

Question # 5: If we were to do this over, what changes would you make to the process and what would you leave the same?

Most participants answered the first part of the question and did not respond to the second part. The one theme which clearly stood out was the need for more involvement from the full Commission. One Commissioner on the Strategic Planning Committee wanted to make it mandatory that all Commissioners participate in the planning process.

The others who agreed on this point were all part of the remaining population. One stated,

Because I view this [planning] as something that is very important—probably if as it was developed if we could have devoted 10 minutes or 15 minutes during each Commission meeting to one or two of the goals As an example, as far as the goals are concerned, if you would have taken one or two goals at each meeting as you developed them, brought them back to the Commission, had the Commission discuss them I think that the Commission buys into the process a lot better that way.

The other Commissioner voiced similar thoughts.

The only thing that I would think of maybe changing is that I'm really sorry that more Commissioners, including myself, were not actually involved with the Committee because I think that in developing (being a part of the development) makes you almost assuredly be a part

of the implementation and we didn't get that kind of commitment from Commissioners this time around.

In general, the Committee was very positive about the process. Two Members would like to see more involvement of community people. One Commissioner in the remaining population would liked to have seen timelines for implementation specified in the plan.

Question # 6: What did you learn from participating in the planning process?

There were a few themes found in the responses to this question. The only difference between the two populations was that the Executive Director and the Community Representative (both arts administrators and both Strategic Planning Committee Members) each commented on the amount of work in front of them. None of the Commissioners viewed things in these terms.

Many participants commented on having learned more about planning. One Committee Member stated that she "learned that it was hard and that planning is a lot of work." Another Commissioner said that it gave him "better understanding of how important a strategic plan is." Finally, one Commissioner saw the experience in terms of professional enhancement. She thought that she would apply her new knowledge of strategic planning in her own work.

Three Commissioners again commented on how planning provides a focus—a focus for individuals and for the group.

The Executive Director and the Chairman commented on having learned more about individual Commissioners, their viewpoints and how to work with them better. One Commissioner said that she learned "that in a big group it's hard to make decisions."

Question # 7: What did the group as a whole learn?

This question elicited a variety of responses. One participant said that he could not answer the question. Most answers were very short. Two Committee Members believed that the group learned the importance of having a plan. Another Commissioner from the Committee thought that the learning would be in the future.

There was mention of focus, personal agendas and the political environment. One Commissioner in the remaining population looked at the positive and negative side of this issue, "On the plus side, I think there's more of a spirit of compromise in several of us. The downside of that though is that some of the troops have polarized."

Question # 8: As a result of the planning process, do you think that the role of or the relationship between the Executive Director, the Commission, the City Manager, City Council, or your constituents will change?

Again, the responses were brief in all cases but one. Three answered no and one said maybe. One Committee member commented that the Commission's relationship with the arts and cultural community (part of the Commission's constituency) had improved due to the community's involvement in the planning process (the Roundtable and the meeting with the Commission).

One Commissioner in the remaining population commented on the importance of the leadership positions (Chair, Executive Committee, etc.) on the Commission.

Well, I think that in order to carry out the goals of the Commission, in order to carry out the strategic plan of the Commission it is very important that the people that are leading the Commission have to have this as a priority in their life . . . so that in order for us to carry out

our plan and be strong advocates and take a position in the community where we are constantly advocating the arts.

Question # 9: Is strategic planning useful for problem solving only or is it worthy of the ongoing attention of the organization?

Everyone from the Committee believed that planning should be ongoing. One cited the value of optional plans, one said "you're always looking forward to a better goal and bigger vision", and one said "it's a work in progress. . . . We have to start thinking long range."

The remaining population was also in consensus also. One Commissioner commented on the need for the plan to be "fluid". Another referred to the importance of updating the document. The value of ongoing planning for nonprofit arts organizations was viewed as important to one Commissioner who considered planning to be a preventative measure against crises.

Two Commissioners recognized the evaluation component in ongoing planning efforts. One commented,

I think that you're always in a planning mode and you're also always looking at the plan to make sure that you're on the right track and it's a good way of evaluating an organization. It's a good way of saying 'What have we done?'. I think that it has less of an efficacy in solving problems than it does in evaluating your particular role and job to see how you've done to make sure that you keep on moving ahead.

Question # 10: Should strategic planning be the responsibility of the Executive Director or the Commission?

Everyone acknowledged that the two must work together but two participants (one from each population) stated that it was the Executive Director's responsibility to generate a plan or lead the planning effort. The

Executive Director stated, "we're [staff] doing the day to day implementation. So we're of course most familiar with what's working and what's not working." A Commissioner in the remaining population stated that the Executive Director must provide the leadership in the planning effort. Someone needs to be the "central power", she said.

All others in the target population agreed that it was the responsibility of the Commission (or board). One Committee Member stated, "I think that it should be generated by the board [Commission]. [Commissioners] have been given the responsibility to act on behalf of constituencies."

The value of a collaborative effort was described by one of the Commissioners from the remaining population.

It has to be a consensus of the board with direction from the professional staff. They [Commissioners] need the input. They don't have the background and training that your professional staff does. . . . Most of us would be completely lost without the professional staff. . . but I think that we [Commissioners] have to adopt it because if we don't adopt it then we're not going to really do it. . . . I think that it is more important for a new organization like ours that we [Commissioners] generate it [the plan]. Because then otherwise I don't think that we'd get into it and really understand it well enough.

Others in the remaining population also described the collaborative nature of the relationship between the Commission and the Executive Director in a planning process. One Commissioner commented on the value of a planning committee,

I think that the Executive Director has to be involved in it and I also think that there needs to be a committee of the Commission that is involved in it. I mean it should be a standing committee of any

organization as far as I'm concerned because it has to be—you have to keep on looking at it.

Another Commissioner believed that "When you're forced to generate ideas and forced to make decisions about ideas you have more commitment to it. I think that's better than having one person's idea, develop it and then you just kind of rubber stamp it."

Question # 11: Describe or compare the functions of the Strategic Planning Committee and the remainder of the Commission through the planning process.

The responses to this question were very lengthy. The tone of the answers was slightly different between populations. A number of the participants acknowledged the full Commission's role as an editing body but the Commissioners in the target population saw the other Commissioners as "critics". One Committee Member stated that the other Commissioners were like the "minority party in Congress. . . . They're basically there to criticize."

One Committee Member viewed the other Commissioners as "trusting" while another saw them as relinquishing power by not being more involved in the creation of the strategic plan.

Everyone acknowledged that the Committee did the majority of the work except one Commissioner from the remaining population who believed that I "did all the work." Whether they saw the full Commission as "editors" or "critics", everyone agreed that it was the job of the other Commissioners (those not on the Committee) to provide input.

Three participants specifically referred to or intimated towards there being trust in the relationship between the Planning Committee and the remainder of the Commission. One Committee Member saw her role as powerful and she didn't think that the others realized what they had given

up by not participating. Another Committee Member said that the planning process encouraged other Commissioners to "trust the professionalism" of the Committee. One Commissioner in the remaining population commented on trust also.

The responsibility of the Commission as a whole is to comment when asked. To give the input when asked and to hopefully trust the committee enough to know that the little glitches have been worked out and if there's something there that you really don't understand, I think that you have a responsibility to. . . ask about it.

Other thoughts from the remaining population included,

I don't think that the rest of the Commission felt like they were getting something spoon fed to them. They felt like it was something they were all originating and I think that was what was good about it. So I didn't really look at it as a differentiation.

Finally, from another Commissioner,

Approval is also associated with buying into the process as the Commission as a whole. . . . I think that the interest could have been augmented had we had the opportunity as you got done with a portion of it [the plan] to go through it and [offer] any recommendations at that point in time and discuss it.

Question # 12: Should the person or persons responsible for planning within an organization be trained in strategic planning or should a consultant be brought in?

Just about everyone agreed that bringing in a planning specialist is preferable. However, one Committee Member said that in an ideal world the Commissioners should be trained to plan. A few Commissioners in the remaining population said that it depended on the organization.

The perceived value of the consultant varied from, "they [consultants] have the expertise, the education--they know how to put it together", to the consultant's objectivity and their ability to mediate. One Commissioner from the Committee commented on the value of hiring a planning expert, "It keeps you channeled. It keeps you on track and I think that's valuable."

A few Commissioners commented on the value of bringing in someone from outside of the organization for the first planning effort. As one Commissioner stated,

I think sometimes having an outsider can kinda get the blood flowing. Whereas as if you have a group of people who are used to working with one another, who are used to disagreeing with one another or having different ideas. . .the ideas may not flow as easily so I can see the value of having a consultant.

"And a Commissioner would just always be another Commissioner", one Committee Member said.

Summary

Post-interview data from the Commission was rich and thick in description. Although these interviews were shorter than many of the pre-interviews, the participants' responses were better directed to the questions than they had been during the pre-interviews when many people had given lengthy responses that may or may not have answered the question.

There was virtually no significant change in the participants' responses to the questions asking for definitions of planning and strategy. This was the only real surprise. Most of the post-interview data wholeheartedly supported strategic planning--for the Commission as well as for other organizations in all sectors. One Commissioner from the remaining population stated her

belief in the value of planning very clearly, "I wouldn't want to be trying this [Commission work] without it [strategic planning]."

The themes found in the data included:

1. Planning as rational and linear.
2. Strategy as the how or method of planning. This included the political aspects of planning for a number of the participants.
3. You learn about planning by planning.
4. The plan provides a road map and direction for the organization's future.
5. There needed to have been greater commitment from the full Commission.
6. According to the remaining population, the Committee did most of the work and the other Commissioners critiqued and provided feedback (worth noting were the references to this being a trusting relationship).
7. According to the Committee, the Committee did all of the work and the remaining Commissioners mostly criticized.
8. According to most, planning is the responsibility of the Commission.
9. Hiring a planning consultant is preferable to handling everything in-house.

One Committee Member stated it this way, "I think we've done something pretty terrific for a short amount of time and [for] as young a Commission as we are."

Conclusion

The Commission for Arts and Culture never formally completed the planning process since the plan has never been finalized and printed. Overall, the process was uncomplicated on the committee level, but

tremendously political when involving the full Commission. In my view, the Strategic Planning Committee lacked the leadership necessary for such a small group to succeed in obtaining approval for a document with the impact potential of a mission plan. A few Commissioners remained uninvolved until the eleventh hour and then (after the plan had already been formally adopted), when their names were included on the draft, they stepped forward with questions and concerns.

This, combined with the low profile of the Chairman in the planning process and the very limited involvement of the Executive Director in the preparation of the document, halted the completion of the process. Not surprising was the involvement of the new staff member in preparing the most recent draft (March) accompanied by the recommendation to use the document as in-house working papers and redesign the plan into a brochure for distribution. This recommendation was made by the same staff member during the November 7th Strategic Planning Committee meeting but was not accepted by the Committee.

In the end, the Commission benefited from the planning process itself and will benefit by having a mission plan, as long as it is implemented. "If an organization is going to grow and flourish it needs to have this [a plan] as its basis and in addition it needs to keep on looking back to this to see how [it's] growing and moving forward." One Commissioner showed a clear understanding and appreciation for the process of planning,

There's a great difference between economic planning and qualitative planning. In a business you have people who are all theoretically trained and have like-interests and have a common goal. Here we've got 15 diverse people whose training and business goals are all diverse and what we're trying to do is to focus them into a single area which is

a qualitative area. So I think that it [qualitative planning] has much more meaning in a group like ours than it would in a business.

I believe that many of the problems pertaining to the planning process were a result of the newness of the Commission. The group had been working together for a short period of time without benefit of any history. The dynamics of the group were political, yet the environment in which they function is a political environment. What was within control was the level of involvement of many of the participants. Had there been more attention paid to the development of *Directions for the Future* (see Appendix F) from the very beginning, I feel certain that much of the confusion and difficulties described above would have been minimized.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

As the literature has shown, nonprofit organizations (including government) have carried the burden of public need for many years. Although the impact of a particular organization on a community may be unique to each situation, clearly, institutional and governmental nonprofit organizations directly impact the quality of American life. However, the nonprofit community has been severely criticized for mismanagement. Recently, scholars and practitioners are taking a closer look at these organizations.

As the year 2000 approaches, the environment steadily grows more complex, competitive and turbulent. Leaders of all organizations are faced with an unpredictable future. Leaders of organizations with the greatest chance of survival will have a firm grasp on the mission they have been charged with and the environment in which the organization exists, an understanding of their organization's strengths and weaknesses, and a commitment to planning practices.

Ansoff (1979) predicted that organizations would respond to this increased turbulence with a convergence of the private and nonprofit sectors. Private organizations would become "progressively diluted" and nonprofit organizations would become more commercial (p. 31). The nonprofit community will benefit greatly as it is prodded to adopt sound, stabilizing management practices.

Whether policies and practices are borrowed from the private sector or established specifically to meet the needs of the nonprofit sector; the need for change is increasingly evident. As Drucker (1989) stated, nonprofit organizations have "discovered management". They must "manage *especially* well precisely because they lack the discipline of a bottom line (p. 62, emphasis in the original)."

This study was conducted to contribute to the literature on nonprofit organizations, Boards of Directors, and strategic planning. Over the last decade other research has shown the need for institutional and governmental nonprofit organizations to initiate planning practices. However, what the literature has not provided is a first-hand account of the planning process executed by a particular organization. This study has attempted to address this void in the literature.

Rationale for the Study

In describing the purpose of this study (Chapter One), eleven problems prevalent in the nonprofit community were identified. Evidence of many of these issues was subsequently cited in the data. The most pertinent are discussed below. From issues of roles and relationships to organizational structure and programs, the organizations participating in this study well reflected this Researcher's earlier observations. Most directly related to this research are:

1. The Board Member's commitment to the organization is often questionable. Both Board Members and Commissioners repeatedly voiced concern for the lack of unity, the need for a single voice and the interference created by personal agendas of their peers.
2. There is poor clarification of roles. Again, both organizations struggled with this issue--the nonprofit organization far more than the public

Commission. The roles of the Executive Director and the Board or Commission and the relationship between the two demand clarity. The Commission was still very young and had not adequately clarified roles. As described in the narrative, this concern and many others were part of educating the Commissioners. For the nonprofit Board, this was an area of much greater concern. The Board had been informed of how the two roles should be defined but had difficulty living up to these standards and consequently had ongoing troubles with staff/Board relationships.

