EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Vol. 8, No. 2

The Journal of The International Society for Educational Planning

PROMOTING THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

VOLUME 8 NUMBER 2

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Beginning with this issue, Donna Martin Gambill (Memphis State University) is the Managing Editor.

ISEP ANNOUNCES

Outstanding Doctoral Dissertations

At its annual meeting, to be held this October in Oklahoma City, ISEP will recognize one or more outstanding doctoral dissertations in the field of educational planning. Anyone working with a student who may be worthy of such distinction should write to Ron Lindahl at the following address for the appropriate forms and further information:

Dr. Ron Lindahl
509 College of Education
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968
(915) 747-5571

Schools Competition

Each year as part of the conference, ISEP sponsors a special recognition award for outstanding school district plans. All submissions are judged by a panel of members of the ISEP board for clarity, innovation and focus. For information on submission procedures and criteria please contact:

Dr. Kenneth Ducote, ISEP President
New Orleans Public Schools
4300 Almonaster Ave.
New Orleans, LA 70126
(504) 942-3517

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Stephen Biles is Associate Director of Texas A& M University at Koriyama, Japan.

B. Kathryn Jones is Senior Evaluator in the Research and Evaluation Department in the Dallas Independent School District.

Ronald A. Lindahl is Program Coordinator in Educational Administration at the University of Texas at El Paso.

Carolyn M. Shields will begin her new position on July 1, 1991 in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Utah.

Arthur W. Steller is Superintendent of the Oklahoma City Public Schools.

Belle Ruth Witkin is Visiting Scholar in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Washington, Seattle.

CREATING OUR FUTURE: AN INTEGRATED AND FUTURE ORIENTED APPROACH TO PLANNING

Carolyn M. Shields

The tumultuous events which have occurred in Eastern Europe and around the world during the past year seem to reinforce the commonly held view that the world is in a state of unprecedented, rapid, accelerating and exponential change. Yet, a curious paradox is evident. The attitude of many people suggests that although change is inevitable, "there is nothing new under the sun." In fact the French proverb, "plus ca change, plus ca reste le meme" is frequently quoted to suggest the illusory nature of change.

Nevertheless it is important to face the situation and to grapple with the question of how an organization, particularly an educational institution, can deal effectively with change. In what ways can an educational organization engage in effective decision making, or planning for the future?

Much has been written about planning and decision making and their central importance in responding to crises or external triggers of a technological, political, or cultural nature (Tichy, 1983; House, 1981) and therefore in bringing about organizational change. Decision making is generally considered a major responsibility of administrators, an activity which is the "heart of organization and the process of administration" (Griffeth, 1958, p. 122). March (1981) affirms that "choice and decision making touch some of the more important values of modern developed cultures, and thereby become major symbolic domains in contemporary organizations" (p. 573).

Planning and Decision Making

It is advisable to attempt briefly to define the terms planning and decision making. Unlike some other writers who have chosen precise and delimiting definitions for these concepts, it is the intention of this writer to use them in a relatively loose and broad way. Further, there will be little or no attempt to differentiate between them, except insofar as each term is used deliberately. Thus, Thompson (1977) cites Sagetti's definition: "planning is anticipatory decision-making. It is a process whereby a system selects outcomes and courses of action in a series of interrelated choice situations which have not yet occurred, but which are envisioned to occur in the future" (p. 45). This definition is attractive for a number of reasons. It recognizes the future orientation of planning and decision making. Planning is seen not just as a series of finite steps but as a process. Decision making is an integral part of planning and the element of choice is acknowledged.

Hanson (1976) suggests that "in recent years a strand of literature has been developing that seems to be groping for more adequate conceptual models of the process of... decision-making" (p. 27). In order to assist those who are indeed "groping" for new models, a reconstruction of traditional stances and paradigms is proposed. This new approach incorporates ideas, techniques, and emphases of futurists into current models of planning and decision making in an attempt to enhance the relevance of both teaching and administration.

Shifting Paradigms

A number of writers (Schwartz & Ogilvy, 1979; Capra, 1982) have discussed the topic of shifting paradigms and the emergence of a new world view. It is essential that this

developing world view recognize that past, present and future lie on a continuum. The past is over; it cannot be changed, but it can and must inform our present thinking. The present is happening around us; it is also too late to change the present. All our experiences of the past and present, all our current energy and research thrusts must be future oriented. This is not to say that studies of what has happened or of the present state of an organization are not useful, but they are not enough in themselves.

