# NIDA and Learning Innovation through Case Research: The Emergence of Programmatic Case Development at NIDA

### Natchaya Chalaysap*

## Abstract

Back to his office after discussing informally with Dr. Pradit Wannarat, Vice President of Academic Affairs, about the recently launched case study development project that afternoon after the luncheon following the July 2011 monthly meeting of deans and directors of schools and centers, President of National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) Sombat Thamrongthanyawong felt deeply concerned about the project survival. The project would surely end if no other actions were taken.

The case research and writing project was part of his proposal when Professor Dr. Sombat ran for office of NIDA presidency. When he became president of NIDA he launched it in 2007 immediately after he made a decision to urge all NIDA faculty to use case studies as instructional material. So far, NIDA had invested a large amount of money to materialize the case research and writing project. Four workshops were arranged – the first three of which were conducted by an external facilitator (a veteran case researcher and writer from the Harvard Business School, who had received awards in casewriting), and the fourth of which was facilitated by a group of NIDA faculty who had succeeded in writing two cases since

the outset of the NIDA case development project. Following each of the first three workshops, faculty were encouraged to propose case frames for the review, approval, and recommendations of the external facilitator. If the case frames were approved, the authors would then proceed to complete and submit them (via email), along with the teaching note, to the external facilitator for a thorough review, critique, feedback, and often re-crafting. A case practicum followed each workshop. Apart from establishing the NIDA Case Research Journal to publish the cases, an academic seminar was arranged after the practicum as another channel to publicize the cases.

Some faculty proposed case frames but did not complete them. Out of around 130 faculty attending the workshops, only 21 case studies were generated and published, of which nearly half (i.e., 10) had been developed by the 6 case writers who were repeat authors. Many faculty gave a reason for failure to write a case that they had to fulfill required workloads and had no extra time for generating case studies. Others said that they had to finish other tasks sponsored by the NIDA Research Center first. Still, others said that the type of case studies solicited by the external facilitator was not similar to cases in their fields. Whatever reason the faculty gave, it reflected their disinterest in writing case studies as instructional material, although Dr. Sombat used quite a handsome sum of 200,000 baht as an incentive for case research and writing.

Moreover, Dr. Sombat tried to be flexible about the workload by allowing a research study or a textbook to be replaced with a case study; still, few faculty were interested to write a case on the ground that it could not be used to replace a research study or a textbook to obtain a higher academic rank. Although he talked to the authority in the Ministry of Education about this issue, no satisfactory answer came from those with authoritative power.

Another concern was that NIDA Case Research Journal would soon encounter an inadequate number of cases for publishing. It was also considered as only a local journal, not even a national journal. One outlet decided by the case writing committee was to hold an international conference on case studies on September 8-9, 2011 so that more cases would be submitted from faculty in other Thai universities and those from overseas universities. They could then be selected to publish in the

journal in order to upgrade it to an international journal in the future. In spite of a good response from overseas faculty, Dr. Sombat wanted NIDA faculty to produce case studies in Thai contexts for classroom use to fulfill his vision of NIDA becoming a world class university. He also wanted the journal to primarily accommodate NIDA faculty's cases. Until now (July 2011) he could not satisfactorily accomplish this.

Dr. Sombat invested a huge amount of money in the case research and writing project and the problem of faculty participation emerged. He indirectly exercised his power to coerce NIDA faculty to attend case research and writing workshops and was successful to a certain extent for that purpose. However, he was not quite successful in urging them to research and write cases for several factors as mentioned above. Now, it was time to appraise the project. He began to ask himself, "Is the long-run survival of the case research and writing project possible? What strategies should he use to gain faculty participation?

**Keywords:** Learning Innovation, Case Study/Research, Participation, Change Theory, Risk Management, Academic Freedom, Motivation

# นิด้ากับนวัตกรรมการเรียนรู้ผ่านกรณีศึกษา:
# กำเนิดโครงการพัฒนากรณีศึกษาเจ้าปัญหาที่นิด้า

**ณัฐชยา เฉลยทรัพย์**

## บทคัดย่อ

บ่ายวันนั้นเมื่อเดินกลับมายังห้องทำงาน หลังจากที่พูดคุยอย่างไม่เป็นทางการกับ รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ประดิษฐ์ วรรณรัตน์ รองอธิการบดีฝ่ายวิชาการเกี่ยวกับโครงการ การพัฒนากรณีศึกษา ในช่วงรับประทานอาหารกลางวันหลังการประชุมของที่ประชุม คณบดีและผู้อำนวยการสำนัก (ทคอ.)

โครงการดังกล่าวเพิ่งเริ่มดำเนินการเมื่อไม่นานมานี้ ศาสตราจารย์ ดร. สมบัติ ธำรงธัญวงศ์ อธิการบดีสถาบันบัณฑิตพัฒนบริหารศาสตร์ (ซึ่งเป็นที่รู้จักกันโดยทั่วไปว่า "นิด้า") รู้สึกเป็นกังวล อย่างมากเกี่ยวกับการอยู่รอดของโครงการ โครงการนี้คงจะถึงกาลอวสานแน่นอน หากเขาไม่ทำ อะไรลงไปเพื่อกู้สถานการณ์

โครงการการพัฒนากรณีศึกษาเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของข้อเสนอของ ดร. สมบัติเมื่อครั้งที่เขา เป็นหนึ่งในผู้ที่ได้รับการเสนอชื่อเป็นอธิการบดีของนิด้า และเมื่อเขาได้รับการคัดเลือกเป็นอธิการบดี เขาได้ลงมือดำเนินโครงการทันทีในปี พ.ศ. 2550 โดยตัดสินใจที่จะกระตุ้นให้อาจารย์นิด้าใช้กรณี ศึกษาในการสอนในห้องเรียน เท่าที่ผ่านมานิด้าได้ลงทุนเป็นเงินก้อนใหญ่เพื่อให้โครงการนี้เป็น รูปธรรมขึ้นมา โดยได้จัดการอบรมสัมมนาเชิงปฏิบัติการจำนวน 4 รุ่น สามรุ่นแรกมีผู้เชี่ยวชาญด้าน การทำวิจัยและเขียนกรณีศึกษาชาวต่างประเทศเป็นวิทยากร ผู้เชี่ยวชาญผู้นี้เป็นศาสตราจารย์ที่จบ การศึกษาจากมหาวิทยาลัยฮาร์วาร์ดและได้รับรางวัลการเขียนกรณีศึกษายอดเยี่ยม ส่วนรุ่นที่ 4 มี กลุ่มอาจารย์นิด้าในรุ่นแรกที่เขียนกรณีศึกษาสำเร็จและได้รับการตีพิมพ์คนละ 2 เรื่องเป็นวิทยากร

หลังจากการอบรม 3 รุ่นได้มีการส่งเสริมให้อาจารย์ที่เข้ารับการอบรมแต่ละรุ่นส่งกรอบ กรณีศึกษาเพื่อให้ผู้เชี่ยวชาญต่างประเทศซึ่งเป็นวิทยากรเป็นผู้ประเมินว่าสมควรพัฒนาเป็นกรณี ศึกษาที่สมบูรณ์หรือไม่ เมื่อกรอบกรณีศึกษาได้รับความเห็นชอบ ผู้เสนอกรอบกรณีศึกษาจะทำการ ร่างกรณีศึกษาพร้อมคู่มือการสอนส่งทางอีเมลถึงผู้เชี่ยวชาญชาวต่างประเทศเพื่อรับการวิจารณ์และ

เสนอแนะเพื่อนำมาปรับแก้ หลังจากนั้นทางสถาบันได้จัดให้มีการวิพากษ์กรณีศึกษา (A Case Practicum) เป็นเวลา 1 วันเพื่อนำกรณีศึกษาของทุกคนที่เขียนเสร็จมาให้ผู้อื่นวิพากษ์อีกครั้ง นอกจากนี้ ยังได้จัดทำวารสารกรณีศึกษาของนิด้า (NIDA Case Research Journal) เพื่อตีพิมพ์ ผลงานของอาจารย์ และยังมีการจัดประชุมทางวิชาการหลังจากการประชุมเพื่อวิพากษ์กรณีศึกษา เพื่อเป็นอีกช่องทางหนึ่งในการเผยแพร่กรณีศึกษาต่อสาธารณชน

อาจารย์บางคนเสนอกรอบกรณีศึกษาและได้รับความเห็นชอบแต่ไม่ได้พัฒนาจนเสร็จ สมบูรณ์ ในบรรดาอาจารย์ประมาณ 130 คน ที่เข้าอบรมกรณีศึกษา มีกรณีศึกษาที่ได้รับการยอมรับ ให้ตีพิมพ์เพียง 21 เรื่อง ซึ่งเกือบครึ่งหนึ่งหรือ 10 เรื่องเขียนโดยผู้เขียน 6 คนเดิม อาจารย์หลาย คนให้เหตุผลว่า สาเหตุที่ไม่พัฒนากรณีศึกษาจนเสร็จสมบูรณ์เพราะมีภาระงานภาคบังคับที่จะต้อง ทำให้เสร็จและไม่มีเวลาเหลือที่จะเขียนกรณีศึกษา บางคนก็อ้างว่า ยังติดค้างทุนของสำนักวิจัยอยู่ และยังมีบางคนอ้างว่า กรณีศึกษาในแบบที่ผู้เชี่ยวชาญชาวต่างประเทศสอนไม่เหมือนกรณีศึกษาใน สาขาวิชาของตน ไม่ว่าจะด้วยเหตุผลใดก็ตาม แต่เหตุผลเหล่านี้สะท้อนความไม่สนใจในการเขียน กรณีศึกษาเพื่อใช้ในการสอนของบรรดาอาจารย์นิด้า ถึงแม้ว่า ดร. สมบัติ จะให้ทุนอุดหนุนก้อนโต พอสมควรคือ 200,000 บาทต่อเรื่อง เพื่อจูงใจให้อาจารย์ทำวิจัยเพื่อเขียนกรณีศึกษา

ยิ่งกว่านั้น ดร. สมบัติพยายามจะยืดหยุ่นเกี่ยวกับภาระงานโดยยอมให้กรณีศึกษา 1 เรื่อง สามารถทดแทนภาระงานการวิจัย 1 เรื่องหรือตำรา 1 เล่มในช่วงเปลี่ยนถ่าน (Grace Period) อย่างไรก็ดี ยังมีอาจารย์น้อยคนมากที่สนใจจะเขียนกรณีศึกษาด้วยเหตุผลที่ว่า ไม่สามารถจะใช้แทน งานวิจัยหรือตำราเพื่อขอตำแหน่งทางวิชาการที่สูงขึ้นได้ ถึงแม้ว่า ดร. สมบัติ จะได้เจรจากับเจ้าหน้าที่ ชั้นสูงของกระทรวงศึกษาธิการเกี่ยวกับประเด็นนี้ แต่ยังไม่ได้คำตอบเป็นที่น่าพอใจจากผู้ที่มีอำนาจ ในการตัดสินใจ