3. Meeting attendance is poor. Meeting attendance for the Strategic Planning Committee of the Commission was perfect for three of the seven meetings. CM 2 was absent for three others and the Community Representative was absent for one. Regular Commission meetings were well attended except for the final Committee report when three of the four participants in the remaining population were absent.

For the nonprofit board, only one planning meeting was attended by all Committee Members. CM 1 was absent for two meetings of the six. CM 2 was absent for two meetings and the President was absent for one. Attendance at the regular board meetings was described in Chapter Four. Overall, it was very poor with less than 50% attendance for the remaining population.

4. There is poor follow through on the Committee level. Minutes are not taken during Committee meetings. There are no reminders between meetings of decisions and promises made. This Researcher found that when Committee Members were sent home with an assignment the majority returned unprepared. Also, on many occasions while working with the Commission it was clear that Committee Members did not remember what decisions had been made at previous meetings—even if the idea had been their own.

5. The amount of time spent addressing the mission of the organization is insufficient. This Researcher found that ongoing discussion of the organization's identity was needed in both organizations. Confusion regarding the role of the Commission and who their constituents were was an excellent example of their need to clearly understand their mission and purpose. This discussion of mission was probably the most beneficial aspect of planning for the CHCDC. They needed to define themselves better and had never taken the time to do so.

6. Programs are reactive, not proactive. This problem was discussed in a number of interviews with Board Members from the CHCDC and also during Strategic Planning Committee meetings. Board Members relied upon the strategic plan for correcting this problem. The Commission had not been in existence for a long enough period to show a track record with programs.

To address these concerns and others, this study was intended to discover what impact strategic planning would have on two participants--a nonprofit board and a public commission. Strategic planning was defined by Grant and King as involving "an organization's most basic and important choices--the choice of its mission, objectives, strategy, policies, programs, goals, and major resource allocations (1982, p. 3)." The process was described as systematic and rational. Not only did the interview participants agree almost unanimously with Grant and Kings' definition, but certainly the process described in the data analysis chapters reflects these same components.

Barry (1986) and Bryson (1988) agreed that strategic planning can help an organization think and act strategically, clarify the future of the organization, set priorities, make forward-thinking decisions, solve organizational problems, improve performance and deal more effectively

with an ever-changing environment. Although both participants in this study wrestled with each of these, the narratives in Chapters Four and Five show that the planning experience was unique to each participant.

As described in Chapter One, many authors agree that nonprofit organizations need some version of a planning model (Bryson, 1988; Conrad & Glenn, 1983; Espy, 1986; Unterman & Davis, 1984; Wolf, 1984). Espy (1986) acknowledged seven reasons cited by nonprofit organizations reluctant to initiate a planning process. Some of these reasons (time and staff concerns, lack of knowledge of the planning process, and lack of control over the mission of the organization) were specifically addressed by the participants in this study. The narratives of the planning process describe how each organization dealt with these barriers to planning as part of the planning process. The interview data clearly offers testimony to the increased knowledge of planning gained by the participants in this study.

Results

Research Question # 1: How does a nonprofit Board and a public Commission develop a strategic plan?

The narratives in Chapters Four and Five describe in detail how a nonprofit Board and a public Commission developed a strategic plan. For each organization, planning was a time consuming endeavor which required the energy, imagination, patience, knowledge, and commitment of a small group of Committee Members and the good will, curiosity, interest, and keen eye of the remainder of the Board and Commission.

The Nonprofit Organization. To look at the planning process of each of these organizations with an objective eye one would describe them very differently. For the CHCDC the creation of a strategic plan was of great interest to the Board President. The remainder of the Board made no

objections to initiating the process. The two Board Members who participated on the Strategic Planning Committee had very different views of the process itself. The newer Board Member, until the very end, considered the planning process and the plan itself to belong to the Researcher. However, during Committee reports this Board Member made a real effort to help communicate and sell the Committee's recommendations.

The second Board Member who participated on the Committee remained skeptical but willing. This Board Member had been trying to help the organization gain better focus for a number of years but the attempts had been unsuccessful. The real impact he had on the planning process was the amount of information he was able to bring to the table. He had a thorough understanding of the organization and the environment in which it exists.

The Board President maintained the positional power implicit in his role throughout the planning process. Included in the narrative is a descriptive account of the times that group consensus sided with the President after a great deal of discussion. He opened and led many discussions. He summarized, reviewed, critiqued, and presented information. After the first Committee report he made all other reports. He was the most actively involved Committee Member while the final draft was being prepared. How much of his active involvement was due to his position and how much was due to group dynamics could not be surmised.

During the period of time the Executive Director was involved with the planning process he attended all meetings and was very interested and cooperative. However, it appeared to the Researcher that additional requests outside of his attendance at the planning sessions would not have been met favorably. The result of this was that for the most part the Researcher looked to the Board President for assistance between meetings.

The process itself took on a pattern. The Researcher's job was to prepare for every meeting and almost spoon feed the information and questions to the Committee Members. It was difficult to tell whether any Member of the Committee even thought about the plan or the planning process between planning sessions.

The remainder of the Board had very limited involvement. They did not ask how the Committee's recommendations were derived. If there was concern about a recommendation it was typically regarding an issue of personal interest to the Board Member who spoke out or it was due to the recommendation being poorly defined, incomplete, or misleading.

When requested to give feedback on a written version of the planning document, only one Board Member called with comments (other than the Board Member who called to say that his name was misspelled).

The final version of the plan was accepted with some excitement. In an earlier chapter it was stated that the impression left by the remaining population was that the Strategic Planning Committee and the Researcher would work together to deliver a planning document to the Board. Essentially this was done. Aside from one Board Member who was unhappy with the chosen planning model, the process and the product; everyone seemed very pleased.

The Public Commission. The original proposal for the Commission to begin the strategic planning process was made by the Researcher. It was proposed to the Commissioners that a three-year strategic plan could be developed by an ad hoc Committee working with the Researcher. This was agreed to and Committee Members were hand picked after discussion between the Researcher, the Executive Director and the Commission

Chairman. Other Commissioners were invited to participate on the Committee but declined.

The two Commissioners who participated on the Committee were very cooperative, interested and encouraging. Although one had a difficult time attending meetings, she was always supportive of the Committee's efforts and was willing to meet separately with the Researcher whenever necessary. The other Commissioner was keenly interested in the value of the plan itself. She spent a great deal of time working with the Researcher to make suggestions for improvement. Whereas one Commissioner was an idea person and very supportive of others' contributions, the other Commissioner was far more analytical, always stopping to ask questions, keeping the Committee on the right track.

The involvement of the Community Representative was most noticeable during the individual strategy sessions when the plan was being outlined. Typically, he was less involved during Committee Meetings. When working in a smaller group his input was thoughtful and valuable. He worked particularly well with CM 1 and seemed to become more and more involved during the last few months of the process. He provided information on the history of the local arts and cultural community which provided a background for many discussions and decisions.

The Executive Director had originally voiced a great deal of support for the planning process. She attended all meetings and participated by bringing the professional view of an arts administrator to the table and sharing a great deal of information. However, her involvement beyond meeting attendance was severely limited. This, combined with the limited support for the plan received from the Commission Chairman, was very debilitating.

Overall, Committee meetings were productive. One of the most noteworthy points about this Committee was their willingness to immediately address internal organizational concerns. Having been so young, a number of the organizational kinks had not been worked out and problems existed which were related to organizational structure, policies and practices. The Committee was interested in addressing problem areas and many times was able to recommend reasonable, practical solutions. Their problem was poor follow through. A number of excellent suggestions were made which needed prompt follow up. Few of their ideas came to fruition.

Also due to the short history of the Commission, a great deal of time was spent discussing the broad questions of the Commission's role and responsibilities. Additionally, a significant amount of time was spent hashing over the political nature of their work. Overall, the most productive time was spent discussing strengths and weaknesses and in individual strategy sessions when the plan was being outlined.

The remainder of the Commission had very little involvement. This researcher believed that had she not interviewed six Commissioners other than the Committee Members, even fewer Commissioners would have become involved. As each draft of the plan was mailed to Commissioners and feedback was requested, the same few Commissioners consistently called. Others did not speak up until the very end.

The planning document was presented to the Commission and adopted in mid-November. In late January the last draft was sent for final clearance of the last minute editing that had taken place in the interim period. This was when other Commissioners spoke up and showed interest in the content of the plan. The request of a few Commissioners to form an editorial board to review the document was authorized by the Commission

(informally). The Researcher explained that due to time constraints she would not be available to do more than minor editing changes. The editorial board proceeded with the assistance of a staff member.

Two months later, at the end of March, the document was again approved with the new changes. This time the document was referred to as working papers intended to be changed during the next two months and developed into a brochure. By this time a number of Commissioners had voiced their concern for the length of time spent preparing the document. While some did not want to accept the document in its current state (as it was during the March Commission meeting), others were not willing to delay the approval process any longer. The document was accepted with six votes in favor, two votes against, and three abstentions. The copy of *Directions for the Future* included in the Appendices (see Appendix F) is the draft copy that was sent to the Commission in January. Some format changes were made to prepare it to be included in this document.

Research Question # 2: What influence does the strategic planning process have, as determined by self-reports, on the two populations?

Interview data, as reported in Chapters Four and Five varied between organizations and populations. Some general conclusions which can be drawn from the data include:

1. Planning was considered to be rational and linear.
2. There was a focus on the political aspects of planning and concern for the personal agendas of Board Members and Commissioners.
3. Planning is a responsibility of the Board or Commission.
4. Planning is equally beneficial for all sectors.
5. The entire Board or Commission needs to be involved in the planning process.

6. It is preferable to hire a planning consultant.

Overall, the pre-interview data for both organizations was a little thin. The post-interviews were generally much better although the quality of the interview data from the remaining population of the CHCDC was severely impacted by the interview participants' poor meeting attendance and the loss of one Board Member.

Some additional themes found in the data from the CHCDC included the organization's need for unity and focus, the value placed on discussion, and the thought that implementation of a plan must occur the success of a planning process is known. The Commissioners took a very political view of strategy, and believed that planning should be an ongoing activity for an organization. Many of the interview participants from both organizations considered the planning document to be a road map or course set for the future of the organization.

No one's definition of planning or strategy was significantly changed by participation in the planning process. Post-planning definitions were consistent with pre-planning definitions. Having a strategic plan was very important to everyone. Many participants from each organization commented that they had learned a great deal about planning and they found this information valuable.

Conclusions

Seven conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study. They are each briefly described below.

1. The planning process is unique to each organization. By selecting a qualitative design to answer the two research questions, this Researcher was able to address the void of descriptive data in the literature and to document two realistic planning experiences. Strict adherence to the steps of Bryson's

(1988) strategic planning model was not required of either participant. Bryson's eight step model provided focus for the Strategic Planning Committees but neither organization followed the steps of the model exactly. Qualitative methodologies allow the research design to emerge. To have strictly controlled the activities of each Committee would have eliminated the possibility of providing a very realistic account.

The planning process took a different shape for each Committee. This may have been due partly to the composition of the Strategic Planning Committees, the individual Committee Members, and the maturity of the two organizations. Nevertheless, the nonprofit board chose to work with an end-goal. Once this decision was made, the remainder of the planning process was focused on accomplishing this goal within a three-year period.

The Commission chose to categorize their activities into seven different headings or goal-topics. Each heading represented a function or duty which was part of the Commission's enabling ordinance. By defining and describing programs and practices under each heading, the Commission was able to better define its scope of services.

Additionally, the stakeholder analysis for each organization was quite different. The CHCDC chose to obtain feedback through individual interviews with representatives of each of the stakeholder categories. On the other hand the Commission pursued information from only one category of stakeholder and did so by holding a roundtable discussion.

2. The product of the planning process is unique to each organization. The CHCDC created a strategic plan for a three year period. The Commission created a document quite different in that it was not written for a specific period of time. King (1979) presented a system of plans which combine to describe the essence of strategic planning in sophisticated organizations. The

seven sub-plans which make up the system are defined in Chapter Three of the study. They are interrelated and interdependent. The first two sub-plans are a mission plan (a plan which outlines the broad mission, objectives and strategies of the organization) and an organizational development plan (a plan which maps in greater detail the route toward the future as described by the mission plan and determines the activities necessary for future outputs).

This Researcher concluded that the document created by the Strategic Planning Committee of the Commission was similar to a mission plan and the document created by the Committee of the CHCDC was closer to an organizational development plan. *Directions for the Future*, the Commission's plan, is a broad outline of the Commission's objectives and mission. Although it includes very limited detail, it provides a focus and defines a role for the Commission in the city of San Diego and in its arts and cultural community. A more detailed planning document will be required in time but for this young Commission, the mission plan was an essential step to take—without which other planning efforts could not be made.

The *Strategic Plan for 1990 - 1993* created by the CHCDC provides more detailed information about how the organization intends to accomplish the end-goal outlined early in the document. This organization placed a greater emphasis on strategy. The needs of the organization were concentrated on their inability to focus their attention, energy and resources. The plan they created provides the road map they needed and wanted. It defines and describes programs and strategies to accomplish specific goals and objectives.

As acknowledged above, the maturity of the two organizations probably had some impact on the type and depth of the planning document produced by each Committee. Also noteworthy was the difference in their original intentions of how to use the document. From the start the CHCDC

understood that they would be creating a plan to use in-house as well as with potential funding sources. Wide distribution of the plan was never considered.

From the beginning the Commission had discussed the value of the planning document in community relations efforts. Because they were so new, they were concerned about how others perceived their image, role, responsibilities, and potential to accomplish the duties set out for them by the Mayor and the City Council. The planning document would provide an avenue to promote their values, goals, and intentions. The Committee did not, however, confuse planning with public relations. They simply saw the plan as an educational tool that could be distributed locally, to arts and cultural organizations and funders, and nationally to select local arts agencies and funders.