Of Futures and Futurists

It is becoming more common today to hear the term "futures," an intentional plural form which indicates that there are many possible visions of the future, many potential future scenarios, some preferable, some definitely not. The key ingredient is that it is not necessary to sit back with a fatalistic attitude and accept whatever future comes our way. It is important to understand as much as possible about some of these alternative future images, with the goal of attempting to influence change, to shape a desirable future for ourselves and for future generations of students and educators.

Many people, however, still regard futurists with the same skepticism they accord to crystal ball gazers or tarot card readers and confuse the significant research and warnings of forecasters with the predictions of fortune tellers. Yet policy analysts in many countries (Sweden, The Netherlands, Switzerland) have begun to recognize that policy which does not take images of the future into account may be predisposed to failure. Change theorists, too, have a real stake in the tools and information of the futurists, yet change theory has only incidentally paid attention to the future as a valid focus for its efforts.

What good are attempts to understand history, to comprehend present trends and directions or to engage in strategic or long-term planning if we have not developed a theory which is able to inform practice or to effect change? Fullan (1982) cites Bennis who suggests that what is needed is a theory suitable not "only for *observers* of social change" but also "for *participants* in, or practitioners of, social change." What is needed is a theory "of *change* and not theories of *changing*" (p. 96). Theories of change, then, examine what has happened and attempt to explain *how* it has come about. Theories of changing, on the other hand, attempt to understand *how to bring about* a desired change. Futures studies must be integrated into our theories of changing; they must be permitted to transform our traditional approaches to planning and decision making.

Traditional Approaches to Planning and Decision Making

The contributions of traditional methods of planning arising from a positivistic paradigm, as well as the more recent contributions of the interpretivists and the critical theorists, have been discussed in detail in an earlier paper (Shields, 1989). From the former, we have inherited rational multi-step approaches to planning and decision making, as well as satisficing, incremental, anarchic and garbage can models. The interpretivists have enriched the field with an emphasis on dynamic, nonrational processes, social interaction, a focus on individual ideas and concerns, and more recently, new and vibrant concepts of leadership in holographic terms (Morgan, 1986) and as a "quality of an organization" (Ogawa & Bossert, 1989). Most recently, the critical theorists have advocated communicative action and reminded planners that issues of power, justice, and value must not be neglected in favor of an unquestioning and sometimes unhealthy reliance on the status quo.

Thus, existing planning and decision making models all have worthwhile contributions to make. Rational models contribute logical, analytical processes and quantitative data which

are indispensable. Interpretive models emphasize meaning, symbolism, qualitative data, and important intuitive right brain types of information and processes. From the critical theorists comes a criticism of the status quo, an emphasis on power, coercion, struggle and a consciousness of justice and value issues.

A new model would synthesize these contributions, yet would be sufficiently comprehensive to allow for creativity, innovation, and flexibility as well as a future-orientation.

Planning and Decision Making for the Future

In a pessimistic, yet too often accurate, indictment of traditional decision making processes, Harrison and March (1984) suggest that the more extended the search for alternatives in an ambiguous decision situation, the greater the likelihood of what they term "postdecision disappointment" (p. 36). In fact, while they recognize that their suggestion may not always be feasible, they assert that "the most obvious way to manage postdecision disappointment is to deflate expectations" (p. 36). The model proposed in this section attempts to synthesize elements of the traditional models with some new concepts and methodologies of futurists. In this way, it is hoped that planning and decision making may become, in themselves, exciting tools for developing innovative and forward thinking individuals and organizations, rather than for creating depression and deflated expectations.

The Nature of Change

One of the major problems for planners and decision makers was identified by Tichy (1980) when he stated that "organizations do not follow predictable biosocial stages of development" (p. 164). It is for this reason he believes that the idea of organizational life cycle models is "seductively simple." Rather, the concept of "triggers" is particularly useful in attempting to understand change. Triggers relating to cycles which are technological, political or cultural in nature "are not based on maturational processes but on the dynamics of social systems surviving and making adjustments in various contexts" (p. 165). In other words, because change is a dynamic process, so necessarily, planning and decision making must be dynamic in nature. Further, Tichy explains, uncertainty is triggered both by "events and activities that occur independently of the cycles" and by "cycles themselves which trigger one another in a dialectical process" (p. 168).