ความกังวลอีกประการหนึ่ง คือ การเกรงว่าในไม่ช้าจะมีจำนวนกรณีศึกษาที่จะตีพิมพ์ใน วารสารกรณีศึกษาของนิด้าไม่เพียงพอ อีกทั้งวารสารดังกล่าวได้รับการมองว่าเป็นเพียงวารสารระดับ สถาบันการศึกษา (Local Journal) ไม่ใช่ระดับชาติ ทางออกทางหนึ่งที่คณะกรรมการส่งเสริม การพัฒนากรณีศึกษาคิดว่าน่าจะช่วยแก้ปัญหาได้ คือ การจัดประชุมระดับนานาชาติเกี่ยวกับกรณี ศึกษาที่จะเกิดขึ้นวันที่ 8-9 กันยายน พ.ศ. 2554 เพื่อจะได้มีผู้ส่งกรณีศึกษาเข้ามาเพิ่มขึ้นทั้งจาก อาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยอื่น ๆ ในประเทศไทยและต่างประเทศ ซึ่งจะทำให้สามารถคัดเลือกกรณีศึกษา ที่มีคุณภาพมาตีพิมพ์ในวารสารกรณีศึกษาของนิด้าได้และยังสามารถยกระดับวารสารขึ้นเป็นระดับ นานาชาติได้อีกด้วยในอนาคต ทั้ง ๆ ที่มีการตอบสนองที่ดีจากอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยในต่างประเทศ ดร. สมบัติยังคงต้องการให้อาจารย์นิด้าผลิตกรณีศึกษาในบริบทไทยเพื่อใช้ในการสอนในห้องเรียน ทั้งนี้เพื่อให้บรรลุวิสัยทัศน์ของเขาที่ต้องการจะเห็นนิด้ากลายเป็นมหาวิทยาลัยที่ติดอับดับโลก นอกจาก นี้ เขายังต้องการให้วารสารที่จัดทำขึ้นรองรับกรณีศึกษาของอาจารย์นิด้าเป็นหลัก ตราบจนขณะนี้

(กรกฎาคม พ.ศ. 2554) เขาก็ยังไม่สามารถทำให้บรรลุเป้าหมายได้อย่างน่าพอใจ

ดร. สมบัติลงทุนเงินก้อนใหญ่ในโครงการการพัฒนากรณีศึกษาและปัญหาการมีส่วนร่วม ของคณาจารย์ก็เกิดขึ้น เขาใช้อำนาจทางอ้อมขอร้องแกมบังคับให้อาจารย์นิด้าเข้ารับอบรมทักษะ การพัฒนากรณีศึกษาและประสบความสำเร็จในระดับหนึ่ง อย่างไรก็ดีเขาไม่ค่อยจะประสบ ความสำเร็จในการกระตุ้นให้อาจารย์นิด้าเขียนกรณีศึกษาด้วยเหตุผลหลายประการดังที่ได้กล่าวถึง มาแล้วข้างต้น ขณะนี้ถึงเวลาที่จะต้องประเมินโครงการดังกล่าว เขาเริ่มถามตัวเองว่า "โครงการ การพัฒนากรณีศึกษาจะไปรอดไหมนี่ เราควรใช้กลยุทธ์ใดดีจึงจะทำให้อาจารย์เข้ามามีส่วนร่วม ในการเขียนและใช้กรณีศึกษาในการสอนดี"

**คำสำคัญ:** นวัตกรรมการเรียนรู้ กรณีศึกษา การมีส่วนร่วม ทฤษฎีการเปลี่ยนแปลง การบริหาร ความเสี่ยง เสรีภาพทางวิชาการ แรงจูงใจ

During the luncheon following the July 2011 monthly meeting of deans and directors of schools and centers, Professor Dr. Sombat Thamrongthanyawong, the president of the National Institute of Development Administration, had the opportunity to speak informally with the vice president of academic affairs, Associate Professor Dr. Pradit Wannarat, and obtain an update on the status of the recently launched case study development program. From the vice president, who had been delegated administrative responsibility for the program, Professor Dr. Sombat learned that three years into the initiative, the progress attained continued to fall significantly short of earlier expectations. More specifically, Dr. Sombat learned that out of the nearly 100 faculty members who had undergone NIDA-supported training in the initial three case development workshops conducted by an external facilitator, only 23 cases had been written. (Of the 23 written, 21 had been accepted for publication to date; but, of the 21 accepted, one case was withdrawn by author before publication.) He further learned that of the approximately 32 participants who attended the fourth case development workshop that was conducted by faculty members who had already written a minimum of two cases, none of the eight participants who had submitted case frames had proved willing to contractually obligate themselves to complete their first drafts during the current calendar year.[1]

The situation was deeply worrying on several levels. First, although the 21 cases accepted for publication to date had been developed by a group of some 15 faculty members, nearly *half* (i.e. 10) of the 21 cases had been developed by the 6 casewriters who were repeat authors. Hence, of the 15 faculty participants from the initial series of three case development workshops who had developed a case that had been accepted for publication, only 6 persons (6%) had demonstrated a continuing commitment to ongoing case development efforts. While Dr. Sombat had never expected that a majority of the faculty participants in the workshops would become regular case researchers and writers, he had anticipated that the percentage would be appreciably greater than it had proven to be. He realized that if the current faculty percentage rate of case developers did not increase significantly, not only would continued publication of the two-year-old *NIDA Case Research Journal* be placed in jeopardy, but the long-term objective of making NIDA a center of Thai-context case research, writing, and teaching, as well.

Second, at Professor Dr. Sombat's direction, NIDA had invested a considerable sum of money – i.e., approximately $90,000 (approximately B 2.7 million) in direct instructional costs alone[2] – in sponsoring both the initial three workshops, which had been designed and delivered by an external case development expert, as well as the more recent attenuated workshop conducted by a subset of earlier-trained faculty. When the faculty case research grant of approximately B 200,000 ($6,250) per case was added to the direct instructional cost of approximately $4,300 (or, approximately B 130,000) per case (i.e., $90,000 divided by 21 *publication-worthy cases*), the total cost of each *publishable* case produced to date essentially exceeded $10,000.[3] Despite the reduction in costs that resulted from the recent utilization of a small group of previously trained faculty to train a segment of the faculty who had not participated in the initial workshop series, the cost of internal workshop facilitators and coaches, plus casewriting grants, would remain substantial for the foreseeable future. Dr. Sombat was concerned that absent NIDA's near-term receipt of some public or private largess not presently known, the university would be hard-pressed to sustain this level of per-case development cost over the long run.

Third, Dr. Sombat was only too aware that the combination of limited faculty case production to date and the high associated costs posed a serious threat to the realization of a major component of the vision that he had articulated and championed since the days of his initial candidacy for the NIDA presidency. That is, both before and during his tenure in office, he had devoted a great deal of time pondering what kind of educational institution NIDA should aspire to become in the near-term future. Dynamic, interactive classroom instruction had been identified as an essential component of that vision; and, case research and development was destined to play a pivotal role in attaining this objective. Hence, as his brief conversation with the vice president for academic affairs drew to an end, Professor Dr. Sombat found himself deeply immersed in thoughts concerning the prognosis of the NIDA case development program and what else, if anything, he should do to ensure the program's success and longevity.

## Brief Background and History of NIDA

National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) was established pursuant to His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej's vision of

advancing Thailand's development through the establishment of an advanced educational institution to groom people to become agents of change for national development. Specifically, NIDA grew out of His Majesty the King's 1963 discussions about the country's development with Mr. David Rockefeller of the Rockefeller Foundation in the United States of America. The result was the emergence of NIDA on April 1, 1966. NIDA was established with financial support from the prestigious Ford Foundation in the U.S.A. and academic assistance from the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), an organization that engages in international technical assistance and educational projects. Almost from the outset, it was thought of as an institute of higher education for Thai scholars who might otherwise have felt compelled to go abroad to pursue graduate studies. Under the beneficence of His Majesty the King, NIDA stood today as Thailand's leading educational institution concentrating exclusively on graduate studies in fields related to national development."[4]

At its inception in 1966, NIDA consisted of four schools, all of which offered Master's degree programs: Public Administration, Business Administration, Development Economics, and Applied Statistics. Other schools established after 1966 were the School of Social and Environmental Development[5], the School of Human Resource Development[6], the School of Language and Communication,[7] and the School of Law founded in 2010. As of 2011, NIDA was comprised of eight schools and one center that offered Master's degree and doctoral degree programs. The only *center* that offered a doctoral degree was the NIDA Center of Integrated Tourism Management (NITs), which was established in 2011.

Over the years, total enrolment – for individual schools and for NIDA as a whole – had tended to be somewhat volatile. For example, in the 10-year period ending December 31, 2010, total NIDA enrolment had been as high as 8,512 students and as low as 6,702 students, often in response to national economic conditions. As of July 28, 2011, total enrolment was 10,087, which represented a 18.5% increase over the previous year. As can be seen in Exhibit 1, the most robust enrolment was in Business Administration, with the smallest enrolment in the School of Language and Communication (exclusive of the School of Law and the Center of Integrated Tourism Management, both of which were founded in 2010 and 2011, respectively).

As had always been the case, the overwhelming majority of NIDA's students in 2011 were Thai nationals, with international students comprising less than 1% of total enrolment. Within the group of 30 doctoral students (out of a total international student enrolment of 47), there was considerable – if not particularly deep – diversity of national origin. However of the 17 international students who were Master's degree candidates, none were from non-Asian countries. (See Exhibit 2.) This pronounced dearth of international students was a matter of concern to Professor Dr. Sombat for whom a robust contingent of international students was an integral aspect of his vision for NIDA. As he envisioned it, the NIDA of the future would have a decidedly international atmosphere, with students from all continents and countries of the world bringing to the educational setting diverse cultures, worldviews, and experiences – thereby enriching the educational process as they learned from, and contributed to the learning of, each other.

## Dr. Sombat and the New Vision for NIDA

At the time that he decided to enter his name as a candidate for election as the twelfth president of NIDA, Professor Dr. Sombat Thamrongthanyawong, then Dean of NIDA's School of Public Administration, had been a NIDA faculty member for about 21 years. His candidacy has been an exceptionally strong one, not just because of the strength of his educational and professional background, but also because of the power of the vision that he articulated to the NIDA community.