Early in the strategic planning process, the organization or the planning committee should discuss their purpose for creating a plan and the audience for that plan. These two questions impact the depth of the planning effort and the content and appearance of the plan itself.

3. The planning process provides an arena for valuable discussion. A number of comments pertaining to the value of discussion were made during interviews with individuals from both organizations. Having taken a qualitative approach to not only the research design for this study but also the planning process, this Researcher discovered how little time was spent discussing critical issues such as mission and overall goals and values.

Reasons for this might include: (a) perceived lack of time, (b) no awareness of the value or need for discussion, (c) a reactive approach to decision making, (d) discussion as a low priority of the president or chair, (e)

poor facilitation skills of the president or chair, and (f) incorrect assumptions about individual's opinions and group consensus.

A qualitative approach to planning places value on discussion and group process and does not require that every decision be quantitatively based. This focus allows for internal organizational weaknesses to be addressed. The information gained from pre-interviews is valuable in that it can identify areas needing discussion. Confusion over roles, responsibilities, mission, goals, constituents, etc. was clearly reflected in the pre-interview data in this study. Requiring the entire Board or Commission to wrestle with this kind of data would create the opportunity for valuable discussion.

4. The selection of the Committee Members and Committee Chair is very important. The literature showed that planning is one of the top three functions of a for-profit Board of Directors, according to 75% of the companies participating in a 1982 study (Heidrick & Struggles; Korn/Ferry). The same study showed that none of the respondents had a permanent planning committee.

Post-interview data in this study showed unanimous agreement among interview participants that strategic planning was equally valuable in all sectors. Data also showed that the responsibility for planning belongs to the Board or Commission, according to a majority of those interviewed.

Since this study dealt with only two organizations, it is impossible to generalize to the larger population of nonprofit boards and public commissions. However, based on the data from this study, recommendations regarding the selection of a planning committee and its chair might include the following:

1. Committee Members must be committed to the value of planning.

2. Committee Members should represent a cross-section of the larger Board or Commission.
3. Committee Members should represent a variety of interests and expertise related to the mission of the organization.
4. An individual perceived as influential with the larger Board or Commission must be included on the Committee and should be responsible for the Committee reports at regular Board or Commission meetings.
5. The President or Chairman of the organization must be committed to the planning process.
6. The Executive Director or senior staff member must be a Committee Member and should have equal voting privileges within the Committee.
7. Committee Members must be able to communicate their vision for the organization as well as enlist support for the goals of the Committee.
8. The Committee should include at least one member of the community served by the organization.
9. The Committee should ideally be between four and six persons.
10. Combining a newer Board Member or Commissioner with another individual having a longer history with the organization provides consistency as well as new ideas and an objective viewpoint.

These recommendations are not placed in any particular order. Possibly the most important one is the need for someone perceived as influential with the larger group to be a part of the Committee. The successful implementation of a plan rests upon the full Board's or Commission's "wholehearted backing," according to Espy (1986, p. 20). The ability of a Strategic Planning Committee to sell the plan and enlist the active support of other Board Members or Commissioners impacts the implementation phase of planning. As one Board Member from the CHCDC

said during a post-interview, "You can't follow something that you haven't been involved in [creating]."

Related to this is the need for each Committee Member to publicly support the Committee's recommendations. Even though both of the Committees in this study made decisions based on consensus, a number of times at least one Committee Member gave in to the majority viewpoint without really agreeing. Later, when the Committee reported to the full Board or Commission it was essential that the entire Committee spoke with one voice and represented one view.

5. The planning process is a four-part process. The four phases are: assessment, formulation of goals and strategies, preparation of the document, and implementation and evaluation. This study involved the first three phases. The assessment phase covered the early meetings of the Strategic Planning Committees. Assessment involves the first six steps of Bryson's (1988) model:

1. Initiating and agreeing on a strategic planning process.
2. Identifying organizational mandates.
3. Clarifying organizational mission and values.
4. Assessing the internal environment.
5. Assessing the external environment.
6. Identifying the strategic issues facing an organization.

The second phase, the formulation of goals and strategies, includes the final two steps of the model.

7. Formulating strategies to manage the issues.
8. Establishing an effective organizational vision for the future. (p. 48)

This second stage is time consuming since it should involve discussion of budgetary and personnel decisions. Specific goals, objectives, and strategies are formulated during this phase.

The third phase, preparation of the planning document will differ significantly from one organization to another depending upon the intent of the plan and the intended audience. A plan which will be distributed to constituents and potential funding sources would require more preparation time. A planning document designed only for use in-house requires less preparation time.

The fourth phase, implementation and evaluation (not discussed in this study), may last for years. This is the most crucial of the four phases. A planning document is worthless if it is not implemented, used as an evaluative tool and updated regularly.

6. Everyone should be involved in assessment and implementation. Post-interview data from both organizations in this study showed that the majority of interview participants believed that more Board Members and Commissioners should participate in the planning process. A number of recommendations for doing this were made. This Researcher concluded that everyone should participate in the assessment and implementation phases of planning.

The assessment of an organization may involve pre-planning interviews, examining organizational documents, discussion of mission and values, and a stakeholder analysis. Interviews may be with all participants or a randomly selected group. They provide an opportunity to poll participants on a number of questions related to the goals of the organization as well as provide the basis of the internal assessment.

An examination of organizational documents will point out the organizational mandates as well as identify ambiguous, misleading, inaccurate and confusing information which may exist. This also includes the process of thoroughly examining the mission, values, and purpose of the organization.

The stakeholder analysis is a key element of an environmental assessment. Collecting feedback (survey, interviews, forums, roundtable discussions, etc.) from stakeholders is very helpful and informative.

Organizational problems can and should be addressed during the internal assessment. Pre-planning interview data can uncover a significant amount of information regarding strengths and weaknesses of an organization. Each of these needs to be examined and addressed as well as possible. Policies and practices will be considered at this time and may be changed.

Finally, to close the assessment process, the strategic issues facing the organization must be identified. These may be in the form of an end-goal as was the case of the CHCDC, a series of goal-topics similar to the Commission, or in another form.

What is important is that the full Board or Commission should participate in this phase. A great deal of time was spent assessing the two organizations in this study. It would have been more effective to have a preliminary meeting with the full group to define the planning process and introduce the assessment phase in greater detail. Following this with an all day meeting or a weekend retreat would be an ideal setting in which to conduct the first step of the planning process.

Doing so would offer everyone an opportunity to set the tone for the planning effort. Having everyone participate in the examination of

documents, wrestle with anonymous interview data and discuss stakeholder feedback would be an effective means of gaining support from the entire Board or Commission for the planning effort. It would also provide a focus for the Strategic Planning Committee as well as contribute to the organization's overall commitment to the implementation of the plan. Implementation is the other phase which needs full support and participation of the Board or Commission.

7. The planning consultant acts as a Researcher/facilitator. In this study the Researcher acted as the planning consultant. Her role was dictated to some degree by the study itself. Nevertheless, this Researcher concluded that the role of a planning consultant should be one of Researcher/facilitator. The research side of the consultant's job pertains to the assessment phase when he or she is responsible for the review and evaluation of organizational documentation and participant and stakeholder interviews.

Facilitation is required throughout the planning process. The consultant contributes planning expertise, group process and interview skills, and a familiarity with the work of the organization. It is the client's responsibility to provide the content--to bring the ideas to the table.

Hiring a consultant who is familiar with the organization's mission and programs but is not an expert in this area places a burden on the Committee Members to be very clear about how they are defining terms, issues, and programs. For the participants in this study, clear definition was essential. The consultant enters and is better able to remain unbiased while contributing to strategy formulation with an objective viewpoint.

Participant Observations

Among the personal observations of this Researcher were: (a) until the very end the Commission would not take ownership of their plan, (b) it was

impossible to strictly adhere to the role of facilitator through the entire planning process, and (c) leadership was not a theme found in either planning process. This Researcher experienced growing concern that the Commission would never acknowledge the planning document as their own. Throughout the planning process, the recommendations from the Committee and the plan itself were referred to as belonging to the Researcher. This became very troublesome as the process progressed and very little feedback was submitted by Commissioners not participating on the Committee.

One possible cause for this may have been that the original proposal for the Commission to begin a planning effort came from this Researcher. Had the Commission initiated the process, they probably would have supported the planning effort from the start and the resulting product. It should be noted that the earlier drafts of the planning document were sent to Commissioners for feedback without the inside cover page which listed Commissioners' names. The first real interest in the plan came about when this page was included with the final draft sent to them for their approval.

As for the difficulty of remaining in the facilitator role, after spending a great deal of time preparing for the planning process by reading as much background information as possible and then conducting pre-planning interviews and participating in the Committee meetings, this Researcher found that she could bring a lot of information to the planning sessions and assist with the formulation of strategy.

Additionally this Researcher found that when trying to develop an outline created by the Committee into a section of the plan required the addition of a great deal of information. Had she been unable or unwilling to make these additions and contributions, the period of time it took to write the

plans would have been significantly extended or Committee Members would have had to participate in the actual writing process.

Chapter One explained that leadership would be handled in the same manner as any other theme which might be found in the data. This Researcher concluded that she did not see evidence of leadership (the dialogical relationship between leaders and followers striving for real intended change based on mutual purposes), in either organization. While the President of the CHCDC certainly exhibited a number of behaviors one might expect of a leader in these circumstances (having a vision for the organization, seeking change, etc.), he seemed mostly to utilize his position power as President. Dialogue was missing from the relationship between the President and other Board Members. The President's vision was articulated during the Committee meetings and to some extent during the regular Board meetings, but there was little attempt to bring new Board Members along and to encourage understanding and greater commitment. There was no real evidence of mutual purposes among many of the Board Members.

The Strategic Planning Committee of the Commission pursued their goal of creating a planning document without any visible leadership from any Committee Member. This was probably the greatest weakness of the Committee. Originally, it was intended for the Chairman to participate as a Committee Member (providing a very influential voice and position power). When he indicated that he would not be able to, changes were not made in the composition of the Committee. Even with the efforts of CM 1 later in the planning process, the Committee was left to gain random support from other Commissioners by means of the efforts of CM 1 and the Researcher. Considering the unsatisfactory closure to the Commission's planning process, these attempts to gain more support were not very successful.

Strengths

Five strengths of this study are worthy of discussion. These include: (a) the duration of the study, (b) the hands-on research design, (c) the Researcher's observations matching the literature in the field, (d) the value of the interviews as a part of the planning process, and (d) the value of the study for scholars, practitioners, and consultants.

Pre-planning interviews (which marked the beginning of the planning process) began ten months before the *Strategic Plan for 1990 - 1993* was presented to the CHCDC and the fourth draft of *Directions for the Future* was submitted to the Commission. Conducting the study over this period of time allowed the Researcher to become thoroughly familiar with each of the organizations. The presentation of interview data and the planning narratives were based on a significant amount of interview data and hours of formal and informal observations which combine to provide thick description and a realistic account of two organizations and their efforts at planning.

The research was designed to allow for the natural variations of the planning process. Having begun the study with no intention of comparing the two organizations, this Researcher was able to conduct a hands-on study of the influence of the strategic planning process.

The third strength of this study is how well the findings reflect the current literature on nonprofit organizations, Boards of Directors and strategic planning. This Researcher found that much of what scholars have claimed regarding the management of nonprofit organizations and the difficulties experienced by their leaders and managers seemed to be consistent with the observations of these two organizations. As for Boards of Directors, the literature reports two versions of the role and responsibilities of Boards.

This study was not conclusive in this area. The literature on strategic planning shows that increasing numbers of scholars and practitioners are recommending planning for nonprofit organizations. The results of this study confirm this.

Pre- and post-interviews were valuable sources of information and contributed to the Researcher's knowledge of the organizations and their needs, helped her understand the dynamics of each group, which improved her ability to facilitate the planning process.

Overall, this study was able to successfully document the strategic planning process with a nonprofit Board and a public Commission and to describe the influence planning had on the individual participants. As stated earlier, specific case examples of how organizations, diverse in maturity, size, structure and mission go about creating a strategic plan are needed in the literature. Versions rich in description and intended to enable the reader to become part of the planning experience will help to demystify the strategic planning process and encourage the practitioner/reader to initiate the planning process or simply lend support to already existing planning practices. For these reasons, this study will benefit scholars, practitioners and planning consultants.

Weaknesses

A number of weaknesses must also be mentioned. These include: (a) the Researcher's limited experience with strategic planning, (b) the idea for creating a plan being initiated by the Researcher, (c) participant observation, (d) inadequate involvement from the remaining population, and (e) the difficulty of generalizing the findings.

This Researcher entered this study with an academic background in strategic planning. This probably impacted the study in two ways. First, the

Researcher's expectations for the process had for the most part been derived from the literature and this may not have created a realistic understanding of planning practices. Secondly, the time spent with each phase of planning was disproportionate. As an example, the assessment phase of planning was belabored by both organizations. Although this was certainly not the intent of the Researcher, without previous experience she was less able to make an evaluation of the situation and act according to the needs of each organization.

As mentioned above, the Researcher initiated the planning process in each organization which probably had some impact on the organization's commitment to planning. When an organization becomes aware of a need (such as the need for a plan) which later results in hiring a consultant, there is probably greater support for the project or program than if it is proposed by an outsider.

Participant observation allowed the Researcher to accomplish the original intent of the study but it also contributed to the complexity of the research. Acting as both the planning consultant and a Researcher did put pressure on participants. The Researcher tried to alleviate this pressure by making her role very clear to participants but this dual role remained confusing for a number of them.

Poor attendance of the remaining populations (the CHCDC being far worse than the Commission) and the loss of one Board Member from the remaining population of the CHCDC impacted the quality of the post-interview data and could be considered a weakness of the study. This was not within the realm of the Researcher's control and simply became one of the many factors which contributes to the messiness of qualitative research.

In all, this Researcher believes that the results of this study and the conclusions drawn are valid and valuable. The use of a qualitative research design implies that the findings have limited generalizability to other organizations. To address this, recommendations for further research are offered below.