It is important to recognize that triggers may not just be events, but individuals, or ideas. Some of the greatest changes in technology, values, beliefs, or scientific understanding have come about because of one person who dared to be inventive or creative, who accepted the risk of challenging old, traditional, and well-established ideas, or who was willing to strike out in a new direction. Further, it is not important that the ideas be complete or well developed, for the nature of the creative process is such that ideas snowball as one is "hitch-hiked" onto another. Kuhn (1970) emphasizes the importance of this concept with respect to the creation of new paradigms.

> The success of a paradigm—whether Aristotle's analysis of motion, Ptolemy's computations of planetary position, Lavoisier's application of the balance, or Maxwell's mathematization of the electromagnetic field—is at the start largely a promise of success discoverable in selected and still incomplete examples. (p. 23)

In dealing with some concepts important in the field of futurism, Lonsdale (1971) discusses the developing of alternate futures, the creation of scenarios, and the role of surprise which "may derive from *system breaks*. . . representing a sudden change in an evolutionary system" (p. 10). This important idea relating to the nature of change comes from Boulding. Boulding (1967, pp. 199-203) explains that *mechanical systems*, such as the sequence of the days of the week, have no surprise in them. *Pattern systems*, such as kittens growing up into cats, have less certainty, but great predictability. *Equilibrium systems* or *control systems*, such as houses with thermostats, are also predictable, but with the added feature of equilibrating feedback. The problem, however, with most predictions is that people attempt to apply them to *evolutionary systems* for which they are totally invalid. In fact, it is change in the characteristics of a system itself which confounds prediction. Changes, triggers, mutations, or "system breaks" result in lack of equilibrium or homeostasis, which is almost impossible to predict. Sudden changes in the economy, a new medical or technological discovery, the outbreak of war or the resolution of a long-standing conflict may cause system breaks. An important implication of this concept may be illustrated very simply. Trends must be examined with caution. Boulding uses the example of human growth. Just because a boy doubles his height between the ages of 2 and 10, does not mean he is going to double it again between the ages of 10 and 18. It is therefore crucial that we be "on the lookout for exhaustion of the original impetus which gave rise to the growth or the development of new impulses" (p. 208). This understanding of discontinuity and its deliberate accommodation in the planning process constitutes one of the keys to successful planning and decision making emphasized in a futures planning approach. Yet, in spite of a myriad of uncontrollable and unpredictable forces which affect the course of history, it is also true to affirm that we can play a role in triggering change.

The Need for Reflection

One of the most useful ideas in vogue today may be the concept of *meta-theory*, the idea that it is important to develop the skills necessary to design and analyze the processes in which one is engaged. Thus, it is not enough to possess knowledge about change theory or planning or decision making or the future; it is important to understand what is actually happening as one engages in specific activity. Berman (1981), in referring to a study conducted of five schools by Miles et al., states: "They suggest that 'meta-planning'—that is, designing the planning process—also develops and evolves in more effective projects" (p. 269).

Although Morgan (1986) does not use the term meta-theory, he develops some concepts which seem to be related. He advocates the use of metaphor as a tool for the "understanding of organizational learning and capacities for self-organization" (p. 105). He subsequently asserts that traditionally the change process has been conceptualized as a problem of changing technologies, structures, and the abilities and motivations of employees. While this is in part correct, effective change also depends on changes in the images and values that are to guide action (p. 138). Thus, the use of metaphor becomes one meta-tool for examining, understanding and changing the way one thinks—even during the process itself.

Creating Visions of the Future

We begin to sense a planning process which works from the present backwards into history to get a sense of what has taken place and what we can learn from it. We leap ahead into the future to develop a vision of some desirable futures. We may work from the present to the future to examine trends and current developments. And we may work from an image

of the future back to the present to determine how to enhance those aspects which may contribute to the attainment of our goal, and how to circumvent those factors which may inhibit our success. The process is not linear. It is not even cyclical. It is a continuous, interactive and somewhat messy process with a great deal of ambiguity, a large quantity of data, and infinite exciting ideas. Livingstone and Lake (1977, p. 95) put it this way: "Three essential ingredients can be distinguished in any effort either to maintain or to restructure the current social reality: *understanding of the existing society, a vision for the future,* and *a strategy for getting there.*" It is important to recognize that there are methodological considerations implied in a "strategy for getting there." Yet, recognition and acceptance of new approaches are often impeded by skepticism, unfamiliarity and reluctance to consider something new. In an attempt to heighten the reader's awareness of their scope and utility for educational planning, some of the strategies and methodologies of futurists will be briefly outlined here.