### Dr. Sombat – Activist, Scholar, Administrator, and Public Servant *Extraordinaire*

The consummate scholar-public servant, Professor Dr. Sombat Thamrongthanyawong was a graduate of several of Thailand's most prestigious universities. After earning his Bachelor of Science degree in Science from the Faculty of Science of Kasetsart University, he proceeded to the Master of Arts degree in Government Studies from the Faculty of Political Science of Chulalongkorn University, followed by the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Development Administration from the School of Public Administration of the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA). In addition to his impressive academic background, Dr. Sombat had been a pro-democracy activist in his younger days. He was

one of the well-known activists of the October 14, 1973 student-led political uprising that succeeded in overthrowing the military government of Field Marshall Thanom Kittikachorn.

He became a NIDA lecturer after completing his doctoral degree at NIDA, and later became dean of the School of Public Administration, the post from which he succeeded to the presidency of NIDA. Dr. Sombat brought a wealth of diversified work experiences to the presidency. These included service as chairman of bodies, such as the Committee on Constitutional Amendment Plans, the Committee on Development of Assessment Systems (the latter under the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (Public Organization), the Software Industry Promotion Agency (Public Organization), and the Sub-committee on Governmental Work Evaluation and Auditing -- to name a few. His previous directorships ranged from director of the Higher Education Commission (Ministry of Education), to director of the Secondary Mortgage Corporation, to director of the Forest Industry Organization (Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives), to cite just a few.

Additionally, Professor Dr. Sombat was currently risk management director of the National Housing Authority and of the Government Pharmaceutical Organization, as well as a member of the Quality Assurance Committee at Prince of Songkla University, and the member of the Administrative Committee of Strategic Study Center of the National Defense Studies Institute. He was also the current chairperson of the Muban Chom Bueng Rajabhat University Council.

This long list of service to public-sector organizations (including institutions of higher education) had earned Dr. Sombat the reputation in some influential circles as being a *public servant extraordinaire*. He was widely viewed as a visionary and a builder – an academic "entrepreneur."

### Dr. Sombat – Educational Visionary

As a candidate for the position of NIDA president for his first three-year term of office back in early 2007, Professor Dr. Sombat had stated that if he became NIDA's new president, his policy would be to pursue NIDA goals of 10 or 15 years earlier – one of which was to become "the foremost international university in Southeast Asia." This was a goal that had been agreed upon by all segments of the university as a worthy

and attainable "stretch" goal. It would require, however, that all facets of the university be upgraded or revitalized—from student demographics to faculty performance and standards to physical infrastructure to information technology to link the campus together, and so on.

In the strategic plan that Dr. Sombat submitted pursuant to his candidacy, he laid out a route by proposing that NIDA should take to become the foremost international university in the region. The vision and mission components of the strategic plan for his first three-year term of NIDA presidency (2007-2009) were as follows:

**Vision:** To have NIDA produce leaders for Thai society, conduct research and efficiently serve society in the area of development administration

**Mission:** NIDA will enhance the knowledge and skills of the country's human resources for sustainability of the national development by
- producing graduates with leadership capabilities;
- building the body of knowledge in development administration; and
- rendering academic services related to development administration.

As shown in Exhibit 3, "improving NIDA's efficiency in conducting research" was one of several strategic "themes" comprising Dr. Sombat's initial strategic plan. He had envisioned that performing research that responded to social needs would be a principal route by which that theme would be developed and expressed. In turn, case study methodology was proposed as one of several major routes to pursue research to amplify and address various social needs. Case studies, he had reasoned, was one of the more practical and practitioner-oriented forms of research. As such, they held the promise, in his view, of keeping research of relevance to societal needs grounded in the principles of *comprehensibility* and *usefulness* to policy makers and implementers. Further, pursued as comparative studies of the phenomena of interest, they could become the grist for arriving at generalizations that would facilitate theory-building and subsequent testing via other research methodologies.

But even more importantly, in Dr. Sombat's estimation, realization of the vision of becoming the foremost international university in the region

would necessarily entail upgrading NIDA's repertoire of instructional modalities – in particular, diversifying instructional technologies away from over-reliance on the lecture method, thereby possibly opening whole new vistas of student participation in their own personal quests for mastery of the pertinent academic subject matter. To become a leading national university that produced the leaders and knowledge needed to manage change at the international level, Dr. Sombat deemed it essential that teaching and learning accentuate the development of students' capacity for critical thinking and judgment. Thus, it was that case methodology in all its facets – i.e., research, writing, teaching, and publishing – captured Dr. Sombat's imagination as worthy of being an integral component of the institutional vision that he had resolved to pursue.

Of the various approaches to teaching and learning that could be observed in NIDA's classrooms at the outset of Dr. Sombat's initial term in office, the use of case studies as instructional materials had been a judged particularly effective approach to teaching both theory and application. Case study methodology was viewed as being instrumental in enabling graduates to put theory into practice, resulting in practical benefits to the society. Further, Dr. Sombat was aware that instructional practices at a number of well-known and highly regarded overseas universities – e.g., the U.S.-based Ivy League schools of administrative sciences of various types, as well as the top-ranked schools of business and/or management in the European Union and in Singapore, among others. In these highly ranked universities, case study instructional material and methodologies ranged from being just one of several approaches to facilitating learning and mastery, rarely consuming more than 20% of total program "learning time" (e.g., Wharton School of Finance and Stanford Business School), to being *"the defining attribute"* of the entire enterprise and consuming upwards of 75-80% of program learning time (e.g., Harvard Business School, Harvard Kennedy School of Government, and the University of Virginia Darden School, and the University of British Columbia).

Aware of these facts, Professor Dr. Sombat had resolved at the outset of his first term of office that NIDA should follow the lead of these well-regarded institutional venues for case methodology in all its facets. However, the emphasis would be placed on the development and classroom use of case studies developed in the _Thai_ economic, political, social, and cultural milieu, as opposed to continuing the usage of case studies

developed in the North America, European, and East Asian contexts. It was Dr. Sombat's expectation that the use of Thai context case studies would help link what was taught in the classroom with the external world or "real life" situations, particularly in Thailand. That is, case studies conducted within the Thai context would enable Thai students to easily visualize and understand the situation better because they were more familiar with Thai organizations and settings.

Of course, some NIDA schools had already been using case studies in their programs to varying degrees, but Dr. Sombat wanted to see case studies included as teaching material in <u>all</u> courses in <u>all</u> schools at NIDA. He even dreamed of having case studies produced by NIDA faculty publicized internationally, thereby burnishing NIDA's stature as newly arrived member of the elite group of world-class universities. Since no universities in Thailand were seriously pursuing widespread usage of case studies for classroom teaching, the NIDA president also believed that a concerted emphasis on case method instruction would enable NIDA to emerge as the leader in this arena. Hence, soon after taking office, Dr. Sombat – greatly excited to materialize this vision – proposed a case study writing project under the long-term NIDA plan (2008-2012), in accordance with the sixth strategy which focused on "building a cooperative network with outside organizations—national and international" (see Exhibit 3).

By the time of his late-2009 announcement of his candidacy for a second presidential term (2010-2012), Professor Dr. Sombat had further developed and formalized the ideas that had crystallized during the course of his first term in office, and that had largely informed the pursuit of his earlier-articulated strategic plan. His plan for the period, 2010-2012, was firmly grounded in the 15-year NIDA development plan (2008-2022) that had emerged in 2008 in response to the Higher Education Commission's second long-term educational plan (2008-2022). NIDA's 15-year plan – the outcome of a concerted brainstorming of ideas by all NIDA work units under the aegis of the NIDA vice president for planning – contained an articulation of NIDA's vision, as well as the elements of which the vision was comprised. They were as follows:

NIDA Vision:   "Being a leading national university that produces change agents and builds the body of knowledge for change at an international level."

Elements of the NIDA Vision:

1. Being a leading university in development administration
2. Being a national university
3. Being a world-class university, which was recognized internationally
4. Being an educational institute that focused on change and development (being the only university that offered only graduate studies related to development administration)
5. Being excellent in three main missions: research, educational management and academic service.

Missions by Which the Vision Was to Be Accomplished

1. Producing leaders who have both wisdom and morals to develop the country
2. Building the body of knowledge and conducting research related to development administration
3. Creating academic services that contribute to national development
4. Building values and conscience in developing the country on the basis of the strength of Thai arts and culture
5. Promoting good governance, with emphasis on personnel development and participatory management
6. Making contributions to the society for sustainable development
7. To fulfill the first NIDA vision – becoming a leading university in development administration -- Dr. Sombat proposed in his second strategic plan a number of detailed strategies by which vision was to be actualized. Included were strategies for achieving academic excellence, for becoming a high-performance organization, for improving the personnel's quality of life and the student's learning, for strengthening NIDA alumni to advance university development and a cooperative network of outside organizations, and for extending the role of social science (including corporate social responsibility) by holding academic service to disseminate correct knowledge to the society and by training government officials to serve the public needs efficiently. (For a fuller discussion of the particulars of each of these strategies for achieving academic excellence, see Exhibit 4.)

## Operationalization of the Case Studies Component of the New Vision

Under the NIDA Case Development Project that he launched in mid-2007, Professor Dr. Sombat charged all NIDA faculties and schools with the development of case studies, specifically *Thai*-context cases, for classroom teaching and for possible publication. He also let it be known that, as soon as practicable, nearly all courses offered at NIDA were to include case studies as instructional material. Further, he decreed that the quality of case studies produced by NIDA faculty were to meet the universal standards governing such academic output, not some standard peculiar to NIDA or Thailand alone.

However, as would soon become evident, bringing the case component of the overall vision to fruition was not to be that easy. First, although a number of NIDA professors were familiar with and indeed, to varying degrees, incorporated case studies in their courses (largely but not exclusively in the administrative sciences fields), the fact remained that there was no real tradition of case research and writing among Thai universities, NIDA included. Hence, the new project had begun with all the liabilities that typically accompany the "new and different" – principal among them faculty skepticism and doubt that everyone had (or even *should* have) the interest and skills to become case researchers and writers, as well as faculty resistance to what, to some, seemed like administrative encroachment on the traditional faculty prerogative to decide what instructional materials to use and how to teach them.

Second, as intimated above, from the erstwhile dearth of case research and writing at NIDA (as well as at other Thai universities), it was thought a big leap of faith to *assume* that everyone already possessed the requisite knowledge and skills to perform the research required for a case study and, once performed, to craft a case to *engagingly* encapsulate the focal issue(s) and supporting information that students would need in order to perform the expected analyses. NIDA faculty varied greatly with respect to their previous exposure to teaching and learning under the case method. Some had pursued one or more of their advanced degrees at case-oriented schools, while others had neither studied nor taught more than a few cases in their entire professional lives. Only a small minority of NIDA faculty possessed a case-intensive educational background as

an undergraduate or graduate student – a background that might help ensure a more propitious start to the process of acquiring the requisite case research and writing skills. A fair number of faculty members regularly used at least a few cases in their courses, albeit more so in some schools than in others — largely as a function of the differences, sometimes pronounced, in subject matter. However, only a small fraction of those who did make occasional use of cases in their classrooms had ever researched and written their own cases. Most of the cases utilized in NIDA classrooms were imported in one form or another, with some sourced from textbooks-with-cases.