Recommendations for Future Research

The completion of this study contributed to the literature on nonprofit organizations, boards of directors and strategic planning. It has also addressed the need for qualitative studies providing thick description and realistic accounts of a planning process. The following suggestions are made for future research.

1. Many more qualitative studies are needed. As stated in Chapter Three, Barton and Lazarsfeld (1969) found that qualitative research plays a very important role by "suggesting possible relationships, causes, effects and even dynamic processes." To date the literature provides commentary on the need for strategic planning in nonprofit organizations. As mentioned previously, descriptive studies are an essential addition to the existing literature as well as a necessity for practitioners interesting in beginning a planning effort in their organizations.

2. Comparative studies with different types of nonprofit organizations or between nonprofit and for-profit organizations would help to identify and describe the numerous variables which cause the planning process to be unique to each organization. This study was not designed to be comparative and so the differences between these two organizations were not discussed in detail. Further studies could compare educational institutions with health care organizations, human service organizations with arts organizations,

organizations from the different branches of government, organizations with and without government funding, etc.

Furthermore, since leaders and managers of nonprofit organizations are encouraged to borrow from the planning practices of for-profit corporations it would be interesting to see how well nonprofit planning efforts and results compare with the efforts and results of for-profit planning efforts.

3. A number of interview participants believed that the success of the planning process could not be measured before implementation. Studies of the fourth phase of the planning process would be very valuable and would provide data enabling scholars to develop an appropriate theoretical framework for the implementation of planning decisions. Additionally, qualitative studies in this area would expose the difficulties experienced by practitioners as they endeavor to implement strategic plans. Practitioners and consultants will profit from recommendations derived.

4. Further analysis of the role of the planning committee will add to the understanding of the political nature of the planning process. Studies which examine committee composition and how it correlates with the success of the planning effort will contribute significantly to the literature as well as to the practice of planning.

5. Further studies using different planning models or systems must be conducted. With the variety that exists of organizations, planning needs, board support and interest, and staff support, the choice of a planning model is a key decision.

6. Comparative studies between government sponsored organizations and independent nonprofit organizations will help to uncover differences

which might pertain to an organization having or not having control of its mission.

7. Studies are needed which will examine the varying roles of staff members and Board Members in the planning process. The majority of the participants in this study believed that it was the responsibility of the Board or Commission to generate a plan. How these roles and responsibilities might impact planning in other organizations is worthy of study.

Concluding Remarks

Cronbach (1975) stated that the generalizability of a particular qualitative study is in the form of working hypotheses, not conclusions. This study has provided a number of conclusions which hopefully will encourage others to proceed with the task of gaining better understanding of the planning process in nonprofit organizations. A limited sample such as that chosen for this study prohibits broad or specific conclusions to be drawn and generalized to other organizations. However, qualitative research is valuable because it captures, through thick description, the realism of a study conducted in a natural setting. It seeks not to control, but to observe and depict.

Strategic planning implies the development of broad and explicit strategies for the accomplishment of specific objectives and overall organizational goals. A planning process requires its own strategy. Organizations develop macro strategies, strategies that address overall organizational goals and issues. Planning committees must develop their own micro strategy, a strategy to accomplish their goal of creating a planning document. A planning committee has its own vision. The difficult task for planners is encouraging others to join with them in adopting the vision.

This is difficult to accomplish without any leadership among planning committee members. To work most successfully within the often political confines of a planning process, a planning committee would be best served by preparing for the feedback and approval phase of the process by having agreed upon a strategy for their own success.

Nonprofit organizations are looked upon as messy and often poorly managed. Strategic planning has the potential to be messy as well. To combine strategic planning within nonprofit organizations requires a firm commitment to planning from the Board of Directors and staff. The planning process and the plan itself can provide focus, address internal organizational weaknesses, capitalize on strengths, support and focus fundraising efforts, and assist in the overall accomplishment of the organization's mission. For these reasons and many others, strategic planning is a practical tool which may improve the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. A., & Anthony R. N. (1986). The new corporate directors: Insights for board members and executives. New York: John Wiley.
- Andreasen, A. R. (1982). Nonprofits: Check your attention to customers. Harvard Business Review, 60, 105-110.
- Andrews, K. (1980). The concept of corporate strategy. Homewood, Il: Irwin.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1979). Strategic management. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ansoff, H. I., Decker, R. P., & Hayes, R. L. (Eds.). (1976). From strategic planning to strategic management. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Anthes, E., Cronin, J., & Jackson, M. (Eds.). (1985). The nonprofit board book: Strategies for organizational success (rev. ed.). Hampton, Ark: Independent Community Consultants.
- Argyris, C. (1985). Making knowledge more relevant to practice: Maps for action. In E. E. Lawler, III, A. M. Mohrman, Jr., S. A. Mohrman, G. E. Ledford, Jr., T. G. Cummins, & Associates (Eds.), Doing research that is useful for theory and practice (pp. 79-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. (1985). Action science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Atkinson, R. F. (1978). Knowledge and explanation in history: An introduction to the philosophy of history. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barry, B. W. (1986). Strategic planning workbook for nonprofit organizations. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

- Barton, A. H., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1969). Some functions in qualitative analysis in social research. In G. J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bassey, M. (1986). Does action research require sophisticated research methods. In D. Hustler, A. Cassidy, & E. C. Cuff (Eds.), Action research in classrooms and schools (pp. 18-24). London: Allen & Unwin.
- Baughman, J. C. (1987). Trustees, trusteeship, and the public good: Issues of accountability for hospitals, museums, universities, and libraries. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Bennis, W. R. (1989). Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: Wiley.
- Bouchard, T., Jr. (1976). Field research methods: interviewing, questionnaires, participant observation, systematic observation, unobtrusive measures. In Dunnette, M. (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 363-413). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bracker, J. (1980). The historical development of the strategic management concept. Academy of Management Review, 5 (2), 219-224.
- Bryce, H. J. (1987). Financial and strategic management for nonprofit organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bryson, J. M. (1988). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bryson, J. M., & Roering, W. D. (1987). Applying private sector strategic planning to the public sector. Journal of the American Planning Association, 53, 9-22.

- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, W. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research. London: Falmer Press.
- Connors, T. D. (1980). The nonprofit organization handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Connors, T. D., & Callaghan, C. T. (Eds.). (1982). Financial management for nonprofit organizations. New York: AMACOM.
- Conrad, W. R., Jr., & Glenn, W. E. (1983). The effective voluntary board of directors: What it is and how it works. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 116-127.
- Cyert, R. M. (1975). The management of nonprofit organizations. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Denny, T. (1983). Story-telling and educational understanding. In Deakin University, Perspectives on case study 3: Story-telling (2nd ed., pp. 1-24). Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.
- Drucker, P. F. (1989). The nonprofits' quiet revolution. Leadership, p. 61-63.
- Duncan, R. B. (1979). Qualitative Research Methods in Strategic Management. In D. E. Schendel & C. W. Hofer (Eds.), Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning (pp. 424-447). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Espy, S. N. (1986). Handbook of strategic planning for nonprofit organizations. New York: Praeger.
- Fenn, D. H., Jr. (1971). Executives and community volunteers. Harvard Business Review, 49 (2), 4-16, 156-157.
- Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 16, 16-21.

- Firstenberg, P. B. (1986). Managing for profit in the nonprofit world. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Fisher, W. R. (1987). Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value and action. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Foster, W. P. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 39-62). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Gans, H. (1962). The urban villagers. Glencoe, IL: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Gardner, J. R., Rachlin, R., & Sweeny, H. W. A. (Eds.). (1986). Handbook of strategic planning. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gergen, K. J., & Gergen, M. M. (1986). Narrative form and the construction of psychological science. In T. R. Sarbin, (Ed.), Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct (pp. 22-24). New York: Praeger.
- Gold, R. (1958). Roles in sociological field observations. Social Forces, 36, 217-223.
- Goodson, I., & Walker, R. (1983). Telling tales. In Deakin University, Perspectives on case study 3: Story-telling (2nd ed., pp. 1-24). Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.
- Grant, J. H., & King, W. R. (1982). The logic of strategic planning. Boston: Little-Brown.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Hartogs, N., & Weber, J. (1974). Boards of directors: A study of current practices in board management and board operations in voluntary hospital, health and welfare organizations. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications.

- Heidrick and Struggles. (1983). The changing board. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Herman, R. D. (1989). Board functions and board-staff relations in nonprofit organizations: An introduction. In R. D. Herman & J. Van Til (Eds.), Nonprofit boards of directors: Analyses and applications (pp. 1-7). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Herman, R. D., & Van Til, J. (1989). Nonprofit boards of directors: Analyses and applications. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Higgins, J. M. (1985). Strategy: Formulation, implementation and control. New York: Dryden.
- Higgins, J. M., & Vincze, J. W. (1989). Strategic management: Texts and cases (4th ed.). New York: Dryden.
- Hodgetts, R. M., & Wortman, M. S., Jr. (1980). Administrative policy: Text and cases in strategic management. (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Hodgkinson, V. A., & Weitzman, M. S. (2nd ed.). (1986). Dimensions of the independent sector: A statistical profile. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- James, E. (1987). The nonprofit sector in comparative perspective. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 397-415). New Haven, Conn: Yale University.
- Kanter, R. E., & Summers, D. V. (1987). Doing well while doing good: Dilemmas of performance measurement in nonprofit organizations and the need for a multiple-constituency approach. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 154-166). New Haven, Conn: Yale University.
- Kennedy, M. M. (1984). Assessing the validity of qualitative data. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6 (4), 367-377.

- Ketterer, R. F., Price, R. H., & Politser, P. E. (1980). The action research paradigm. In R. H. Price & P. E. Politser (Eds.), Evaluation and action in the social environment (pp. 1-16). New York: Academic Press.
- King, W. R. (1979). Strategic planning in nonprofit organizations. In Gerald Zaltman (Ed.), Management principles for nonprofit agencies and organizations (pp. 340-362). New York: AMACOM.
- Korn/Ferry, International. (1983). Board of directors: Tenth annual study. New York: Author.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. Journal of Social Issues, 2, 34-36.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Part II, social planning and action research. Human Relations, 1, 143-153.
- Lewin, K. (1948a). Action research and minority problems. In K. Lewin, Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K. (1948b). Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Frontiers in group dynamics. In K. Lewin, Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lorange, P. (1980). Corporate planning: An executive viewpoint. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lorange, P., & Vancil, R. F. (1977). Strategic planning systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Louden, J. K. (1982). The director: A professional's guide to effective board work. New York: AMACOM.
- Luke, J. (1988). Managing interconnectedness: The challenge of shared power. In J. M. Bryson & R. C. Einsweiler (Eds.), Shared power: What is it? How does it work? How can we make it work better? Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

- Mandler, J. M. (1984). Stories, scripts, and scenes: Aspects of a schema theory. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mason, D. E. (1984). Voluntary nonprofit enterprise management. New York: Plenum Press.
- Mattar, E. P. (1985). The board in nonprofit corporations. In E. P. Mattar & M. Ball (Eds.), Handbook for corporate directors (pp. 32.1-32.8). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mattar, E. P., & Ball, M. (Eds.). (1985). Handbook for corporate directors. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Middleton, M. (1987). Nonprofit boards of directors: Beyond the governance function. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 141-153). New Haven, Conn: Yale University.
- Middleton, M. (1988). Planning as strategy: The case of nonprofit organizations. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, New Haven, CT.
- Miller, L. E., Weiss, R. M., & MacLeod, B. V. (1988). Boards of directors in nonprofit organizations: Composition, activities, and organizational outcomes. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 17, 81-89.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research interviewing: Context and narrative. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moskow, M. H. (1978). Strategic planning in business and government. New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- Mueller, R. K. (1982). Board score: How to judge board worthiness. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

- O'Connell, B. (1976). Effective leadership in voluntary organizations. Piscataway, NJ: New Century Education Corporation.
- O'Neill, M., & Young, D. R. (1988). Educating managers of nonprofit organizations. New York: Praeger.
- Olsen, J. B., & Eadie, D. C. (1982). The game plan: Governance with foresight. Washington: Council of State Planning Agencies.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. (Ed.). (1986). Strategic planning: Selected readings. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Polkinghorne, D. E., (1988). Narrative knowing and the human sciences. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Powell, W.W. (Ed.). (1987). The nonprofit sector: A research handbook. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Provan, K. G., & Stewart, D. W. (1982). Measuring organizational effectiveness in the not-for-profit sector. Academy of Management Proceedings, 339-343.
- Quinn, J. B. (1980). Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Rider, R. W. (1983). Making strategic planning work in local government. Long Range Planning, 16, (3), 73-81.
- Ring, P. S., & Perry, J. L. (1985). Strategic management in public and private organizations: Implications of distinctive contexts and constraints. Academy of Management Review, 10 (2), 276-286.
- Rist, R. (1975). Ethnographic techniques and the study of the urban school. Urban Education, 10 (1), 86-108.
- Rodman, H., & Kolodny, R. (1971). Organizational strains in the researcher-practitioner relationship. In F. C. Caro (Ed.), Readings in evaluation research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Rogers, V. R. (1984). Qualitative research: Another way of knowing. In Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Using what we know about teaching (pp. 85-105). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Rost, J. C. (1988, July). The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era. Paper presented at a meeting of Educational Leadership Researchers at the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
- Rothman, J. (1974). Planning and organizing for social change: Action principles from social science research. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Salamon, L. M. (1987). Partners in public service: The scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 99-117). New Haven, Conn: Yale University.
- Saline, C. (1982). The board game. Philadelphia, 73 (10), pp. 142, 234-238.
- Savage, T. J. (1984). Not-for-profit trusteeship: Salvaging the myth. Paper presented at the Conference on Research on Volunteerism and Nonprofit Organizations, Blacksburg: VA.
- Schendel, D. E., & Hofer, C. W. (Eds.). (1979). Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Slavin, S. (Ed.). (1978). Social administration: The management of the social services. New York: Haworth Press.
- Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative versus qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. Educational Researcher, 12 (3), 6-13.
- Sorkin, D. L., Ferris, N. B., & Hudak, J. (1984). Strategies for cities and counties: A strategic planning guide and workbook. Washington: Public Technology.

