



MEMORANDUM

Date: 5 January 1973

To: Richard E. Gibson, Director  
Facilities Planning

From: THE Hodne/Stageberg PARTNERS, Inc.

Re: University of Iowa Long Range Planning  
(Commission Number 7213.2)

Subject: Interim Position Paper - Plan for Planning

116 east 22nd street 339-0561 (612)  
minneapolis, minnesota 55404

---

The following text is a preliminary position paper regarding the Plan for Planning. Section D describes the New Planning Process - IRPP as noted in the accompanying graphics of same date.

LL/THH

/mae

## D. The New Planning Process - IRPP

### 1. New Planning Process Objectives:

Issues were analyzed and synthesized, and the result superimposed on current long range planning methodologies to isolate process deficiencies. These deficiencies became the basis for the delineation of the objectives of the new planning process.

#### a. Quality Planning

- 1) The University of Iowa has entered a new era in which quality as well as quantity concerns must become a focus of attention if the University is to fulfill its academic mission.
- 2) Current planning methods make little provision for the development of creative quality and quantity measures. Rather they rely heavily on prototypical space standards to generate a single, static concept of physical campus quality.
- 3) The University of Iowa's unique circumstance and problems require the formulation of tailored quality and quantity measures.

#### b. Participatory Planning

- 1) Planning cannot be done for the University of Iowa. It must be done with the University and its constituencies if real change is to be achieved.
- 2) Most currently employed long range planning methodologies make inadequate provision for broad and meaningful constituent participation in the planning process.
- 3) A new planning process for the University of Iowa should include broad user participation in the formulation of objectives and in policy modification to achieve those objectives; program and fiscal and physical planner participation to coordinate policy direction; and decision maker participation throughout to insure commitment to, and implementation of a new planning policy.

#### c. Implementational Planning

- 1) All too often long range planning process identify desireable ends but provide no clear procedures for attaining these ends.
- 2) Current implementational planning procedures are frequently unsuccessful because they make no provision for incorporation of current planning decisions into the long range planning process.
- 3) As an improved future is primarily a function of improved decisions made today the success of a new planning process for the University



of Iowa will be contingent on its ability to integrate current planning decisions into the long range planning process.

2. Basic Definitions of the New Planning Process:

To attain these objectives, three fundamental planning procedures were formulated to establish the conceptual basis of IRPP, the Incremental Response Planning Process.

a. Ideal and Realty Plan Projections

1) Ideal Plan Projections

- a) Ideal plan projections are physical interpretations of abstract, desired end states of the University of Iowa that can be approached but never achieved in reality.
- b) Ideal plan projections will be formulated by having concerned constituencies define desirable characteristics of the University, converting these characteristic trends to development policy, and projecting the physical outcome of that policy several years into the future.
- c) This projection is critical to IRPP not as an achievable goal but rather as the upper termination of a scale that can be used to measure the success of current planning decisions.

2) Realty Plan Projections

- a) A reality plan projection is the portrayal of the University environment of the future if planning decisions continue to be made in the same way that they are currently being made.
- b) Program, fiscal and physical planners will identify current planning decisions, analyze their probable impact, and project their implied policy outcome several years into the future.
- c) Reality projections are necessary to IRPP as a means to organize individual planning decisions into a whole product to clarify the impact of these decisions on the future of the University.

b. Difference Analysis

- 1) Difference Analysis is the identification of a development problem as the gap between what the university ought to be (ideal) and what it will probably be if no changes occur (reality) several years in the future.
- 2) Planning participants will analyze these differences and their potential solutions as a basis for recommending either changed ideal or current incremental decision policies.
- 3) New ideal or incremental decision policies will become the input into the succeeding planning cycle in an attempt to progressively reduce the difference between ideal and real University performance.

c. Cycles

- 1) Cycles are the repetition of ideal and reality plan projections, difference analysis and policy change either as a function of University funding schedules or of discovered decision policy deficiencies.
- 2) The effectiveness of policy changes developed and implemented in previous planning cycles is measured by the degree to which they minimize the present gap between ideal and reality plan projections.
- 3) Policies which demonstrate positive influence on closing this gap are continued, negative and neutral policy influences are eliminated or revised and new policy created to deal with previously undefined problems. Each is continued, eliminated, modified or created in response to its individual impact on moving real total University performance to the closest possible approximation of ideal University performance.

3. Results of the new Planning Process:

IRPP fit with quality, participation, and implementation planning process objectives generates a system of ongoing progress toward solution of University development problems.

a. Objective fit:

- 1) Quality as well as quantity planning is fostered by IRPP by (a) developing a scale which is capable of defining such problems; and (b) establishing a process for evaluating the effectiveness of quality as well as quantity resource investment.
- 2) The participation of users, planners, and decision makers is an essential, integral element of IRPP. The process cannot proceed without this participation.
- 3) Implementation, the ability of the planning process to narrow the gap between ideal and real performance, is generated as new and modified policies are fed into ensuing cycles and tested to see if they are in fact effective in reducing this gap.

b. Impact

- 1) The ideal reality scale developed by IRPP generates the knowledge need by all participants to improve policy decisions.
- 2) Broad and meaningful user, planner and decision maker participation paves the way for unified, integrated, institutional commitment to change.
- 3) Confrontation with the differences between ideal and reality projections of the University forces planning participants to intervene now to correct identified problems.



c. Outcome:

IRPP is a master process rather than a master plan in which repeated cycles of ideal and reality projections, difference analysis and policy changes produce the understanding of policy effectiveness necessary to take action that will progressively minimize the difference between ideal and real performance of the University.

4. Model:

These fundamental procedures were expended and sophisticated in terms of specific elements and operations to create a working model of IRPP, the new planning process.

a. Ideal Plan Projections

b. Reality Plan Projections

c. Difference Analysis

d. New Policy