Third, there was the prospect of inadequate levels of faculty interest in doing case research and writing, or even case teaching and publishing. Initially at least, Professor Dr. Sombat had had no *a priori* reason to believe that the faculty interest level would in fact be extremely limited, although from years of previous administrative experience, he knew that resistance was likely to emerge at each phase of the project as some members of the faculty reacted to decisions or actions requiring *change* on their part. He also knew that NIDA faculty led very full lives – e.g., teaching, research, service, and outside professional endeavors. In such situations, it would not be unusual for some clusters of faculty members to fail to respond to this particular item among the many comprising the NIDA long-term plan, if for no other reason than that of too many pressing demands on their time. In any event, in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Pradit Wannarat, who responded enthusiastically to the idea for a case research and writing project, Dr. Sombat began to sketch out an approach to dealing with each of these issues.

### Tackling the Ability Issue: The Case Research and Writing Workshops

In view of the paucity of case development experience within the faculty, it was decided that equipping the faculty with the requisite case development skills should be the first order of business. It was clear to Drs. Sombat and Pradit that unless this first challenge could be met successfully, the entire initiative in case research and writing would have very limited prospects for success. Hence, Dr. Sombat, in collaboration with the vice president of academic affairs, Dr. Pradit, resolved that NIDA should periodically hold a course or workshop to train

NIDA faculty in case research and writing. Dr. Sombat allocated a budget sufficient to sponsor a total of three, 2 1/2-day case research and writing workshops, with about 32 faculty participants per workshop.

Dr. Sombat then assigned Dr. Pradit to be in charge of the project, now given the formal name, ***"NIDA and Learning Innovation through Case Research."*** The responsibility for holding the case workshops was assigned to the Human Resource Management Department. Plans to hold a university-wide academic seminar on case research and to publicize the cases produced by NIDA faculty via the eventual launching of NIDA's own in-house case research journal were also preliminarily discussed.

The broad contours of the project having been outlined, Dr. Pradit, as project head, charged his assistant, Mrs. Paradee Thepkayon (generally known as "Khun Phoo") to undertake a search for a recognized expert in case research and writing – preferably someone from *outside* Thailand, it was specified – to conduct the training for NIDA faculty members. Khun Phoo's subsequent surfing of the Internet resulted in the identification of an experienced and award-winning casewriter – a graduate of the M.B.A. and doctoral programs at the Harvard Business School – who had conducted case development workshops in various venues – e.g., in North America, East Africa, and Southeast Asia. After preliminary inquiries to, and subsequent negotiations with the local (Thai) consulting firm with which the case development expert was affiliated, an agreement was struck to hold the first workshop in December 2007. For this first two and one-half day workshop in the series of three, NIDA paid a sum of Baht 535,000, which in addition to the fee paid the Thai consulting firm included the facilitator's fee for preparing the instructional materials (e.g., the *Participant Workbook* and PowerPoint slides), the facilitator's instructional fee, and the cost of sample cases and teaching notes. There were approximately 35 participants, including three observers, at this initial workshop.

The workshops that the external facilitator developed for NIDA were guided by the central objective of sufficiently equipping workshop participants with the case development insights and skills needed to enable them to draft their own case study for review and critique soon after each workshop came to a close. To this end, the two and one-half day workshops were structured in a "hands-on," experiential way in which "how-to"

instruction in case research and writing was interspersed with exercises aimed at, for example, identifying format, style, and "story-telling" patterns in different types of cases. Additionally, individual participants were required to develop a "case frame" of a case study that each would be responsible for researching and writing in the interim between the workshop itself and a later follow-up *"practicum."* [8]

The purpose of the subsequent *practica* was not only to sharpen skills in recognizing the strengths/weaknesses of the draft cases, but also that of beginning to build an *esprit de corps among* the casewriting faculty. This was deemed essential in order to minimize the possibility that case development activity would cease once the workshops ended and the workshop facilitator departed.

Importantly, prior to the launch of the initial workshop in the series, Dr. Sombat and Dr. Pradit had to take one of their first critical decisions: Whether to make participation strictly voluntary or essentially mandatory. There were advantages and disadvantages for each option. *Voluntary* participation, for example, offered the considerable advantage of maximizing the prospect that all who participated would do so out of, minimally, a curiosity about case research and writing and, maximally, a strong interest in acquiring the skills to engage in case research and writing – as opposed to participating out of concern for the potentially negative consequences of *not* doing so. On the other hand, *mandatory* participation maximized the prospects of the eventual emergence of a core case research and writing contingent of the faculty, given the likelihood that some who had been disinterested before receiving a command to participate might well emerge from the workshops sufficiently intrigued and enamored of what they learned to be willing to give casewriting a try.

The decision eventually made by the two administrators was to provide formal instruction in case research, writing, and (to a lesser extent) teaching to the largest feasible percentage of the faculty, with the focus on those faculty members who were still a few decades away from retirement. However, for the initial workshop (and, to some extent, for later ones as well), the approach decided upon was first to ask for volunteers from all the schools and teaching centers, with the proviso that if the number of volunteers from some school did not reach the target, then faculty members from other schools could fill in the gap. More

specifically, the deans of the various NIDA schools were asked to send three faculty members to the workshop. But, in instances in which a school did not use the whole quota, faculty members in other schools could be solicited. (See Exhibit 5 for the number of participants from each school in the first workshop.)

All who attended the initial, as well as subsequent, workshops were informed via an administrative circular that they would be required to write one case study after the training. They were also advised that they each could avail themselves of financial support for case research and writing from the NIDA Research Center.

### Tackling the Interest Issue: *Voluntary* Becomes *Mandatory*

Faculty interest in participating in the *initial* workshop (December 14-16, 2007) could be described as "moderate." Indeed, a sizable percentage of the participants in the initial workshop were volunteers, although several were known to have received "strong encouragement" from their school deans. However, interest in attending the subsequent two workshops waned appreciably. For example, in response to the administrative circular sent to schools deans prior to the second workshop (May 23-25, 2008), most deans reported great difficulty in finding faculty volunteers to attend.

As Drs. Sombat and Pradit wrestled with the issue of low levels of interest among the faculty in learning how to research and write case studies, the decision was finally taken to make participation **mandatory,** notwithstanding the risks inherit in "ordering" faculty to do something. The decision makers did not take the matter lightly, as they understood well the high valence that academicians place on "academic freedom." The act of "summoning" them to attend a workshop risked alienating them. The fact that the decision was nevertheless taken, despite this risk, was an indication of how integral was the development of faculty skills in case research and writing to the realization of the vision that Dr. Sombat has set for the institution. Bringing the vision to fruition was too important an objective, he felt, to be left totally to the predilections and preoccupations of individual faculty members. Hence, the decision was taken to go one step further in maximizing prospects of garnering a full complement of participants. Specifically, Dr. Pradit, as the designated lead administrator for the project, instructed that a list of names of desired faculty participants be sent to the deans. The deans, in turn, were also asked to

approach faculty members whose names appeared on the list to urge them to join the workshop. This process resulted in a "yield" of approximately 30 participants for the second workshop.

By the time of the third workshop (October 17-19, 2008), the manifest level of faculty interest was lower still. It was believed that this was at least in part due to the fact that the more "promising and willing" faculty members had been targeted for inclusion in the first two workshops, leaving most of those believed to be *least interested* in case development for the third and final workshop. Hence, the tack taken with respect to the invited participants for the third workshop was to send the letter of invitation directly to individual faculty members, while simultaneously alerting each faculty invitee's dean and urging him or her to do everything possible to prevail upon the invitee to participate, as requested. Importantly, also, the deans were advised that those who could not recruit enough faculty members to join the training course would *themselves* have to attend. The eventual participant "yield" was about 35 faculty members, including a couple of deans.

While making participation in one of the workshops mandatory and importuning faculty invitees either indirectly (through the deans) or directly (via direct invitations) – or, both – was successful in ensuring that each workshop was fully subscribed, Drs. Sombat and Pradit admitted that these tactics were "stop-gap" measures and could in no way sustain faculty commitment to case development over the long run. In fact, as early as the end of the initial workshop, as they reflected on the reluctance exhibited by some faculty invitees to participate, it became apparent that action was required to address the varied reasons for the lack of faculty enthusiasm. These ranged from the objection that case research and writing took a substantial chunk of *already* insufficient faculty time, to the complaint that financial support for case research and writing was inadequately funded, to the perceived high "opportunity costs" of pursuing case research and writing, to the inadequacy of the scholarly credit extended for casewriting compared to traditional research. Over-hanging all was the reality of NIDA's perennial budget constraints – constraints that limited the feasible solution space for most of these objections.

## Earlier Attempts to Induce More Faculty to Engage in Case Research and Writing

In their earliest quest to heighten faculty interest in, and commitment to, case development endeavors, Drs. Sombat and Pradit had pursued a couple of different tacks. First and foremost, they took advantage of every opportunity to reiterate the importance of case research and writing to the goal of becoming an international university of world-class stature. In so doing, they hoped to tap into the faculty's pride in participating in elevating NIDA to a new plateau of excellence. Additionally, through both the case critique *practica* conducted by the workshop facilitator and project advisor several months following each workshop and the academic seminars organized by the Human Resource Management Department following the completion of case critique *practica*, they strove to give maximum visibility to the Case and Teaching Note output of the faculty, as well as publicize case research to the general public. Total attendance for both academic seminars on case research and writing (December 1, 2009 and March 12, 2010) was around 200; but, attendance at each of the three case critique *practica* (May 26, 2008; October 20, 2008; and, December 14, 2009) rarely went beyond the five or six presenters plus a small group of other faculty (usually, those who had previously written and presented their own cases) who attended and participated to render collegial support.

Despite these steps, cajoling greater numbers of faculty into engaging in case research and writing remained largely ineffectual. Just as the earlier recruitment of faculty to attend one of the case development workshops had proven a perennial up-hill climb, so too were endeavors to persuade greater numbers of trainee faculty case writers to give a try at developing case studies for use in the classroom. The number of habitually active writers continued to hover in the 8 to 10 range.

As they continued to ponder the apparent lack of interest in case research and writing, Drs. Sombat and Pradit came to the realization that several different "sub-issues" might underlay the paucity of faculty "interest." They were both sufficiently experienced administrators to know that sometimes when faculty members display disinterest in a new institutional initiative, the sub rosa <u>operative</u> issue was really a **"what's in it for <u>me</u>?"** issue. In other words, *"Why should I take time away from what I'm currently doing to devote to this new initiative?"* Such thinking

was likely to be especially prominent in instances in which either the instrumentality of the new institutional initiative to some distant objective was not immediately apparent and/or the distant objective itself was deemed uninteresting or uncompelling.