- Steinberg, R. (1987). Nonprofit organizations and the market. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (pp. 118-138). New Haven, Conn: Yale University.
- Steiner, G. A. (1979). Strategic planning: What every manager must know. New York: Free Press.
- Steiner, G. A., Miner, J. B., & Gray, E. R. (1986). Management policy and strategy: Text, readings, and cases (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Tompkins, C. J. (1985). Planning. In L. E. Grayson & C. J. Tompkins Management of public sector and nonprofit organizations (pp. 137-149). Reston, VA: Reston Publishing.
- Trost, A., & Rauner, J. (1983). Gaining momentum: For board action. San Diego, CA: Marlborough Publications.
- Unterman, I., & Davis, R. H. (1982). The strategy gap in not-for-profits. Harvard Business Review, 60 (3), 30-40.
- Unterman, I., & Davis, R. H. (1984). Strategic management of not-for-profit organizations: From survival to success. New York: Praeger.
- Waldo, C. N. (1985). Boards of directors: Their changing roles, structure, and information needs. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Walker, J. M. (1983). Limits of strategic management in voluntary organizations. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 12, 39-55.
- Weisbrod, B. A. (1988). The nonprofit economy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weiss, S., & Wynn, P. (1980). An examination of the literature on the function and responsibilities of board of directors in not for profit organizations. New York: Community Service Society of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 063)

- Wheelen, T. L., & Hunger, J. D. (1986). Strategic management and business policy (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- White, M. J. (Ed.). (1981). Nonprofit firms in a three sector economy. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Whyte, W. F. (1982). Interviewing in field research. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), Field research: A source book and field manual. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Wolf, T. (1984). The nonprofit organization: An operating model. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wortman, M. S., Jr. (1979). Strategic management: Not-for-profit organizations. In D. Schendel & C. Hofer (Eds.), Strategic management (pp. 353-373). Boston: Little-Brown.
- Wortman, M. S., Jr. (1988). Strategic management in nonprofit organizations: A research typology and research perspective. In J. H. Grant (Ed.), Strategic management frontiers. Greenwich, Conn: Jai Press.
- Zald, M. N. (1969). The power and functions of boards and directors: A theoretical synthesis. American Journal of Sociology, 75, 97-111.
- Zusman, J. (1982). Public agency boards. In J. K. Loudon, The director: A professional's guide to effective board work (pp. 217-280). New York: AMACOM.

Interview Participant Consent Form

Consent Form

Research: THE INFLUENCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS ON A NONPROFIT BOARD AND A PUBLIC COMMISSION

Researcher: Mary A. Powers

Procedures and Protections: There are no foreseen risks to this research. Your participation in this research is strictly on a voluntary basis with the understanding that you may withdraw at any time.

You will be interviewed by this researcher for approximately one hour. The interviews will be audio-taped and coded for purposes of confidentiality and anonymity. Your name will not be used. Coded, transcribed interviews will be analyzed for recurring themes by the researcher.

You may ask questions about the procedure, and have those questions answered before you sign this form.

Consent: I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, I give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

Participant: _____

Date: _____

Location: _____

Researcher: _____

Date: _____

Pre-interview Guide

**THE INFLUENCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS
ON A NONPROFIT BOARD AND A PUBLIC COMMISSION**

Pre-interview Guide

This dissertation study will look at the process of strategic planning as experienced by a nonprofit Board (City Heights Community Development Corporation) and a public Commission (City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture). Part of the data obtained will come from pre- and post-interviews with the President and Chairman, Executive Directors, Strategic Planning Committee Members and a randomly selected group of the remaining Board Members and Commissioners. All interviews will be audio-taped. Any information obtained will remain anonymous.

Each organization has named a Strategic Planning Committee which will begin meeting monthly (for 6 months) to work towards the creation of a three-year strategic plan. The questions for this pre-interview will address the background of the interviewees, their experience and understanding of strategic planning, and their thoughts about their organization. Interview data will be analyzed for recurring themes.

1. Tell me about your educational and professional background.
2. Aside from this organization (Commission or CHCDC) what other nonprofit or public organizations have you been involved with? In what capacity?
3. How did you become involved with this organization?

4. Have you had any previous experience with strategic planning? If so, please describe your experience.
5. What are your thoughts regarding how this Board or Commission will respond to the strategic planning process?
6. How would you define planning?
7. How would you define strategy?
8. Do you have any specific concerns related to the process of strategic planning?
9. What do you see as the primary goal of the organization? What other goals for the organization are important to you?
10. What do you see as the strengths of the organization?
11. What weaknesses are there, if any?
12. Within the overall structure of the organization, what do you see as the role of the Board or Commission?
13. What is the role of the Executive Director?
14. How do you see the current relationship between the Executive Director and Board or Commission? Describe how you would like to see it, if this is different from what you have just told me.
- 14a. How do you see the current relationship between the Executive Director and City Manager? Describe how you would like to see it, if this is different from what you have just told me. (Commission only)
- 14b. How do you see the current relationship between the Commission and City Manager? Describe how you would like to see it, if this is different from what you have just told me. (Commission only)
- 14c. How do you see the current relationship between the Commission and City Council? Describe how you would like to see it, if this is different from what you have just told me. (Commission only)

15. How do you see the current relationship between the organization and your constituents? Describe how you would like to see it, if this is different from what you have just told me.
16. Are there other specific changes related to structure or program you would like to see occur?
17. Do you have any ideas for tactics to implement these changes?
18. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about this organization that could help me prepare for facilitating the strategic planning process?

Post-interview Guide

**THE INFLUENCE OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS
ON A NONPROFIT BOARD AND A PUBLIC COMMISSION**

Post-interview Guide

1. How would you define planning?
2. How would you define strategy?
3. Describe in your own words, the purpose of creating a strategic plan.
4. In your opinion, how successful was this strategic planning process we just completed?
5. From your perspective, if we were to do this over, what changes would you make to the planning process? What would you leave the same?
6. What did you learn from participating in the planning process?
7. What did the group as a whole learn?
8. Is strategic planning useful for your organization? Do you believe that the planning process addressed specific weaknesses and capitalized on particular strengths of the organization?
9. As a result of the planning process do you see any differences in roles and relationships as we discussed during the pre-interviews?
10. Do you think that strategic planning is equally beneficial in all three sectors (private, public, and nonprofit) or do you believe that it belongs in private industry?
11. Is strategic planning useful for problem solving only or is it worthy of the on-going attention of an organization?
12. Should strategic planning be the responsibility of the Executive Director or the Board (or Commission)?

13. Describe/Compare/Contrast the functions of the Strategic Planning Committee and the remainder of the Board (or Commission) as they pertain to the planning process.
14. Should the person or persons responsible for planning within an organization be trained in strategic planning or should a consultant be brought in by the organization?

Appendix E
City Heights Community Development Corporation
Strategic Plan 1990 - 1993

Strategic Plan 1990 - 1993

City Heights
Community Development
Corporation

**City Heights
Community Development Corporation**

Board of Directors

Strategic Planning Committee

**Mary A. Powers
Planning Consultant**

Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The History.....	2
The Mission	3
The Organization.....	3
The Purpose of the Plan	3
The Methodology.....	4
Goals, Objectives, and Strategies	
The Goals.....	5
Community Development.....	6
Neighborhood Organizing.....	6-7
Community Enhancement Program.....	8
Adopt-A-Tree Program.....	9-10
Economic Development.....	11
Housing.....	11-12
Redevelopment.....	13
Business Development.....	14
Capital Improvements.....	15
Resources.....	16
Volunteer Support.....	16-17
Personnel.....	18
Funding.....	19
Appendix	A1
Organizational Chart.....	A2
Map of City Heights.....	A3
Acknowledgements.....	A4

THE HISTORY OF CITY HEIGHTS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

In late 1979, the San Diego City-County Reinvestment Task Force was charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of "redlining" in certain neighborhoods. While "redlining" was never specifically discovered, the investigators identified severe lender disinvestment in City Heights*.

The Task Force, which includes public officials and representatives of both lending institutions and neighborhood groups, held a number of public hearings in City Heights to determine potential solutions to specific problems facing local residents. After a lengthy process of assessing problems, goals, and strategies, the Task Force recommended that the residents form their own community development corporation to represent the community's interests and to work toward the community's goals. Thus was formed the City Heights Community Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as CHCDC), incorporated in June of 1981.

Early activities of the CHCDC included publishing *The VOICE of City Heights*, conducting a market survey, creating an economic development strategy, and forming relationships with private developers and businesses to support revitalization and redevelopment efforts in the City Heights commercial area. In more recent years, the programs of the CHCDC have grown in number to include community organizing, clean-ups, anti-graffiti campaigns, governmental advocacy, the initiating process to establish a City-recognized community planning group, regreening efforts, and capital improvement needs identification.

The early years of the CHCDC have been spent organizing the community. Now is the time to move towards economic development activities in order to improve the economic position of City Heights.

*City Heights, a community in the city of San Diego, is bordered by El Cajon Boulevard on the north, Home Avenue on the south, Euclid Avenue on the east and the 805 Freeway on the west.

THE MISSION

The City Heights Community Development Corporation implements community and economic development strategies designed to empower local residents, improve neighborhood image and identity, and facilitate the revitalization of City Heights through desirable residential and commercial growth and redevelopment.

THE ORGANIZATION

The City Heights Community Development Corporation is a California Nonprofit Corporation. The CHCDC is governed by a volunteer Board of Directors, the majority of which are City Heights residents. Board responsibilities are supported by two levels of committees. Standing Board committees include the Executive/Finance, Community Development, and Economic Development Committees. Project committees are formed ad hoc by the Board or professional staff. They are composed of Board Members and/or area residents and other volunteers who act in an advisory and/or service capacity to the standing committees of the Board. The professional and administrative staff is assisted by legal, economic development, planning, auditing and public relations services obtained on a consultation basis. The organizational chart for the CHCDC is included in the appendix.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The City Heights Community Development Corporation recently began a six-month planning endeavor to develop a three-year strategic plan for the organization. The product of this effort is a road map intended to guide the CHCDC towards the attainment of its mission. The Plan will be reviewed annually and revised as conditions and circumstances change.

THE METHODOLOGY

The ten-month planning effort that the *CHCDC's STRATEGIC PLAN, 1990 - 1993* represents was directed by Mary A. Powers, as part of her doctoral research for the Division of Leadership and Administration at the University of San Diego. Ms. Powers is a consultant specializing in organizational and planning strategies for nonprofit and public organizations. The planning process was executed by the Strategic Planning Committee of the CHCDC's Board. The planning committee was composed of the Board President, two additional Board Members, and the Executive Director.

A planning model designed by John M. Bryson and William Roering for use by public and nonprofit organizations was used. (Bryson, J. M., Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1988).

The planning process included:

- A significant amount of research conducted by the consultant which included document analysis, Board meeting observations, and a series of pre-planning discussions with key Board Members and staff members.
- Pre-planning interviews with all Committee members, the Board President, and additional randomly selected Board Members. Interview questions were focused on mission, goals, roles, relationships, strengths, weaknesses, and strategies.
- A series of interviews with key informants was held as part of a stakeholder analysis.
- Six months of Strategic Planning Committee meetings, involving the examination and evaluation of committee and consultant-generated research and information, were held from May 1989 to October 1989. The Committee was responsive to feedback received from the community as well as from other Board Members, government representatives and elected officials. Following this, a series of meetings with individual Committee members (responsible for the refinement of various sections of the plan) and a final meeting of the full Committee completed the planning process. A series of drafts was then presented to the full Board for feedback and approval. Suggestions received from Board Members were incorporated into this document.

THE GOALS

This strategic plan for 1990 - 1993 has been developed to support the Board of Directors' commitment to utilize the organization's resources more efficiently. In recent years, human and financial resources have been primarily focused on community development activities. In the future a gradual shift towards economic development projects will occur. The Board intends to better define and focus the organization's scope of programs and services in support of this commitment. To pursue the mission of the organization, the City Heights Community Development Corporation will:

- **FOSTER** the development of a network of neighborhood groups for the purpose of revitalizing their own areas as well as combining efforts to benefit the overall City Heights community.
- **IMPLEMENT** the Community Enhancement Program to reverse the deterioration of public and private properties and promote neighborhood pride and the revitalization of City Heights.
- **COORDINATE and IMPLEMENT** the Adopt-A-Tree program to regreen City Heights and facilitate resident involvement.
- **IMPACT** the current housing crisis in City Heights by sponsoring the development or rehabilitation of single-family, multi-unit, or mixed-use projects.
- **ADVOCATE** for the needs of the City Heights community in the City of San Diego's redevelopment process.
- **PROMOTE and IMPROVE** the local business environment by marketing the area to a diversity of businesses, providing technical assistance to business owners and managers, and creating new businesses to serve the City Heights community.
- **ADVOCATE** for capital improvements, effective zoning enforcement, and improved municipal services with the City of San Diego.
- **INCREASE** volunteer support from individuals and groups.
- **DEFINE and IMPLEMENT** a clear organizational structure and personnel policies and practices which reflect and support the mission of the organization.
- **BROADEN** its economic base of support.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

City Heights is an economically and ethnically varied community. It is largely low-income. Much of its housing and its small business districts are depressed. A large percentage of the housing is absentee owned. Recent years have seen rapid increases in multiple unit apartments. Population increases have impacted elementary school attendance figures resulting in overcrowding. The levels of crime, particularly violent crimes against people, have nearly doubled in the past five years. Most standard measurements of urban decline are present and increasing in City Heights.

The CHCDC is committed to addressing the causes of decline through community development activities, primary amongst which is the empowerment of local residents. Neighborhood Organizing, the Community Enhancement Program, and the Adopt-A-Tree Program are three specific strategies aimed towards community development. The CHCDC Board believes that the solutions to community problems should derive from the members of the community. Therefore, the primary focus of each of these programs is the organization and development of leadership potential in program volunteers.