Forecasting

Joseph (1974) suggests that in the 1960s, "technology forecasters learned that they could not accurately forecast technology apart from the other social forces that were moving society into the future" (p. 3). With respect to education, he continued that we are also learning the necessity of considering the future of other areas of society. Thus, forecasting, whether directly relating to educational planning or to a broader social need, is a holistic, global, and integrated process which cannot examine data in isolation. McNamara (1974, p. 378) informs us that "the difference between technological forecasting and scientific prediction is not *rigor* but rather *purpose.*" He goes on to suggest that certain tests are generally accepted to validate scientific models: reproducibility, validity, value explicitness (p. 378). Likewise, he would respond to those who attempt to discredit forecasting, that it has its own criteria of reproducibility, internal validity, proximate validity, and value explicitness (p. 379).

Forecasting Techniques

This brief overview of some of the tools and techniques of forecasting is not intended to be a comprehensive examination of all of the methodology of futurists. There will be no attempt to submit each methodology to an exhaustive critique and analysis, nor is it intended that these few comments constitute a "how to" manual for those wishing to incorporate some new views into their notions of planning. It is, however, hoped that these glimpses will provoke interest in further study of the possibilities offered by a more comprehensive and integrated approach to planning and decision making.

Makridakis and Wheelwright (1981), as well as many other writers, recognize that there are about a dozen commonly used forecasting techniques. Lonsdale (1971) reports a study conducted by McHale (1970) which indicated that the nine most commonly used techniques in order of frequency were "scenario building, Delphi techniques, simulation/gaming, trend extrapolation, dynamic modeling, cross-impact analysis, correlation plotting, expert position papers, and relevance trees" (p. 25). In addition to these techniques, others would add the nominal group technique, developed by Delbecq and Van de Ven in 1970, and force-field analysis. A few comments concerning these strategies are in order.

The *Delphi technique,* developed by Olaf Helmer and colleagues at the Rand Corporation in 1968, was originally intended as a forecasting tool which would gain information and feedback through a series of successive individual communications with a large number of knowledgeable individuals. The *nominal group technique* attempts to combine the advantages of individuals working and brainstorming ideas alone, and later interaction by group members.

Simulations, games, and models, whether concrete or computer based, are tools for conducting exploratory forecasting. They are means of investigating strengths and weaknesses as well as relative advantages of possible plans or proposals for the future.

Trend analysis, force-field analysis, cross-impact matrices, decision (or relevance) *trees* and *correlation plotting* are tools which could be categorized as primarily relating to *causal forecasting*, although it must be noted that all types of forecasting have some normative intentions. These methodologies all attempt to foresee causes and relationships, to measure the relative strengths and weaknesses of different factors, and to draw some conclusions with respect to the extremely complex nature of problems and opportunities related to the future. It is again worthy of note that these conclusions will relate to both facts and values.

Although each specific discipline (planning, policy making, organization theory, change theory, futures forecasting, etc.) seems to have its own peculiar vocabulary, each recognizes some singularly important and similar concepts. Thus, the idea of force-field analysis, which attempts to identify forces for change, may also recognize that these forces are not constant and indeed may constitute the type of "trigger" or "system break" referred to earlier. This concept of "system breaks" or non-continuous trends is essential to the proper use of the causal forecasting methodologies. The pessimism associated with many comments concerning exponential growth in such areas as population, weapons build-up, or environmental issues may be overemphasized. "There is growing evidence that the exponential increase in many changes is now beginning to taper off, bending the J-curve into an S-curve, which has always symbolized change from one state of relative stability to another state of relative stability" (Lonsdale, 1971, p. 26). Trends are valuable data sources, but they, like all else, are neither constant nor immutable.

It is not surprising that McHale found *scenario building* to be the most prevalent technique. Scenario writing provides a unifying and culminating activity in the field of forecasting, for it demands that vague notions and accumulated data concerning the future be elaborated as a "concrete" vision of the future. A scenario, such as Gage's (1989) "Paradigm Wars," written in the present tense as if the future were already in existence, facilitates the presentation of new visions and concepts.

> By exploring different alternatives, [scenarios] extend our appreciation of the range of what is possible. By projecting present developments into the future, they show us the implications of policy decisions. By speculating on insights from different disciplines, and by blending art and science, they force us to relate events and trends which we may be tempted to consider as separate. (Henchey, 1977, p. 17)

Thus, the scenario becomes one of the primary tools of *normative forecasting.* As it presents us with images of *possible* futures, it enables us to identify *probable* futures and, therefore, to begin to deal with the very real and significant values questions concerning *preferable* futures.