In this connection, the *"what's in it for me"* issue took on particular importance among those professional schools (e.g., business administration, public administration, development economics, etc.), where faculty, by either tradition or policy, were either expected or strongly encouraged to engage in outside activities in the areas of their expertise. At NIDA, as at similar universities, consulting to outside organizations was a very common way by which many faculty met this expectation, while also augmenting – sometimes substantially -- their university salaries with consultation or training fees. Undertaking specific projects or studies for outside organizations for a fee was another common endeavor. As was the case at NIDA's sister universities, the amount of time (e.g., days per week) in which faculty were permitted to engage in outside activities was restricted and administratively monitored. In this context, assuming that the time devoted to ongoing teaching and university service responsibilities remained untouched, case research and writing activities would in essence, compete with income augmentation opportunities for the faculty's limited time and energy. In other words, extra emoluments for researching and writing cases had heretofore not been available, many faculty perceived case research/writing as having a high "opportunity cost."

At other times, the *"sub rosa"* issue that negatively impacted faculty interest in case research and writing was faculty member concern about how much academic credit toward the mandated volume of scholarly activity would be granted for case research and writing. Despite their long-demonstrated value in propagating knowledge and enhancing analytical skills, cases at most schools continued to be relegated to second-class status, well behind the more traditional forms of academic research. And, because tenure and promotion decisions continued to rest, in large measure, on a candidate's record of scholarly endeavors (e.g., research, publications in refereed journals, and the like), it was not surprising that many NIDA faculty had some concerns about the wisdom of utilizing the limited time available for scholarly endeavors to case research and writing.

A third, and somewhat related, *"sub rosa"* issue impacting faculty interest in the case development project appeared to be that of uncertainty within some quarters of the faculty – primarily, among those with no previous experience with the case method – as to whether they could really develop cases of the quality of those that were exhibited, decomposed, and discussed at the earlier case development workshops. In other words, the question was, *"Despite what I learned at the workshop, can I <u>really</u> do this? How much time and energy will it take? And, will it be worthwhile?"*

**Tackling the "Make-It-Worthwhile" Issue: The Provision of Generous Research Support**

The significance and impact of the several "hidden" issues were thought to vary from one faculty member to the next. However, to the extent that these issues negatively impacted a particular faculty member's reluctance to engage in case research and writing, Drs. Sombat and Pradit knew that faculty case study output would continue to suffer. Appropriate ways and means had to be identified or developed to address all three issues.

*Handling Concern over the High Opportunity Cost of Case Research and Writing.* In seeking to mitigate the negative financial impact of engaging in case development at the expense of outside consulting and training endeavors, NIDA undertook a major departure from how universities traditionally responded to the matter. That is, rather than providing the "standard" response that "research is a part of a faculty member's job and thus already being compensated," Drs. Sombat and Pradit signaled their awareness that for many faculty, case research and writing did in fact have a high opportunity cost, and that it was therefore unrealistic to expect them to forego ongoing opportunities to earn substantial sums of outside income in order to spend time conducting research and writing cases.

After this realization, the approaches taken to "making it worthwhile" had gone through three distinct phases: Initially, Dr. Sombat stipulated that a grant of up to Baht 200,000 was to be made available through the NIDA Research Center to defray a faculty member's *actual* expenses in researching and writing each combination of a case study and the Teaching Note. Additionally, because initial plans called for NIDA to market its cases to other organizations, case output was to be translated

into Thai, with the casewriter paid at the rate of Baht 300 per page.[9] As it turned out, these policies ended up being applied to just the first six cases produced by the first batch of workshop participants (i.e., the December 2007 workshop).

The financial support policy was changed immediately following the second training workshop (May 2008) to one whereby a lump sum of Baht 200,000 was paid for each case produced, *regardless of the actual expenses incurred by the casewriter*.[10] Finally, after the third workshop (October 2008), the financial support policy underwent yet another "tweaking." That is, while the total amount of the grant remained the same (Baht 200,000), it was payable in two installments: The case author received Baht 180,000 for the English version of the case, and the remaining Baht 20,000 once the case had been translated into Thai. (Noteworthy was the fact that, to date, only one case had actually been translated into Thai.)

It was all but impossible to know the extent to which these grants for case research and writing would eventually motivate dramatically increased case development activity within the faculty. Preliminary evidence was that it was having a "some" impact, but primarily among the less senior members of the faculty, as well as those faculty in disciplines where external consultancy and project opportunities were not easily come by. Senior faculty members and those from disciplines who readily found highly remunerative external opportunities seemed not to view the availability of financial support as a meaningful inducement.

*Handling Concern over Credit for Scholarly Work.* With regard to the issue of how much credit for scholarly activity would be forthcoming for case research and writing, Drs. Sombat and Pradit developed a proposal aimed at reducing this concern. It was proposed that faculty case researchers/writers would receive credit for one unit of traditional research/publishing for every two cases and teaching notes accepted for publication. While some faculty had hoped for equivalence, with one case study/teaching note receiving the same credit as one piece of traditional research, going this far would have required the consent of the appropriate oversight body within the Ministry of Education. Hence, the decision to propose the "2-for-1" calibration of scholarly credit. Even this incentive proved to be in vain.

When Dr. Sombat pursued the matter with authorities in the Ministry of Education, he was advised that NIDA faculty could use one case study to replace a traditional research study or a textbook. For example, an associate professor who had to produce two publications a year—two research studies or two textbooks or one research study and one textbook—could now use a case study to replace either a study or a textbook. Thus, the negotiation with the Ministry resulted in only flexibility of workload count, and this applied to faculty at NIDA only. Case studies still could not be used to replace research studies submitted for consideration for elevation to a higher academic rank – an outcome that President Sombat, as well as the casewriting segment of the faculty, had very much wanted to see.[11]

## Attempts to Manage the Ongoing Challenge of Budgetary Constraints

From the outset of the case development project, Dr. Sombat had viewed the training as an *investment* in broadening the *corpus* of instructional materials used in courses by expanding the research skills repertoire of the NIDA faculty. However, as time went forward, the cost of defraying three case research and writing workshops, the three follow-on *practica,* and the reviews, critiques and re-crafting of individual draft case studies and Teaching Notes had proved to be considerable, creating a serious strain on NIDA's ability to continue to defray the total costs. In fact, by the completion of the third workshop, NIDA had insufficient remaining funds with which to hold additional workshops, to continue to incent the faculty, and to defray the associated costs of draft case reviews, critiques, and re-crafting. Without financial supplementation, the project was in danger of coming to a premature end. To prevent this, Drs. Sombat and Pradit pursued several routes by which to both augment project funding and economize on the costs of the endeavor.

### Tackling Project Budget Constraints: Attempts to Augment Funding

*Seeking Financial Support from High-Income NIDA Schools.* Several NIDA schools were deemed to have excellent prospects of earning significant income from Master's and doctoral degree programs offered in the evenings and on weekends – in particular, the schools of Public

Administration and Business Administration. Hence, it was decided to request that these two schools support the project by sponsoring (i.e., funding) the case development activities of their own faculty instead of receiving financial support from the Research Center. The two schools agreed, but stipulated, in turn, that each of their faculty members could conduct case research and develop just one case a year.

*Seeking Income to Fund Case Development from Sales of NIDA Case Studies.* From the very early days of the case development project, well before budgetary constraints became so problematic, Drs. Sombat and Pradit had discussed the possibility that NIDA might be able to recoup some of its investment by marketing cases developed by NIDA faculty. It was speculated that, potentially, there might be demand for Thai-context cases among other organizations, (e.g., other educational institutions); and, a budgetary allocation was provided for authors to translate their cases into Thai, which would *greatly* enhance their marketability. Despite NIDA's offer to compensate authors for these translations (initially at the rate of Baht 300 per page, and later revised to Baht 20,000 per *case*), to date only one case out of the 21 accepted for publication been translated into Thai. (Anecdotally, the reason for the lack of translation effort was case authors' citation of a lack of enough time to perform such tedious work, given all the other demands on their time and energy.)

## Tackling Project Budget Constraints: Attempts to Reduce Project Costs

*Training by a Vanguard of Casewriters.* Although only about one-half of the total number of full-time faculty members had received training during the three workshops conducted by the external facilitator/ project advisor, by the end of the third workshop, *NIDA* could no longer afford to engage the external facilitator/advisor to conduct more such workshops. Rather, building on Dr. Pradit's earlier appointment, under the Research Center, of the authors of the six cases produced out of the first workshop to the "Committee for Driving Case Study Development" to help screen case frames before they were submitted to the external facilitator/advisor, Dr. Sombat decided that those faculty members who had succeeded in writing at least two cases as of the end of the third workshop should henceforth be engaged to help train the rest of the faculty.[12]

Thus, a fourth workshop was organized in July 2011, with the six double-case authors assigned as the trainers. The same method of recruiting faculty to attend the training course as used in the third round was employed. That is, in addition to asking the dean of each school to send the rest of his/her school's faculty to attend the training course, an invitation letter was also directly sent to individual faculty members in all schools.

*Case Critique by a Group of Vanguard.* Again, to save costs after the third round of training, a new committee, "NIDA Case Research and Writing Committee," was formed under the Research Center to replace the earlier the Case Study Driving Committee, and designated as mentors to those faculty members who were researching and writing case studies for the first time.

Both sets of tactics – i.e., attempts to augment funding for case development and attempts to reduce project costs – succeeded in shaving workshop and case development expenditures for the fourth workshop. However, to date, the second set of tactics – attempts to reduce project costs – had been considerably less successful in generating additional case output from newly trained faculty members. Further, the training course on case development for outsiders that had been organized by the Training Center, and staffed by some case authors (three to be specific) from the first workshop, had not yet resulted in the submission of cases for consideration for journal publication by academicians outside of NIDA, as had been initially hoped.

## Attempts to Keep the In-House Case Research Journal Alive

Eager to provide visibility to the case development output of the faculty, Dr. Sombat had taken the decision to launch the in-house *NIDA Case Research Journal* in December 2008, immediately following the finalization of the first batch of case studies and Teaching Notes (six in total) developed by participants from the first workshop.[13] Likewise, the second annual edition of the *Journal* went to press in 2009, with the second batch of six cases out of a total of nine publication-worthy cases that were generated by participants from the second workshop.

## Efforts to Create a Larger Base of *Prospective* Case Researchers and Writers at NIDA

By the end of the third workshop, with few case frames submitted and with an insufficient inventory of cases to draw upon to assure continued *Journal* publication, the NIDA Case Research and Writing Committee took upon itself to circulate a letter inviting the faculty to submit case frames in order to qualify for case research funding. The result was the submission of four additional frames beyond those that had been submitted during or immediately following the third workshop. Learning of this, Dr. Sombat intervened and requested that the director of the Research Center implore the members of the Case Research and Writing Committee to write one more case each if no other casewriters came forward, in order to make a third edition of the *Journal* possible. An additional ten case frames were submitted, although only a limited number of the frames were developed into first-draft cases and Teaching Notes. The total yield was six publication-worthy cases out of the total batch of fourteen case frames.