Neighborhood Organizing

Traditionally, community development programs sponsored by the CHCDC have included: community clean-ups, graffiti paint-outs, crime prevention activities, neighborhood organizing, a citizen complaint program, and greening efforts. The success of these programs and projects will be enhanced with greater community involvement and responsibility.

In the future the focus will be on the creation and development of new and existing neighborhood groups composed of volunteers able to coordinate and implement programs of their own with technical assistance provided by the CHCDC.

Active neighborhood groups currently exist for Lexington Park, Euclid Avenue, and Orange Avenue, in addition to the City Heights Improvement Committee. These groups, once strengthened and made more visible, can become models for the development of new neighborhood groups. Through its neighborhood organizing activities, the CHCDC will develop self-sufficient groups led by individuals able to promote the goals of the group, recruit volunteers and work in conjunction with other, similar groups in City Heights.

Goal I: **The CHCDC will foster the development of a network of neighborhood groups for the purpose of revitalizing their own areas as well as combining efforts to benefit the overall City Heights community.**

Objectives:

- A. To strengthen existing groups to create models for the development of new groups.
- B. To promote community leadership through individuals and groups.
- C. To create two new, self-sufficient neighborhood groups each year.
- D. To change the CHCDC staff function in community development activities from coordinator to technical assistance provider over a three-year period.

Strategies:

- 1. Recruit and hire a neighborhood organizer to support neighborhood group activities and the Community Enhancement Program.
- 2. Initially focus on the existing neighborhood groups to develop them to a level of self-sufficiency.
- 3. Facilitate the formation of new neighborhood groups to address community-related issues and problems.
- 4. Design and implement a campaign to recruit volunteers.
- 5. Sponsor community leadership development programs.
- 6. Implement a technical assistance program tailored to the needs of new and existing groups.

Community Enhancement Program

The Community Enhancement Program offers a comprehensive, coordinated reinvestment strategy for rebuilding deteriorated neighborhoods. Partnerships among the community and business and government entities can have a tremendous impact upon the rehabilitation of City Heights. This program entails door-to-door inspections which allow residents and business owners to participate in the process. Housing issues and commercial strip problems are focused upon for successful voluntary compliance or enforcement.

Goal II: The CHCDC will implement the Community Enhancement Program to reverse the deterioration of public and private properties and promote neighborhood pride and the revitalization of City Heights.

Objectives:

- A. To rehabilitate the community in order to improve the health and safety of local residents and to impact investor attitudes.
- B. To coordinate a systematic, comprehensive code enforcement program for City Heights.
- C. To identify public and private resources that may be used to augment the Community Development Block Grant funds allocated for community revitalization efforts.
- D. To encourage public/private partnerships to install and maintain infrastructure and public facilities in City Heights.

Strategies:

- 1. Hire staff to implement the Community Enhancement Program.
- 2. Educate property owners and residents regarding the Community Enhancement Program.
- 3. Coordinate a Volunteer Assistance Committee to assist elderly or handicapped individuals with code compliance.
- 4. Promote voluntary compliance, implement enforcement procedures, and evaluate and revise the program as appropriate.

Adopt-A-Tree Program

Regreening efforts began in 1981 with the Adopt-A-Tree program. Since that time trees have been available for residential, business and public sites in City Heights. This program involves door-to-door and mail campaigns in addition to public presentations to promote the adoption of trees. The Adopt-A-Tree program is implemented by the CHCDC in cooperation with the City of San Diego's Park and Recreation and Landscape Departments and regreening experts. Planting volunteers are recruited from a number of organizations as well as the City Heights community. The Parker Foundation, the San Diego Community Foundation, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego, City Farmers Nursery, the Lexington Park/Poplar Street Community Association and private contributors jointly fund the program.

Goal III: The CHCDC will coordinate and implement the Adopt-A-Tree program to regreen City Heights and facilitate resident involvement.

Objectives:

- A. To promote the regreening of the City Heights community through an on-going street tree planting and maintenance program.
- B. To plant 500 trees by mid-1990.

Strategies:

- 1. Recruit and hire a community organizer to coordinate the Adopt-A-Tree program.
- 2. Develop a door-to-door solicitation package which will include: general information, issues questionnaire, citizen's improvement form, voter registration form, Adopt-A-Tree information sheet, Adopt-A-Tree signature form, and the most recent issue of the *VOICE*.
- 3. Form a project committee which will report to the Board of Directors through the Community Development Committee. Committee members will be interested area residents and greening experts able to assist with program implementation and public relations.

4. Establish and maintain a computer tracking system of resident and business participation.
5. Continue door-to-door canvassing to promote tree planting.
6. Recruit and train volunteers to plant trees.
7. Educate local residents regarding tree maintenance and care.
8. Work with Board Members, public relations consultant, and/or project committee members to design and implement fundraising and public relations plans.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

City Heights is an older, low-income, multi-ethnic neighborhood in the Mid-City area of the city of San Diego (see appendix for map). Historically, City Heights has been a working class, single family, owner-dominated community. Recent years have seen over-taxation of the infrastructure, unemployment, increased density, and poorly managed property. All of these combine to create an environment for increased crime and overall decline within the community.

While community development strategies seek to address the symptoms of these problems, economic development seeks correction by addressing the problems themselves. The CHCDC Board has prioritized four areas of economic development: housing, redevelopment, business development and capital improvements, and has devised preliminary strategies aimed towards better defining the role of the CHCDC in these activities and specific ways to improve the economic condition of City Heights.

Housing

The increase in population density brought about by the replacement of single-family homes with multi-unit residential buildings has had a tremendous, negative impact on the City Heights community. The consequential demographic shifts have increased the need for quality housing. The San Diego Neighborhood Housing Services (supported by the Mid-City Plan amendment) has begun to address this concern but a tremendous need to reverse the decline of City Heights' housing; promote housing rehabilitation programs; and provide desirable, affordable, single-family and multi-unit residential building still exists.

Goal IV: **The CHCDC will impact the current housing crisis in City Heights by sponsoring the development or rehabilitation of single-family, multi-unit, or mixed-use projects.**

Objectives:

- A. To develop a housing policy which meets the need for quality affordable housing for City Heights residents.
- B. To complete a housing project.

Strategies:

1. Recruit and hire an economic development consultant qualified to help identify possible projects for housing or mixed use construction or rehabilitation.
2. Create a development team composed of an architect, engineer, developer, attorney, banker, and real estate broker, responsible for identifying potential projects, financing, and project implementation.
3. Create home-ownership opportunities.
4. Develop property management expertise and act as a role model for other property owners in the community.
5. Provide incentives for property up-keep and beautification.

Redevelopment

City Heights has been proposed as a redevelopment area. State redevelopment law provides communities like City Heights with the tools needed to address deteriorating conditions within their jurisdictions. Through the redevelopment process City Heights will work with the City of San Diego to plan, develop, replan, redevelop, rehabilitate or reconstruct the designated area. Redevelopment will provide financial resources which will allow for capital improvement projects, property rehabilitation, private development, and desirable affordable housing. The CHCDC must play a major role in this process. By insuring community input and participation in the formation, development, and implementation of the redevelopment plan, the CHCDC (acting on behalf of City Heights residents) will take full advantage of the opportunities made available through redevelopment.

Goal V: **The CHCDC will advocate for the needs of the City Heights Community in the City of San Diego's redevelopment process.**

Objective:

- A. To ensure that the City Heights community participates in the redevelopment process and has input in the formation of the redevelopment area and the identification and implementation of specific projects.

Strategies:

- 1. Ensure community representation for the I-15 Task Force, the Project Area Committee, and future citizen advisory groups.
- 2. Identify and sponsor a major revitalization project to be implemented with redevelopment funds.

Business Development

More than 300 businesses are located in City Heights, the majority of which are ethnic owned and operated. Resident survey data from 1985 indicated that the community is interested in new businesses locating in City Heights as a means for job opportunities. After studying the commercial feasibility and market demand of the City Heights commercial strip consultants concluded that a redevelopment project offered the greatest potential for successful revitalization. In conjunction with redevelopment, existing businesses in City Heights would benefit from improved marketing efforts, additional technical assistance, and a better mix of businesses, and service organizations able to meet the needs of local residents.

Goal VI: **The CHCDC will promote and improve the local business environment by marketing the area to a diversity of businesses, providing technical assistance to business owners and managers, and creating new businesses to serve the City Heights community.**

Objectives:

- A. To create and implement a plan for business development which defines the role of the CHCDC and best serves the commercial interests and residents of the community.
- B. To cultivate ethnic/cultural commercial diversity.
- C. To improve traffic flow, parking, and pedestrian access conditions.

Strategies:

- 1. Promote good relations with the Business Improvement Districts' Boards of Directors and the Mid-City Chamber of Commerce.
- 2. Update research statistics with a questionnaire to new businesses.

Capital Improvements

Through the Community Enhancement Program, the CHCDC will remain abreast and well-informed of the community's capital improvement needs. The organization's advocacy role should include the recommendation of resource allocations related to the provision of services and capital improvements in community and school facilities.

Goal VII: **The CHCDC will advocate for capital improvements, effective zoning enforcement, and improved municipal services with the City of San Diego.**

Objective:

- A. To ensure that the City Heights community receives its fair share of Capital Improvements Program funding.

Strategy:

- 1. Link local residents and the Capital Improvements Program by involving neighborhood groups in the process of identifying community needs.

RESOURCES

Volunteer Support

The success of the projects and programs described in this document, the future leadership of the CHCDC, and the well-being of the community as a whole, are dependent upon active volunteer support. To achieve the goals set out in this document, community leaders must be recruited, developed, and empowered to impact their immediate neighborhood as well as contribute to the overall revitalization of the City Heights community.

Goal VIII: The CHCDC will increase volunteer support from individuals and groups.

Objectives:

- A. To recruit, develop, and empower individuals and groups through recognition of and assistance with neighborhood issues and concerns.
- B. To increase community awareness and support for the programs and projects of the CHCDC which increase the visibility, image and public support for the organization.
- C. To increase the CHCDC's membership by 50 each year.
- D. To appoint area residents and business owners to the standing committees and project committees of the Board.
- E. To develop a pool of candidates for potential appointment to the Board of Directors.

Strategies:

- 1. Recruit volunteers through the Neighborhood Organizing, Community Enhancement, and Adopt-A-Tree programs.
- 2. Emphasize volunteer involvement in community clean-ups and graffiti paint-outs.
- 3. Develop a Community Leadership Development program to be implemented twice annually.

4. Promote volunteer involvement in every issue of the *VOICE*.
5. Develop a packet of information designed to inform and educate potential CHCDC volunteers about the organization and its programs and opportunities for involvement.
6. Increase the general mailing list for CHCDC promotional and informational items.

Personnel

Goal IX: **The CHCDC will define and implement a clear organizational structure and personnel policies and practices which reflect and support the mission of the organization.**

Objective:

- A. Establish and maintain positive, effective relations between the Board of Directors and staff.

Strategies:

1. Recruit an economic development specialist and a community development specialist to implement economic and community development strategies.
2. Recruit an executive director responsible for coordinating and overseeing administration and program operations.
3. Hire additional support staff as needed.

Funding

The CHCDC is currently funded by a City of San Diego Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and County of San Diego Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT); gifts from the San Diego Community Foundation, the Parker Foundation, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and Citicorp; fees for service from the City Heights Business Improvement District (BID), El Cajon Boulevard Central Business Improvement District; and, interest income and membership fees. A cost center detailed budget is adopted by the Board each year prior to the beginning of the fiscal year (September 1). The budget for fiscal year '90 supports this document. Future budgets will reflect the strategic plan. Each goal addressed herein will be pursued with the required budgetary, timeline, and workplan documentation.

Goal X: The CHCDC will broaden its economic base of support.

Objectives:

- A. To seek new funding sources which will support the mission of the CHCDC.
- B. To create financially self-sufficient programs.
- C. To create revenue-generating programs able to fund other CHCDC programs.
- D. To maintain efficient accounting and internal control practices.

Strategies:

- 1. Develop and implement a strategy to diversify funding.
- 2. Continue annual independent audits.
- 3. Complete the transfer of financial reporting to an in-house function.

Appendix

CITY HEIGHTS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Organizational Chart

CITY HEIGHTS

Acknowledgements

The City Heights Community Development Corporation would like to extend a special thanks to individuals and organizations whose efforts contributed to the completion of the strategic plan.

Susan Davis
Board of Education, San Diego City Schools

Jeff Hale
San Diego Community Foundation

Vince Hall
For City Councilman Bob Filner

Judy McDonald
Parker Foundation

Jeff Marston
For Former City Councilmember Gloria McColl

Jim Merriken
City Heights Business Improvement District

Daniel Pegg
San Diego Economic Development Corporation

Maureen Stapleton
Deputy City Manager, City of San Diego

A note from the Consultant . . .

The creation of the *City Heights Community Development Corporation's STRATEGIC PLAN, 1990 - 1993* was part of a doctoral dissertation entitled: *The Influence of the Strategic Planning Process on a Nonprofit Board and a Public Commission*. I would like to thank the CHCDC for agreeing to participate in this research. A copy of the study, including the *STRATEGIC PLAN, 1990 - 1993*, will become part of the permanent collection of the Helen K. James S. Copley Library at the University of San Diego, San Diego, California.

Special appreciation to: Barry J. Schultz, Jim Bliesner, Valerie Hoffman, John W. Stump, Daniel Salazar, Sandra Wilson, Nghiep Le, Jake Jacobs, Becky Rainsberger, Marc R. Duggan, and Craig Lee.

Mary A. Powers
1/90

City Heights Community
Development Corporation
4252 University Avenue
City Heights, CA 92105
(619) 584-1535

Appendix F
City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture
Directions for the Future

**DRAFT
COPY**

Directions for the Future

City of San Diego

Commission
for
Arts and Culture

Directions for the Future

City of San Diego

Mayor

Maureen O'Connor

City Council

Abbe Wolfsheimer
Ron Roberts
John Hartley
H. Wes Pratt
Linda Bernhardt
J. Bruce Henderson
Judy McCarty
Bob Filner

City Manager

John Lockwood

Deputy City Manager

Jack McGrory

Commission for Arts and Culture

Strategic Planning Committee

Mary A. Powers, Planning Consultant

Commission Staff

Mayor's Staff

Contract Staff

Directions for the Future was supported in part by a grant from the
California Arts Council State/Local Partners Program.