Although continuity of publication of the *Journal* had been achieved for the first three editions, concern remained that the day would arrive when there would not be enough case studies to sustain the *Journal*.[14] Also, concerns were expressed that the cases published would be the output of the same small group of researchers and writers. Hence, when the decision was taken to hold a fourth workshop (July 2011), staffed by former workshop participants who had written and published at least two case studies (that is, the so-called "NIDA Casewriting Vanguard"), there was an expectation that the outcome would be a larger annual submission of case frames and first-draft cases and Teaching Notes. And, indeed, seven of the workshop participants submitted a total of eight case frames (two by the same author) for consideration for financial support from the Research Center.[15]

However, after the case frames were approved by the Case Research and Writing Committee, none of the authors proved ready to sign a case-writing contract with the Research Center. Two gave up, explaining that they had no time to perform the actual research and writing. The others explained that they first had to complete "work-in-progress" research for which they were already contractually responsible to the

Research Center before committing to a second project. Thus, as of mid-2011, publication of a fourth edition of the *Journal* was almost entirely dependent on the continued commitment and diligence of the Casewriting Vanguard under the continued supervision of the external facilitator/advisor. This group of seven constituted the beginnings of the critical mass needed to sustain the initiative, but Dr. Sombat knew that neither NIDA's case development initiative (and all that it was intended to support) nor the *NIDA Case Research Journal* could be sustained with a group of just seven ongoing casewriters.

**Efforts to Create a Base of Local Case Writers Whose Works the Journal Could Publish**

A second tack taken to increase the number of case study submissions to the *Journal* entailed offering training in case research and writing to interested persons outside of NIDA – e.g., corporate training and development personnel, governmental training staff members, other university professors, and so on. The idea was that if outsiders could be trained to do case research and write cases for classroom teaching purposes, they might subsequently have an interest in submitting their work to the *NIDA Case Research Journal* for publication consideration.

In follow-up, the Training Center, in collaboration with the Committee for Case Driving Case Study Development, structured a four-level regimen of training to offer to interested professionals outside NIDA. The first-level training course was designed to be just an introduction to casewriting and did not aim at actually producing casewriters. Those who were really interested in producing case studies had to take higher-level courses, which were to be offered only after there were enough trainees who passed the lower-level courses. The first – and to date, only – training course was held in March 2010, with about 17 trainees participating. Four of the faculty participants from the first workshop who had completed their first case study were assigned to train the outsiders for two days, with each trainer being responsible for half day of the training.

The second training course, scheduled for August 2010, had to be canceled because of an insufficiency of interest (i.e., only two applicants emerged). The same fate befell the November 2010, and May and August 2011 courses. Dr. Sombat nevertheless wanted the Training Center to

include the case study training program in the Center's yearly operating plan, in the hope that the situation would be better in due course. (See Exhibit 6 for the training schedule.)

### Efforts to Tap the International Community of Case Researchers and Writers

Because of the Case Research and Writing Committee's continued concern that a situation could develop in which there would be a dearth of case studies for publication in the *NIDA Case Research Journal,* and also because the committee wanted to upgrade the Journal to international status, they resolved that NIDA should convene an international conference on case studies on an annual basis, beginning in 2011. It was believed that such conferences could potentially be an excellent way of sparking outside casewriters' interest in having their cases published in the *Journal*, as well as a vehicle for publicizing the progress of NIDA's faculty in generating teaching cases of high quality.

The first international conference on case research was to be held during September 8-9, 2011. The local and overseas responses to the calls for case studies had thus far been, on the whole, satisfactory. To date, nearly 50 abstracts had been submitted for consideration, a fair number of which seemed likely to be accepted for presentation at the Conference. (Noticeably, to date, there had been only a few submissions written by Thai scholars.) Post-conference plans called for a careful screening of each submission, with a view to selecting the best ones for future publication in the *NIDA Case Research Journal.*

It had been Dr. Sombat's objective that the *NIDA Case Research Journal* would be an international case research journal. But neither the first two editions nor the third edition (currently, in press) had contained a single case by an author outside Thailand. Indeed, some maintained that, according to the regulations of the Higher Education Commission, Ministry of Education, the *Journal* could not even be described, accurately, as a *national* one, given that all of its cases to date had been researched and written by only *NIDA* faculty members.

## Full Speed Ahead, Course Correction, or Abandon Ship?

Returning to his office while still reflecting on the debriefing that he had just received from the vice president for academic affairs, Professor Dr. Sombat was in deep thought concerning the status of the NIDA Case Development Project. From what Dr. Pradit had just conveyed, it seemed clear that Dr. Sombat's vision of an energetically prolific faculty developing and using Thai-context case studies as a learning innovation across NIDA's programs and courses stood in great jeopardy. More worrying still was the near-certainty that without the attainment of a reputation as a venue for passionate, student-focused teaching that case method teaching was intended to facilitate, NIDA's prospects for recognition as an international university of world-class stature were likely to be uncertain, at best.

Among the many questions that entered his mind as he struggled to find the right levers to get the project on track were the overarching ones of *"What else can I do to get a much larger number of faculty members to get involved in case research?," "What's holding them up?,"* and *"Do they need more incentives, and if so, who?"*

If the problem was one of inadequate time and/or remuneration, he wondered, *"Should I let faculty use a case to satisfy part of their required teaching load, for example let a case replace one course of teaching load? Should I try to find the funds (somehow) with which to increase the amount of financial support per case? Would the budgetary ramifications of either course of action be manageable?"*

Then, remembering faculty dissatisfaction with the absence of "research equivalency" for case research and writing, Dr. Sombat ruminated about what further he could do, if anything, to persuade the Higher Education Commission of the Ministry of Education to accept case studies as equivalent to traditional research studies or textbooks, so that faculty would be able to present their case development work for purposes of obtaining elevation to higher academic ranks. *"Should I try to make faculty in other universities realize the importance of conducting case research and writing up case teaching materials? If I had experienced NIDA faculty train them on how to research and write cases, might they then join with us to press the Higher Education Commission to reconsider their stance on case research and writing?"* But, then he remembered that the Training Center had reported that outside interest in such a course had

*been so limited that only the initial course offering (out of four that had been scheduled) was sufficiently subscribed to go forward, the others having had to be canceled. "Could this have been the consequence of poor public relations work or poor marketing?"* he wondered.

He had also heard that many business organizations were interested in having university faculty conduct case research for them and train their personnel with such. *"If so, might the prospect of extra income from such engagements be yet another way to entice NIDA faculty to conduct more case research and writing?"* he wondered. But, how could he approach those organizations?

On a more upbeat note, he recalled that the Research Center had reported that the first international conference on case studies had been receiving a good response from overseas faculty. However, if NIDA was to lead other Thai universities in this endeavor, as Dr. Sombat very much desired, then the NIDA faculty needed to generate more case studies in Thai contexts. *How to make his dream come true:* This was the open question dominating his thoughts he entered the Administration Building and made his way toward his upper-floor office.

# Endnotes

1. A case "frame" was essentially an expanded outline and sketch of the case study that a researcher proposed to write. Among other elements, it consisted of teaching objectives, a synopsis of the case-to-be-written, a rudimentary outline of the sections of the proposed case, sources of data, etc. As such, it was the first step in the case development process.

2. To this sum had to be added the case development grants made to the faculty who researched and wrote the cases and teaching notes, and also the fees of Know-Edge Company, Ltd.

3. The external facilitator, who was paid on a per case basis (regardless of the amount of time that he devoted to each case and Teaching Note combination, reported that the *typical* case and Teaching Note submission usually consumed a minimum 5 or 6 days of review, critiquing, and feedback time. (The review/critique/feedback work was accompanied by periodic "brain-relaxation" breaks of varying lengths.) The exact amount of time required to complete the work on each case and Teaching Note was a function of the author's facility with written English, stage of mastery of the art of engagingly organizing and crafting a case/Teaching Note, and how much re-writing of the draft case had to be undertaken to ensure that the facilitator's critique was clear to the authors.

4. From the official website for National Institute of Development Administration, www.nida.ac.th.

5. The School of Social and Environmental Development came from the School of Social Development, officially established in 1990, to which the Environmental Management Graduate Program was later added.

6. The School of Human Resource Development was upgraded from the Human Resource Development Graduate Program, which was established in 1991.

7. The School of Language and Communication was upgraded from the NIDA Language Center in 1999.

8. As the series of workshops unfolded, the procedures for submission of case frames and draft cases changed. Initially, both case frames and draft cases were sent directly to the workshop facilitator/case project advisor by the each case author. The facilitator/advisor would review, critique, and render feedback on case frames and later the completed draft cases. A typical case and Teaching Note would go through several drafts (each of which the facilitator/advisor reviewed, critiqued, and provided feedback on) before they were sufficiently polished to warrant acceptance for publication.

   By the time of the second workshop, a new procedure was instituted by NIDA whereby all workshop participants were required to submit their case frames to a newly constituted Case Research and Writing Committee, comprised of several earlier casewriters. It was the function of the Case Committee to screen the case frames and forward only the most promising ones to the workshop facilitator for his review, critique, and feedback. By the time of the third workshop, the submission procedure was again revised, with the NIDA Research Center designated as the venue for case frame and draft case submission. The Research Center would then pass the submissions to Professor Darden *without screening*.

   As casewriting continued following the end of the third workshop, budgetary constraints became more troublesome. In consequence, Dr. Pradit, in consultation with the Case Research and Writing Committee, decided that henceforth only case studies produced by the seven faculty who had completed two cases would be eligible for review, critique, and feedback by the workshop facilitator/project advisor. The idea was that, in order to conserve limited budgetary resources, this group of seven would continue to burnish their case research and writing skills and then help other faculty members to develop cases in the future.

9. Only one of the cases produced by the first batch of case authors, i.e., the participants in Workshop 1 (December 2007), was actually sold. The same was true of the six cases produced by the second batch of case authors from Workshop 2 (May 2008).

10. Ostensibly, these resources were provided in recognition of the fact that case research entailed certain expenses, e.g., interview transcription services, transportation expenses (for distant field research sites), and so on. But, as practical matter, it was understood that the grant was also

intended to compensate in some small measure for lost income-generation opportunities arising from the family member's re-allocation of time from outside engagements to case research and writing.

[11] However, in their discussions with President Sombat, the authorities at the Higher Education Commission did express a desire to promote case writing among other Thai university faculties.