January, 1990

A Message From the Mayor . . .

Directions for the Future is intended to serve as a road map to the City of San Diego's future support of our City's arts and cultural organizations.

Because the arts and culture have long played an important role in defining a community's character and quality of life, the San Diego City Council is committed to creating a mutually beneficial link between our community's artists/arts and culture organizations and the neighborhoods that now comprise the nation's sixth largest metropolis. Rich in cultural diversity, the City's arts community has much to offer the citizenry and visitors alike.

The Commission for Arts and Culture is the City's primary advocate for arts funding and programming. In its efforts to create an atmosphere conducive to the further growth of the arts and culture in San Diego, the Commission has undertaken a plan of action to integrate the arts, both visual and performing, into all aspects of the community.

The eclectic plan contained in the following pages includes programs ranging from the placement of art throughout our urban environment and neighborhood festivals to the education of elected officials, government agencies and community leaders about the benefits of a vibrant and growing cultural core.

As San Diego embarks in to the 1990's its character will continue to be defined by its commitment to aesthetics and artistic expression. San Diego's future is bright and filled with much promise. *Directions for the Future* will provide us with yet another opportunity to reach our potential as a great "world class city."

Sincerely,

Maureen O'Connor
Mayor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Vision.....	2
Basic Values	3
The Mission	4
The Purpose	4
The Purpose of <i>Directions for the Future</i>	4
Methodology.....	5
Goals, Objectives and Strategies	
The Goals.....	6
Partnerships	7
Advocacy.....	7
Government and Community Relations.....	9
Arts, Culture, and Tourism Partnerships.....	11
Resources.....	12
Funding.....	12
Programs and Services.....	14
Allocations	14
Visual Art in Public Places.....	17
Community Outreach.....	18
Appendix	A1
Definitions.....	A2
Acknowledgements.....	A3

THE VISION

On August 31, 1988, as part of the first meeting of the Commission for Arts and Culture, Commissioners and staff members joined together to create a vision of San Diego in the 21st Century.

San Diego as a city . . .

- where arts and cultural organizations work as partners.
- where the realities of equal access are faced.
- where all humanitarian resources are tapped.
- where quality arts education in the schools is encouraged.
- where arts and culture reach their highest funding potential.
- where artists are citizens, decision makers and problem solvers.
- where the arts, cultural and tourism industries work together to gain international attention.
- where the performing, visual, literary, and media arts are approached with a higher level of understanding and appreciation.
- where informed citizens recognize excellence in arts and culture and appreciate their role in society.

. . . a Paris of the 21st Century.
Dr. Roger Revelle
Commissioner

BASIC VALUES

The City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture is committed to serving the citizens of San Diego and its arts and cultural community by:

<i>Leadership</i>	Providing a vision and a direction to create an environment where arts and culture will flourish;
<i>Service</i>	Sustaining an ongoing dialogue in response to the needs of the community;
<i>Quality</i>	Assisting artists and arts and cultural organizations to achieve artistic and administrative excellence;
<i>Equality</i>	Creating equal access to arts and cultural opportunities;
<i>Diversity</i>	Promoting and preserving cultural diversity, recognizing the integrity of artistic expression in all cultures;
<i>Support</i>	Recommending the allocation of funds to promote, encourage, stabilize, and foster the arts and cultural institutions, activities, and individual artists within its boundaries;
<i>Aesthetics</i>	Cultivating the consideration of aesthetic issues in all areas; and
<i>Planning</i>	Continuing to engage in arts and cultural planning.

THE MISSION

The mission of the San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture is to assist artists and arts organizations and cultural institutions which enrich the quality of life for the people of San Diego.

THE PURPOSE

The Commission seeks, through its recommendations to the Mayor, the City Council, and the City Manager, to promote and increase support for the literary, performing, visual and media arts, and for the city's cultural organizations and institutions. The Commission also seeks to support organizations which educate and expose the public to a rich and diverse range of artistic expression. The Commission will advocate strongly for substantial increases in funding for arts and culture from the City of San Diego, from the private sector, and from local, regional, state and federal governments and international entities. It will seek to implement art in public places throughout the neighborhoods of the city of San Diego and to persuade the private sector to integrate art in private development.

The policies and programs of the Commission seek to strengthen the involvement and input of artists and other professionals in cultural planning, to reflect the cultural diversity of the people it serves, and to foster local, national and international cultural understanding.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

Directions for the Future serves as a vital, changing road map that will lead the Commission for Arts and Culture to a future in which the rich offerings of our city's arts and cultural community will entice, uplift, and inspire all of our citizens.

METHODOLOGY

The ten-month planning effort that *Directions for the Future* represents was directed by Mary A. Powers as part of her doctoral dissertation research for the Division of Leadership and Administration at the University of San Diego. Ms. Powers is a consultant specializing in organizational and planning strategies for nonprofit and public organizations. The planning process was executed by the Strategic Planning Committee of the Commission. The planning committee was composed of two Commissioners, a representative from the local arts and cultural community and the Commission's Executive Director. A planning model designed by John M. Bryson and William Roering for use by public and nonprofit organizations was used. (Bryson, J. M., Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1988).

The planning process included:

A significant amount of research conducted by the consultant which included document analysis; research into other cultural plans; Commission and Committee meeting observations; and a series of pre-planning discussions with key Commissioners, staff members, and government representatives.

Pre-planning interviews with all Committee members, the Commission Chairman, and additional randomly selected Commissioners. Interview questions were focused on mission, goals, roles, relationships, strengths, weaknesses, and strategies.

Two open meetings with San Diego artists and representatives from local arts and cultural organizations as part of a stakeholder analysis.

Six months of Strategic Planning Committee meetings, (held from May, 1989 to October, 1989) which involved the examination and evaluation of committee and consultant-generated research and information. The Committee was responsive to feedback received from the arts and cultural community as well as from other Commissioners, government representatives, and elected officials. Following this, a series of meetings with individual Committee members, responsible for the refinement of various sections of *Directions for the Future*, and a final meeting of the full committee completed the planning process. A series of drafts of *Directions for the Future* was then presented to the full Commission for feedback and approval. Suggestions received from the Commission were incorporated into this document.

THE GOALS

The Commission for Arts and Culture will:

- **BE** the primary advocate for arts and culture for the city of San Diego. The Commission will recommend the formulation and implementation of arts and cultural policy;
- **WORK** to develop and maintain favorable, productive relationships with the citizens of San Diego; the San Diego City Council; and local artists and arts, cultural and community organizations;
- **PURSUE** the vision of San Diego as an international cultural destination through the development and support of arts, culture and tourism partnerships;
- **PROTECT** current funding sources and strive to increase the number of sources of support for arts and culture;
- **STRENGTHEN and IMPLEMENT** the annual allocations program and associated technical assistance programs serving arts and cultural organizations and individual artists;
- **EXPAND** the opportunities for the citizens of San Diego and visitors to the area to experience a broad range of high quality art in public places; and
- **DEVELOP** an Arts and Cultural Plan that represents all the communities of San Diego and embraces the cultural diversity of our city.

PARTNERSHIPS

Advocacy

Advocacy is the Commission's primary role. Within the arts and cultural community, the Commission seeks to strengthen and diversify the organizational base, then inform and seek consensus regarding policy. The Commission provides leadership, information and insight regarding arts and cultural issues to other governmental offices, the press, and the general public. The Commission's advocacy role will be pursued through the appropriate government channels within the guidelines of the Brown Act.

In developing a position on an issue, the Commission considers information regarding the history of the issue, any opposing opinion, and constituent concerns and desires.

Advocacy can be exercised by either the group (the Commission as a whole) or individual Commissioners. Commissioners acting alone, with or without the consent of the Commission, will represent the Commission's chosen positions and policies. The Commission or individual Commissioners may advocate for a particular issue in writing, verbally or by their presence at a public meeting. Commissioners are encouraged to continue their advocacy role as private citizens. When an individual Commissioner adheres to a position contrary to that of the Commission, he or she acts as a private citizen.

Goal I: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will be the primary advocate for arts and culture in the city of San Diego. The Commission will recommend the formulation and implementation of arts and cultural policy.**

Objectives:

- A. To advocate for increased funding for arts and culture from current and new sources.
- B. To represent San Diego on the California Arts Council.
- C. To advocate for San Diego arts, culture and tourism issues; arts and culture as a quality of life issue; underserved and underrepresented populations; and public art.

- D. To support arts and cultural organizations as well as individual artists on issues not directly related to the annual Allocations Program such as rehearsal and performance space, artist work/live space, and other issues which may be presented to the Commission.
- E. To seek support from the various levels of government by individual Commissioners or staff members.
- F. To encourage and assist arts and cultural organizations to work together as partners and in partnership with the Commission.

Strategies:

- 1. Assist arts and cultural organizations to become better advocates for their own needs as well as the needs of the larger arts and cultural community.
- 2. Seek support from arts and cultural organizations and the citizens of San Diego in part by a speakers bureau composed of Commissioners and others.
- 3. Provide information on, and recommend the use of services available from other public and private service organizations such as the Public Arts Advisory Council, San Diego Community Foundation, and COMBO, to arts and cultural organizations and individual artists.

Government and Community Relations

Favorable, productive working relationships with the agencies, organizations, and individuals with a vested interest in the work of the Commission are necessary in order to maximize the effectiveness of the Commission.

Goal II: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will work to develop and maintain favorable, productive relationships with the citizens of San Diego; the San Diego City Council; and local artists and arts, cultural and community organizations.**

Strategies:

1. Relations With the Citizens of San Diego

• Media

- a. Develop a public relations plan to include print and electronic media.
- b. Develop an internal policy to channel media inquiries regarding general information and special projects of the Commission through the Chairman, Executive Director, committee chairpersons, and the appointed (Commissioner) Media Spokesperson.

• Public Relations

- c. Obtain funding to produce a brochure for the Commission.
- d. Produce an annual report to keep the Commission's constituency informed of the Commission's work. Present the annual report at an annual meeting of the Commission. Include roundtable participants; elected officials; representation from government, community organizations, artists, media; and general public.
- e. Print business cards and permanent name badges for individual Commissioners.
- f. Include Commissioners' names on Commission letterhead.

2. Relations With the San Diego City Council

- a. Implement a program to educate the Commission more fully regarding governmental process, relations with City Council, and successful presentations before City Council and Council Committees.
- b. Schedule twice yearly meetings between individual Commissioners and Councilmembers to discuss current concerns of the Commission.
- c. Keep Council Offices informed of Commission activity by forwarding all press releases, quarterly executive director reports, and annual reports to designated council representatives.

3. Relations With Arts, Cultural and Community Organizations

- a. Foster the development and effectiveness of the Arts and Culture Coalition by holding quarterly meetings of the Arts and Culture Roundtable.
- b. Create an Arts and Culture Board Member Roundtable to meet twice annually for informational purposes.
- c. Nurture the community outreach relationships created between the Commission and neighborhood land use planning groups and community associations with an annual roundtable discussion.
- d. Appoint community members to the working committees and advisory panels of the Commission.
- e. Include all arts, cultural and community organizations on the Commission's mailing list.
- f. Promote greater awareness of multi-cultural issues and education through an annual conference, The Callaloo.
- g. Provide information to arts and cultural organizations interested to recruiting multi-cultural board members. Act as a clearinghouse for names of recommended and interested persons.
- h. Host the 1990 National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies Annual Conference.
- i. Provide visibility for the San Diego arts and cultural community by hosting national and statewide arts and cultural leaders to San Diego.

Arts, Culture, and Tourism Partnerships

The arts and cultural community plays a pivotal role in San Diego's tourism industry. The Commission recognizes this and actively promotes increased communication between the two industries, participation in the development of cooperative community education programs, and joint promotion of events which serve and benefit both industries.

Goal II: The Commission for Arts and Culture will pursue the vision of San Diego as an international cultural destination through the development and support of arts, culture and tourism partnerships.

Objectives:

- A. To support the efforts of the Arts, Culture and Tourism Roundtable as it works towards the attainment of its adopted goals to:
 - 1. Educate the arts, culture and tourism industries on how they can work together to better serve the visitors in San Diego.
 - 2. Develop a network of contacts for the arts, culture and tourism industries.
 - 3. Work together to promote San Diego as a cultural destination.

- B. To make recommendations regarding the future administration of festival programming. Initial steps toward the creation of an on-going festival program might include:
 - 1. Review the San Diego Arts Festival Treasures of the Soviet Union.
 - 2. Assess community response to the Soviet Arts Festival.
 - 3. Research other local, national and international festivals.
 - 4. Propose a structure for the administration of festival programming which serves and supports the San Diego arts and cultural community as well as presents diverse international artistic and cultural experiences to San Diegans and visitors to the area.
 - 5. Recommend a theme for the 1992 festival.

RESOURCES

Funding

As a local arts agency, the Commission provides financial support, services, and other programs for arts and cultural organizations, individual artists, and the community as a whole. In order to accomplish this, the Commission is supported by funds from the City of San Diego, the California Arts Council and the National Endowment for the Arts.

Goal IV: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will protect current funding sources and strive to increase the number of sources of support for arts and culture.**

Objectives:

- A. To pursue a change in the City's transient occupancy tax (TOT) distribution policy to ensure that a percent of the total TOT income is set aside for arts and culture. Historically, TOT funds allocated for arts and culture have grown by a cost of living increase.
- B. To recommend the Arts and Culture Festivals/New Art Programs funding.

Strategies:

- 1. Seek the highest level of support from the following funding sources:
 - a. City of San Diego - TOT for granting purposes
 - b. City of San Diego - TOT for administrative purposes
 - c. City of San Diego - Percent for Art Ordinance
Capital Outlay Funding (TOT)
 - d. California Arts Council
State/Local Partners
Challenge Grant
 - e. National Endowment for the Arts
Local Program
Local Challenge Grant
Visual Arts Program
Challenge Grant
Expansion Arts Program
Design Arts Program

2. Seek additional funding from the following sources:
 - a. Percent for Art Ordinance
 - Private development sources (PAPDP)
 - City of San Diego capital improvement projects
 - b. Private contributions
 - Monetary contributions
 - In-kind services
 - Equipment donations

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Allocations

The City of San Diego provides funding support for cultural, recreational and promotional programs offered by private organizations. The Commission administers this funding (provided by the Transient Occupancy Tax, TOT), to arts organizations and cultural institutions. Funds are awarded to organizations in support of their ongoing operational expenses and/or the sponsorship of projects.

Goal V: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will strengthen and implement the annual allocations program and associated technical assistance programs serving arts and cultural organizations and individual artists.**

Objectives:

- A. To recommend all City funding decisions for arts and culture and to make all granting recommendations to the City Council.
- B. To support the artistic and administrative quality of artists and arts and cultural organizations.
- C. To foster the growth and stability of the City's prominent arts organizations and cultural institutions.
- D. To foster the stability of established arts and cultural organizations and to create an environment which attracts and nurtures emerging artists and arts organizations.
- E. To work in partnership with the City of San Diego and the private sector to promote San Diego as a cultural destination.
- F. To expand the availability of arts activities throughout all the social, cultural and economic levels of the city to foster, promote and expand artistic cultural diversity.

- G. To foster programmatic and organizational support to artists representing all cultural traditions, including but not limited to Alaskan/American Indian, Asian, African American, Chicano, Filipino, Hispanic, Indochinese, and to increase the involvement of those artists and communities in the planning and execution of arts activities.

Strategy:

1. Pursue an ordinance change allowing the Commission to report directly to City Council.

Program Descriptions:

I. Organizational Support

The criteria for the awarding of funds are divided into three organizational support levels, based on an organization's actual operating income figures from the last completed fiscal year. While criteria for all levels are in agreement with the Commission's mission statement, there are differences in emphasis from one level to another.

Criteria for Levels I, and II:

- 1) Quality
- 2) Evidence of community representation and support
- 3) Inter-organizational cooperation
- 4) Measurable benefits to city residents
- 5) Demonstrated need and the impact of funding
- 6) Professionalism of applicant organization
- 7) Education and Outreach Programs

Criteria for Level III:

- 1) Quality of proposed program
- 2) Evidence of community representation and support
- 3) Inter-organizational cooperation
- 4) Fiscal planning and cost-effective budgeting
- 5) Expand access to the arts for underserved audiences
- 6) Impact on artists
- 7) Innovation/creativity in the use of resources
- 8) Plan for completion

II Special Projects Program

The Special Projects Program, in its early stage of formulation, has many options for its future direction in terms of objectives and administration. Its goals are in alignment with those of the other allocations programs: stabilizing and diversifying San Diego's cultural base, enhancing the quality of life in the city's neighborhoods, and pursuing the vision of San Diego as an international cultural destination. Special projects can be distinguished from the allocations program of ongoing organizational support in that they are discrete, unique, and of limited duration.

The Special Projects Pilot Program has been funded for 1990. Nearly 50% of the funding was granted by the California Arts Council State/Local Partnership Program. This portion of funds is designated specifically for projects benefiting multi-cultural organizations, artists, and communities.

The Special Projects Pilot Program of 1990 is designed to support new projects that will commence and be completed between April 1, 1990 and June 30, 1990. Proposals that have a special emphasis on enhancing tourism, reaching into underserved communities and utilizing artists of diverse ethnic backgrounds. The Special Projects Pilot Program is designed to support proposals that create projects that are different from an organization's ongoing programming.

The Criteria for the Special Projects Pilot Program are:

- 1) Quality of proposed program
- 2) Evidence of community representation and support
- 3) Inter-organizational cooperation
- 4) Fiscal planning and cost-effective budgeting
- 5) Expand access to the arts for underserved audiences
- 6) Impact on artists

A Special Projects Review Panel, (Commissioners selected by nomination and community members from the Commission's existing FY 90 panel pool), will review and rank proposals and make funding recommendations.

III Individual Artist Program

The Individual Artist Program will support the goals of the allocations effort. It recognizes the invaluable contribution that artists make as members of the community. The program will be designed to strengthen the relationship between artists and the community. A committee of the Commission will refine the objectives and administrative structure of this program. A proposal for the Independent Artist Program will be developed during 1991 for funding in 1992.

Visual Art In Public Places

The Commission is committed to promoting public art and encouraging the consideration of aesthetic issues in community planning. Current programming includes advisement to the City of projects and programs designed to promote the acquisition and placement of works of art throughout San Diego's neighborhoods.

Goal VI: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will expand the opportunities for the citizens of San Diego and visitors to the area to experience a broad range of high quality art in public places.**

Objectives:

- A. To implement a Public Art Master Plan which includes an amendment to the percent for art ordinance.
- B. To design a public art education strategy which expands the community's perception of and relationship to public art, strengthens communication between artists and the community, and builds an advocacy base supporting the Art in Public Places Program.
- C. To establish Commission policies, for the adoption by City Council, for endorsements, acceptance of donations, and site-approvals.
- D. To establish a collections management program.

Strategies:

- 1. Earmark at least one percent of all capital improvement projects to support artist fees, maintenance, education, and administration for the Art in Public Places Program.
- 2. Earmark at least one percent of all development funds from private development for the Art in Public Places Program.

Community Outreach

An Arts and Cultural Plan based upon the arts and cultural needs of San Diego's neighborhoods will assist the Commission in program planning decision making and policy recommendations. The creation of the plan will follow a timeline parallel to that of the Public Art Master Plan. Community demographics will be combined with the data obtained from the Public Arts Master Plan.

Goal VII: **The Commission for Arts and Culture will develop an Arts and Cultural Plan that represents all the communities of San Diego and embraces the cultural diversity of our city.**

Objectives:

- A. To obtain up-to-date information useful for future program and policy-making decisions about our city's neighborhoods and their respective vision for arts and cultural development.
- B. To create a link between the Commission and the neighborhoods of San Diego by fostering the development of neighborhood art programs throughout the city with an emphasis on underserved and multi-cultural communities.
- C. To identify and serve multi-cultural arts and cultural organizations with technical assistance needs.
- D. To establish a link between the Commission and the City Council Offices by working together to meet the arts and cultural needs of the individual council districts.
- E. To encourage arts and cultural representation on neighborhood land use planning committees.

Strategies:

- 1. Appoint a Neighborhood Arts and Culture Advisory Committee to support and encourage neighborhood art programs and to advise the Multi-Cultural and Art in Public Places Committees of the Commission on matters pertaining to the promotion of multi-cultural arts and cultural programs.
- 2. Increase neighborhood participation following the timeline of the Public Art Master Plan.

Appendix

Definitions

Art includes dance, design art, folk art, literature, media arts, music, opera, musical theatre, theatre and visual arts. As applied to the funding process, Art is the development and presentation of artistic elements in a manner that reflects levels of quality, accessibility, diversity and financial stability.

Culture applied in the funding process includes those institutions and groups dedicated to preserving and exhibiting some aspects of our culture; including art, architecture, science, and history.

Culture is the total array of transmitted heritage characteristic of a people.

Cultural organizations are those devoted to the fine arts, humanities and broad aspects of a science distinguished from vocational and technical skills.

A **museum** is an institution that strives to preserve some aspect of that culture, be it artistic, scientific, or historic.

With origins that extend back to ancient times, a museum educates a people, instilling in them an understanding and appreciation of their world and serving as a permanent repository for their cultural artifacts. The support and use of museums are hallmarks of culturally mature people.

A museum eligible for funding should be a nonprofit institution devoted to the procurement, care, study, and display of objects of lasting interest or value, that has regular business hours and is open to the public.

Multicultural is a term used throughout the country to describe underserved ethnic groups. Multicultural applied in the funding process refers to Alaskan/American Indian, Asian, African American, Chicano, Filipino, Hispanic, and Indochinese.

Underserved is defined in the funding process as those who currently do not have full access to arts and cultural experiences, including multicultural groups, seniors, children, differently-abled, institutionalized, or those with financial constraints.

Acknowledgements

The Commission for Arts and Culture would like to extend a special thanks to individuals and organizations whose efforts contributed to the completion of *Directions for the Future*.

Lynette Allen, Jewish Community Center
 Erick Altona, Spreckels Organ Society
 Jack Barefield, NewWorks
 Jim Barker, Sushi Performance Gallery
 Linda Barnett, International Visitors Council
 Larry Baza, County of San Diego, Public Arts Advisory Council
 Jack Borchers, COMBO
 Leslie Bouffard, San Diego Symphony
 Martha Brechlin, San Diego Youth Symphony
 Gene Calman, San Diego Gilbert & Sullivan
 Juan Carrillo, California Arts Council
 Lolita Carter, Samahan Philippines Dance Company
 Patricio Chavez, Centro Cultural de la Raza
 Carol Chelsea, San Diego Aerospace Museum
 City of San Diego
 Fred Colby, San Diego Foundation for the Performing Arts
 Jihmye Collins, African American Writers & Artists, San Diego
 Tom Corcoran, San Diego Area Dance Alliance
 County of San Diego
 Louisi Cummings, La Jolla Playhouse
 Rufus B. DeWitt, San Diego Community Theater
 Peggy Duly, Mainly Mozart
 Larry Dumlao, Combined Organization for the Visual Arts
 Ellen Eichler, San Diego International Children's Festival
 Jim Eischer, La Jolla Stage Company
 Carolyn Elliott, Maritime Museum
 Joan Endres, Centro Cultural de la Raza
 Eleanor Estes, Ruse Performance Galleries
 Vivian Evenson, Spreckels Organ Society
 Ethan Feerst, Sledgehammer Theater
 Colleen Finnegan, City of La Mesa Cultural Arts
 Harris Goldman, San Diego Civic Light Opera - Starlight
 Kit Goldman, Gaslamp Quarter Theatre Company
 Ernesto Guerrero, Centro Cultural de la Raza
 Ray Hall, California Ballet
 Tom Hall, Old Globe Theatre
 Hilliard Harper, Young Audiences
 Sherri Helvie, San Diego Convention and Visitors Bureau
 Richard Huff, National Endowment for the Arts
 Carol Hobson, Management for the Arts
 Barry Humphrey, San Diego Automotive Museum
 Dominic Ietto, Old Globe Theatre
 Kathryn Irey, Stage 7 Dance Theater
 Jean Isaacs, 3's Company
 Ann Kantor, San Diego Historical Society
 Jeff Kirsch, Rueben H. Fleet Space Theater and Science Center
 Bee Knott, San Diego Historical Society
 Hugh Kramer, San Diego Natural History Museum
 Nancy Laturno, Mainly Mozart
 John LeTourneau, San Diego History Museum
 Alan Levey, La Jolla Playhouse
 Marshall Lewis, Civic Youth Orchestra
 Richard A. Lou, Centro Cultural de la Raza
 Nels Lund, San Diego International Children's Festival
 Robert Lynch, National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies
 Gloria Lockwood, California Arts Council
 Craig MacCullough, MacCullough Brown Associates
 Hal Mahan, San Diego Natural History Museum
 Maxine Mahon, California Ballet
 John Malashock, Malashock Dance & Company
 Paul Marshall, KPBS-TV
 Nancy McCaleb, 3's Company
 Bob McGlade, San Diego Civic Light Opera - Starlight
 Ed McKellar, San Diego Aerospace Museum
 Kathleen McLaughlin, San Diego Opera
 Eileen Moss, San Diego Civic Chorale
 Michael Mullin, San Diego Early Music Society
 Leon Natker, San Diego Gilbert & Sullivan Company
 Victor Ochoa, Centro Cultural de la Raza

Arthur Ollman, Museum of Photographic Arts
 Irving Parker, University of San Diego
 Neale Perl, La Jolla Chamber Music Society
 Elizabeth Persons, Junior Theatre
 Christopher R. Ruse Performance Gallery
 Robert Reed, California Arts Council
 Greg Robe, Ilan-Lael Foundation
 Pat Rogers, San Diego Junior Theater
 John Rotsart, Model Railroad Museum
 San Diego Arts, Cultural and Tourism Roundtable
 Anja Schoenbeck, San Diego Art Institute
 Lynn Schuette, Sushi Performance Gallery
 Doug Sharon, San Diego Museum of Man
 Carol Sigelman, Children's Museum
 Mary Skinner, Children's Museum
 June Spencer for 50 Cities
 St. Louis Regional Arts Commission
 Ellie Stein, New Works Theatre
 Linda Stephens, San Diego Museum of Art
 Adrian Stewart, San Diego Repertory Theater
 Pat Sumi, American Ballet Foundation
 Sally Thomas, Reuben H. Fleet Space Theater
 Suzanne Townsend, San Diego Performances
 Debbie Vaughn, Christian Community Theater
 Kay Wagner, San Diego City Schools
 Dan Wasil, Arts Consultant
 Shirley Williams, African American Museum
 Anne D. Young, West Coast Lyric Opera
 Alan Ziter, San Diego Theatre League
 Typeset and layout - Marc R. Duggan

A note from the Consultant:

The creation of *Directions for the Future* was part of my doctoral dissertation study entitled: *The Influence of the Strategic Planning Process on a Nonprofit Board and a Public Commission*. I would like to thank the Commission for Arts and Culture for agreeing to participate in this research. A copy of the study, including *Directions for the Future*, will become part of the permanent collection of the Helen K., James S. Copley Library at the University of San Diego, San Diego, California.

Special appreciation to: Milton Fredman, Ann Winslow MacCullough, Karen Sugg Cohn, Larry Baza, Warren O. Kessler, Catherine Yi-yu Cho Woo, Darlene V. Shiley, Sylvia M'Lafi Thompson, Kate Adams, Victoria L. Hamilton, Simi Windward, Salvatore Giametta, Marc R. Duggan, and Barry J. Schultz.

Mary A. Powers
 1/90

Executive Complex
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 555
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 533-3050