[12] Also, four members of this initial group of six had earlier been engaged by the Training Center to be the trainers in a course on case research and writing that NIDA organized for members of the general public. Upon strong recommendation of the external facilitator/project advisor, the initial group of six faculty members who had succeeded in writing at least two cases was soon joined by a seventh member, who had been unable to complete her second case in time for publication in the third edition of the *Journal*. In deference to budgetary limitations, Dr. Pradit and the Case Research and Writing Committee decided that only case studies produced by this group of seven – the so-called "NIDA Casewriting Vanguard" team – would henceforth qualify for electronic review/ critique/feedback/re-crafting by the external facilitator.

[13] Some fifteen participants out of the initial workshop group of 30+ submitted a case study "frame" the external facilitator's review and suggestions. However, only 6 of the case frames were ever developed into first drafts that subsequently received a full review, critique, and rendering of feedback and suggestions by the external facilitator.

[14] Unlike the first two editions of the *Journal* that contained six cases per volume, the third edition went to press with *eight* cases because some case writers did not want to wait one more year to be published in the fourth edition. In consequence, with the publication of the third edition of the *Journal*, for the first time no cases remained in "inventory" as a head start on the minimum number needed to publish the fourth edition of the *Journal*. The facilitator/advisor reported that he had urged since the launch of the *Journal* that once the minimum number of six cases were in hand to publish a given edition of the *Journal* that the remainder be held over until the next edition – at least such time as NIDA could be assured of always having at least half (i.e., 3) of the required number of cases to launch another edition of the Journal. This advice was proffered in recognition of the perennial uncertainty as to the number of new cases that will ultimately be submitted and found to be publication-worthy from year to year. Publication of the entire batch in Volume III effectively negated the work-in-progress toward building a small inventory to assure continuity of publication on some *regular* cycle of periodicity.

[15] The Case Research and Writing Committee resolved that lecturers would be limited to one research grant per case per year. The case could be written in either Thai or English. For English cases, the flat research grant was 180,000 baht; after translation into Thai, the writer would receive another 20,000 baht. For cases written in Thai, the support fund was 120,000 baht per case, and 20,000 baht more for the English version. The case writing supervisor would get 30,000 baht per case, no matter what language it was written

**Exhibit 1:  The Number of Students at the End of Academic Years 2007-2010 and as of July 28,  2011**

| Degree | Program/Major | Number of Students at Year-End | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | As of July 28, 2011 |
| Master's Degree (Official Hour Programs) | Public Administration | 174 | 198 | 230 | 217 | 282 |
| | Public and Private Management (MPPM) | 92 | 121 | 165 | 163 | 218 |
| | Business Administration | 300 | 394 | 382 | 361 | 449 |
| | Development Economics | 26 | 23 | 42 | 38 | 48 |
| | Business Economics | 119 | 226 | 232 | 204 | 241 |
| | Financial Economics | - | 26 | 73 | 75 | 75 |
| | Applied Statistics and Information Technology | 254 | 299 | 267 | 175 | 129 |
| | Applied Information Technology | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| | Applied Statistics (New Program) | - | - | 59 | 186 | 279 |
| | Social Development Management | 50 | 59 | 72 | 76 | 86 |
| | Language and Communication | 26 | 43 | 50 | 35 | 51 |
| | Applied Communication | - | 9 | 34 | 47 | 47 |
| | Human Resource Development | 69 | 97 | 114 | 121 | 163 |
| | Management Technology | 24 | 27 | 70 | 77 | 91 |
| | Environmental Management | 42 | 54 | 67 | 64 | 73 |
| | Information Technology Management | 30 | 4 | 2 | - | - |
| | Law for Executives | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | Law | - | - | - | - | 42 |
| **Total Students in Official Hour Programs** | | **1,206** | **1,580** | **1,859** | **1,839** | **2,280** |
| Master's Degree (Unofficial Hour Programs in Bangkok) | Public Administration | 432 | 376 | 398 | 198 | 363 |
| | Public and Private Management (MPPM) | 509 | 727 | 724 | 510 | 510 |
| | Y-MBA | 259 | 328 | 277 | 259 | 297 |
| | E-MBA | 107 | 133 | 90 | 82 | 82 |
| | FLEX-MBA | 670 | 876 | 844 | 851 | 1,008 |
| | Business Economics | 387 | 525 | 563 | 622 | 702 |
| | Financial Economics | - | - | 58 | 91 | 161 |
| | Applied Statistics and Information Technology | 412 | 528 | 437 | 544 | 450 |
| | Applied Information Technology | 3 | 3 | - | - | - |

**Exhibit 1 (cont.): The Number of Students at the End of Academic Years 2007-2010 and as of July 28, 2011**

| Degree | Program/Major | Number of Students at Year-End | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | As of July 28, 2011 |
| | Applied Statistics (New Program) | - | - | 162 | 369 | 399 |
| | Social Development Management | 202 | 205 | 170 | 202 | 193 |
| | Language and Communication | 328 | 299 | 237 | 266 | 286 |
| | Applied Communication | - | 12 | 65 | 49 | 49 |
| | Human Resource Development | 176 | 186 | 209 | 206 | 347 |
| | Management Technology | 144 | 138 | 135 | 136 | 186 |
| | Environmental Management | 138 | 182 | 146 | 142 | 184 |
| | Law for Executives | - | - | - | 21 | 29 |
| | Law | - | - | - | - | 108 |
| **Total Students in Unofficial Hour Programs** | | **3,767** | **4,518** | **4,515** | **4,548** | **5,354** |
| Master's Degree Unofficial Hours in Provinces | Public Administration | | | | | |
| | Lampoon | 77 | 16 | 13 | 13 | - |
| | Pitsanuloke | 137 | 137 | 176 | 173 | 250 |
| | Nakornratsima | 158 | 182 | 225 | 188 | 270 |
| | Udornthani | 153 | 174 | 223 | 181 | 257 |
| | Suratthani | 161 | 191 | 255 | 270 | 270 |
| | Songkhla | 171 | 201 | 270 | 269 | 269 |
| | Chonburi | 157 | 169 | 249 | 240 | 240 |
| | **TOTAL** | **1,014** | **1,070** | **1,411** | **1,334** | **1,556** |
| | Public and Private Management (MPPM) | 80 | 64 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | **Total Students in School of Public Administration** | **1,094** | **1,134** | **1,414** | **1,335** | **1,557** |
| | Social Development Management | | | | | |
| | Chiang Rai | 72 | 44 | 37 | 19 | 10 |
| | Ubonratchathani | 8 | 5 | - | - | - |
| | Yala | 151 | 166 | 203 | 189 | 189 |
| | Rayong | - | - | 40 | 89 | 89 |
| | **Total Students in School of Social and Environmental Development** | **231** | **215** | **280** | **297** | **288** |
| **Total NIDA Students in Provinces** | | **1,325** | **1,349** | **1,694** | **1,632** | **1,845** |
| Master's Degree Programs | MBA International | 19 | 33 | 31 | 30 | 38 |
| | MBA English Program | 70 | 95 | 54 | 47 | 53 |
| | MBA FIRM | 26 | 50 | 55 | 52 | 74 |

**Exhibit 1 (cont.): The Number of Students at the End of Academic Years 2007-2010  and as of July 28, 2011**

| Degree | Program/Major | Number of Students at Year-End | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | As of July 28, 2011 |
| | **Total Students in International Programs** | **115** | **178** | **140** | **129** | **165** |
| | **Total Master's Degree Students at NIDA** | **6,413** | **7,625** | **8,208** | **8,148** | **9,644** |
| Doctoral Degree | Development Administration (Inter) | 94 | 106 | 116 | 115 | 115 |
| | D.P.A. (Thai) | 57 | 67 | 80 | 83 | 82 |
| | JDBA | 10 | 12 | 12 | - | - |
| | Ph.D. Finance (Inter) | - | - | 11 | 15 | 20 |
| | Economics (Inter) | 68 | 84 | 83 | 72 | 79 |
| | Computer Science and Information System | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 15 |
| | Statistics (Inter) | 18 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 15 |
| | Population and Development | 14 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | Social and Environmental Development | 16 | 24 | 29 | 30 | 39 |
| | Human Resource and Organization Management | - | - | - | 19 | 31 |
| | Language and Communication | - | - | - | 4 | 4 |
| | Law | - | - | - | - | 22 |
| | Integrated Tourism Management | - | - | - | - | 22 |
| | **Total Doctoral Degree Students** | **289** | **333** | **364** | **364** | **443** |
| | **TOTAL NIDA STUDENTS** | **6,702** | **7,958** | **8,572** | **8,512** | **10,087** |

*Source*: Education Service Department, Statistics as of July 28, 2011.

**Exhibit 2: Number of Foreign Students at NIDA (As of June, 30, 2011)**

| School/Educational Level/Program | Country | Number of Students |
|---|---|---|
| **Master's Degree** | | |
| ***School of Public Administration*** | | |
| 1.  Public Administration Program | Cambodia | 1 |
| | Korea | 1 |
| | China | 1 |
| | Laos | 2 |
| ***School of Business Administration*** | | |
| 1.  Business Administration (English and International) Program | China | 3 |
| | Japan | 1 |
| | Laos | 2 |
| ***School of Human Resource Development*** | | |
| 1.  Human Resource and Organization Development Program | Laos | 2 |
| ***School of Language and Communication*** | | |
| 1.  Language and Communication Program | China | 2 |
| | Japan | 1 |
| **Total Master's Degree Students** | | **17** |
| **Doctoral Degree** | | |
| ***School of Public Administration*** | | |
| 1.  Doctoral Degree Program | Gana | 1 |
| | Canadia | 1 |
| | China | 2 |
| | Tibet | 1 |
| | Nepal | 1 |
| | Pakistan | 2 |
| | Burma | 3 |
| | Mongolia | 3 |
| | Malavia | 1 |
| | Germany | 1 |
| | Laos | 1 |
| | Lezoto | 1 |
| | Vietnam | 2 |
| | Spain | 1 |
| | India | 3 |

**Exhibit 2  (cont.): Number of Foreign Students at NIDA (as of June, 30, 2011)**

| School/Educational Level/Program | Country | Number of Students |
|---|---|---|
| ***School of Business Administration*** | | |
| 1.  Financial Business | Brazil | 1 |
| ***School of Development Economics*** | | |
| 1.  Economics | Laos | 1 |
| ***School of Applied Statistics*** | | |
| 1.  Computer Science | Bangladesh | 1 |
| ***School of Social and Environmental Development*** | | |
| 1.  Social and Environmental Development | China | 1 |
| ***School of Human Resource Development*** | | |
| 1.  Human Resource and Organization Development | Burma | 1 |
| | Nigeria | 1 |
| **Total Doctoral Degree Foreign Students** | | **30** |
| **Total Master's and Doctoral Degree Foreign Students** | | **47** |

**Exhibit 3: Dr. Sombat's Proposal of a Strategic Plan for University Development in His First Term of NIDA Presidency**

| Item | Target Goal | Strategy |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Academic Excellence | Being recognized in the area of development administration at the national and international levels | 1. Developing the academic personnel to have a higher d in order to meet the international standards<br>2. Developing and strengthening doctoral degree programs (international) to cope with global changes<br>3. Promoting publishing research papers in international journals<br>4. Promoting Master's and doctoral degree students to write high quality theses and dissertations for national and international contests<br>5. Promoting hosting international conferences<br>6. Promoting producing national and international journals<br>7. Adjusting the teaching and the research workloads<br>8. Increasing academic cooperation with overseas universities<br>9. Launching aggressive public relations to attract students with high academic performance<br>10. Coordinating with the Department of Technological and Economic Cooperation (DTEC) and international organizations as well as foreign governments to obtain scholarship funds<br>11. Systematically improving students' quality |
| 2. Increasing NIDA's Efficiency in Conducting Research | Having research studies that respond to social needs | 1. Doing research to develop the knowledge of sufficiency economy<br>2. Conducting case studies<br>3. Doing research on development administration for public, state enterprise, and private sectors<br>4. Doing research on marketing of major Thai commodities for proposing marketing strategies and short-term and long-term plans |

**Exhibit 3 (cont.): Dr. Sombat's Proposal of a Strategic Plan for University Development in His First Term of NIDA Presidency**

| Item | Target Goal | Strategy |
|---|---|---|
| | | 5. Doing research on social and environmental development |
| | | 6. Doing research on language and communication learning models |
| | | 7. Doing policy research to predict the country's social, economic and political trends |
| 3. NIDA Management Efficiency to become a Leading University | Having good governance and efficient modern administration system | 1. Promoting good governance, team-working, and participative management |
| | | 2. Promoting knowledge management (KM) to make NIDA be a leading university |
| | | 3. Upgrading the knowledge and job skills of the support line |
| | | 4. Developing information technology (IT) for management and administration |
| | | 5. Developing IT service and e-library to serve student needs sufficiently |
| | | 6. Promoting educational quality assurance and setting a blueprint for change |
| | | 7. Developing enterprise risk management |
| 4. Extending NIDA's Social Service Roles | More widely rendering services through training and conducting research | 1. Encouraging the Research Center and Schools to extend research service |
| | | 2. Encouraging the Training Center and Schools to develop more up-to-date training courses that serve the needs of Thai society |
| | | 3. Providing training courses on sufficiency economy to disseminate such knowledge |
| | | 4. Developing the SI-Kew campus to be a learning and training resort |
| 5. Improving the Quality of Working Life of the Personnel and the Quality of Students' Learning | A good quality of working life | 1. Developing NIDA's physical resources and environment |
| | | 2. Promoting the quality of working life of the personnel |
| | | 3. Building equilibrium between the students' quality of life and learning |

**Exhibit 3 (cont.): Dr. Sombat's Proposal of a Strategic Plan for University Development in His First Term of NIDA Presidency**

| Item | Target Goal | Strategy |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Promoting the Alumni Associations of All the Schools and the NIDA Alumni Association to develop the University and building a Cooperation Network with Other Organizations | 1. Having the alumni to drive the university development<br>2. Building a cooperation network with other organizations | 1. Having the alumni associations of all the Schools and the NIDA Alumni Association to join hands to set a strategic plan for NIDA development<br>2. Encouraging the alumni associations to express their views on curriculum development and improvement<br>3. Promoting the alumni associations to hold activities to mobilize resources<br>4. Developing a cooperation network with other organizations in public, public enterprise and private sectors. |

**Exhibit 4: Presentation of the Prof. Dr. Sombat's Strategies for Pursuing the Academic Excellence Element of the NIDA Vision**

**1. Strategies for Academic Excellence**

1.1 Finding funds from domestic and overseas sources to sponsor newly recruited faculty to earn a doctoral degree.

1.2 Motivating newly recruited faculty to increase their research skills and to conduct research continuously. To materialize this, all new faculty members were required to publish their research papers at an international level. This was used as a condition for employment contract renewal.

1.3 Having at least 30% of the faculty conduct research and publish their works in national and international journals. Currently, only one-third of NIDA faculty conducted research regularly, but their papers were not been submitted to publish in national and international journals.

1.4 Encouraging the faculty in all the schools--depending on their expertise--to conduct research to solve crucial national problems.

1.5 Developing and strengthening NIDA international doctoral programs to cope better with global changes by seeking cooperation from well-known overseas universities.

1.6 Recruiting foreign lecturers as permanent faculty members.

1.7 Developing post-doctoral programs to enhance local and overseas researchers' expertise in conducting research. Such programs could serve as a channel to increase the number of research papers published in the NIDA international journal.

1.8 Supporting Master's and doctoral degree students to produce high quality theses/dissertations for national and international contests.

1.9 Hosting international conferences at least once a year and having all the schools to hold an international conference at least once every two years.

1.10 Promoting all the schools to produce national and international journals, with the NIDA Journal of Development Administration to be an international one and all the existing journals issued by different schools to be at least national journals, with stress on spreading the works through the NIDA website for easy access by outsiders.

1.11 Balancing teaching and research workloads. The faculty would be encouraged to do more research by finding research funds from both the public and the private sectors and by supporting the research excellent forum project.

1.12 Promoting academic cooperation with overseas universities, especially those in the Asian region, to exchange faculty and students and to cooperate in conducting research. Also fellowships would be granted to faculty from universities in the Middle-East of Asia and in Africa to work for doctoral degrees at NIDA.

1.13 Carrying out aggressive public relations to attract undergraduate students and Master's degree students with high academic performance to get a scholarship to earn a Master's and a doctoral degree at NIDA in order to increase the Institute's input quality.

1.14 Coordinating with the International Development Cooperation Office, international organizations and foreign governments in grating scholarships to people in neighboring countries who wanted to further their studies at NIDA. This is a way to build an academic network to have a better relationship in the future.

1.15 Developing student quality systematically by building a good environment and atmosphere, providing welfare and encouraging students to join activities to show off their academic works in and outside NIDA.

## 2. Strategies for NIDA to be a High Performance Organization

2.1 Team-working and good governance. Focus would be primarily on coordination, cooperation, with the top administrators as facilitators and promoters so that all work units could work independently and efficiently under good governance in order for NIDA to be a role model for national administration.

2.2 Promoting knowledge management for NIDA to become a learning organization by building new knowledge and conducting research in line with the national development plan. Also knowledge would be systematically shared by means of modern information technology in and outside NIDA through different channels.

2.3 Continuously developing the support personnel to have a good knowledge and skills to work efficiently. All support staff would be equally support to develop themselves continuously and to have a better quality of working life by sending them to attend training courses in and outside NIDA. Moreover, a training course for those in the administrative line would be developed to increase their administrative efficiency.

2.4 Developing the Management Information System (MIS) to become an e-university. The following aspects would be developed:
    1) e-office
    2) e-library
    3) e-learning

4) e-testing

5) Management Information System (MIS)

2.5 Employing educational quality assurance (QA) as a tool for academic excellence. QA would be made part of corporative culture, with the QA results published in the annual report to publicize NIDA performance and to be ready for assessment from outsiders—the National Bureau of Standards and Quality assessment and the Office of Public Sector Development in Providence. The QA results would be used in preparing a blueprint for change in each fiscal year.

2.6 Developing enterprise risk management in order to reduce risks and to be ready to move forwards steadily. This risk management involved how to attract and retain the best personnel at all levels, how to attract students with a high GPA to study at NIDA, and so forth.

### 3. Strategies for Improving the Personnel's Quality of Life and the Students' Learning

3.1 Making NIDA to become a "green" university.

3.2 Promoting the quality of life of the personnel by building a good work environment and a warm atmosphere, with focus on teamwork and on exercising so that they would have both good mental and physical health.

3.3 Developing students' quality of life and learning by providing enough facilities, relaxation and study areas and places for exercise.

### 4. Strategies for Strengthening the NIDA Alumni to be a Mechanism for the University Development and Building a Cooperation Network with Outside Organizations

4.1 Encouraging alumni of individual schools to join together to set a strategic plan to develop NIDA as a whole.

4.2 Encouraging alumni to express their opinions on how to develop academic programs offered by NIDA to meet the needs of different organizations.

4.3 Encouraging alumni to participate in fund-raising activities to develop the university and to conserve Thai culture.

4.4 Developing a network with public and private organizations to increase an opportunity for NIDA graduates to find jobs.

5. **Strategies for Extending the Role of Social Sciences, including Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by Holding Academic Service to disseminate Correct Knowledge to the Society and to train Government Officials to serve the Public needs efficiently, with Emphasis on Transparency, People's Participation, and Bureaucratic Development for the Sake of the Public**

5.1 Having the Training Center and all the schools offer more training courses to meet the needs of the public and the private sectors.

5.2 Promoting cooperation between NIDA and communities to solve the latter's Problems.

5.3 Revising all degree programs to cover CSR.

5.4 Developing the knowledge of sufficiency economy as an alternative for national development.

5.5 Having the Research Center and all the schools to extend research service to serve the needs of public and private organizations to develop the body of knowledge in Thai contexts. Also, the faculty members were encouraged to use case studies for classroom teaching, which would directly benefit the students.

**Exhibit 5:  Number of NIDA Faculty Attending Four Case Research and Writing Workshops Classified by School**

| School/Center/Office | First Workshop Dec. 14-16, 2007 | Second Workshop May 23-25, 2008 | Third Workshop Dec. 17-19, 2008 | Fourth Workshop April 4-5, 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School of Language and Communication | 2 | 2 | 5 | 8 |
| School of Applied Statistics | 5 | 6 | 8 | 2 |
| School of Business Administration | 5 | 4 | 4 | - |
| School of Public Administration | 8 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| School of Development Economics | 1 | 8 | 5 | 3 |
| School of Human Resource Development | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| School of Social and Environmental Development | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Information Systems Education Center | 1 | - | - | - |
| Research Center | 1 | - | - | - |
| Office of the President | 2 | - | - | - |
| School of Law | - | - | - | 11 |
| School of Public Administration (Thammasat University) | - | - | 1 | - |
| **TOTAL** | **36** | **30** | **35** | **32** |

**Exhibit 6:  Schedule of the Training Course on Case Development for the General Public  Organized by the Training Center**

| Batch | Starting Date of Advertising | Time | Number of Trainees |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | December 9, 2009 | March 22-23, 2010 | 17 |
| 2 | March 25, 2010 | August 23-24, 2010 | Cancelled |
| 3 | June 14, 2010 | November 22-23, 2010 | Cancelled |
| 4 | March 28, 2011 | May 30-31, 2011 | Cancelled |
| 5 | July 5, 2011 | August 9-10, 2011 | Cancelled |
| 6 | Not advertised yet | November 14-15, 2011 | |