Contributions of Forecasting

Forecasting tools, like any other tools, have their specific purposes and their limitations. They help to provide both the objective and subjective data. They do not provide answers, but they will assist those who attempt to expand their models of planning and decision making

for the future. Forecasting requires that one look to the past for information, for the beginning of trends, for images of civilization and for lessons about creativity and creative solutions to problems. It then mandates that decisions be made with the recognition that this is an age of discontinuity when relationships, trends and values are in flux, and therefore with the understanding that even the most highly developed plans and decisions must be somewhat exploratory and flexible in nature. These are some of the key contributions that futures forecasting brings to a broader concept of planning for the future.

A Future Planning Perspective

Tichy (1983, p. 173) believes that "successful change must rely on the ability to predict change." Effective planning for the future will certainly rely more on this concept. It will be more comprehensive, more complex and more dynamic than traditional planning and decision making models. There will be more data accumulated and a greater number of processes used, yet with more tolerance for ambiguity and an increased recognition of the roles played by discontinuity and by serendipity. It will be important to recognize that there may be several equally valid ways of knowing or of interpreting any given fact or situation.

Changing for the Future

There is no doubt that the planning and decision making process involves implicit assumptions concerning the future. The challenge for the educational decision maker of the nineties is to make those assumptions more explicit and to balance interpretations with historical truths. It is also to develop acceptable communal images of possible, probable and desirable futures rather than simple individual images. Indeed, as we struggle to find a new and broader conceptual framework, it will be important to examine further some ethical questions concerning values about which this paper has merely hinted. It will also be important to attempt to discover ways of applying some of the notions suggested here to specific situations. There is much work to be done. But a new, effective conceptualization might well include the following components: a broader methodological base which would include both traditional and innovative forecasting tools; a new concept of data; a flexible planning and decision making structure; and revised views of authority, power, autonomy, and organizational structure.

Data revisited. It will be important to consider data for planning and decision making in new ways. Judgments as well as other data which have traditionally been considered "outputs" should also be considered as "inputs" into decision situations. In addition, data considered appropriate for educational decision making must encompass both the rational and empirical as well as the symbolic. We must look beyond isolationist and "narrow limitations, inherited mainly from specific disciplines" (Green, 1973) to a holistic, global, and intricate view.

Structure revisited. The structure of the planning process is another component which must be considered. Too much structure will be inhibiting. Too little will provide no guidance and produce little in the way of change. A successful futures planning process needs broad goals, defined but flexible parameters which constitute a loose structure within which to work, and some elements of redundancy. The latter may be accomplished by a multiple team approach to planning, by developing numerous strategies, plans, and images of the future, or by a participative approach to decision making and planning which permits all members of an organization to contribute.

Organizations revisited. A participatory view of the processes involved may indeed lead to a new view of the organization itself, in which accountability is required of all members of the organization. Thus, a modified view of authority and power with respect to forecasting, planning and decision making would require a recognition of the expertise, interests, insights and contributions of each member of the organization. If the broad goals of the organization become, in holographic fashion, a part of each member of the organization, then it is not unreasonable to suggest that an organization concerned with planning for the future will train each interested individual in the necessary forecasting techniques, decision making concepts, and communication skills. In this way, planning and decision making, as well as leadership, will truly become qualities of an organization.

Conclusion

Thus, the planning and decision making models from the traditional research paradigms, combined with the tools and orientation of futurists, have much to contribute to our knowledge of how to plan for educational change. But educational change does not happen, indeed must not happen, in a vacuum. It must occur within the context of dynamic relationships among education and the cultural, sociological, ideological and technological changes taking place within the world today. The challenge is vast, the risks are enormous; there will be plans which are not successfully implemented. Yet the possibilities offered by a renewed model of planning and decision making are endless. An expanded repertoire of techniques, greater tolerance for risk and ambiguity, encouragement of creativity and innovation, enlargement of the concept of leadership for change within an organization, validation of subjective data as inputs, new means of communication, renewed trust in and understanding of the processes involved in decision making and planning— all these will assist us to develop strategies which will help to positively shape the direction of education for the next century.

Educators, administrators and teachers alike must approach the tasks of planning, coping with change, goal setting, decision making, problem solving, and curricular leadership with new insight and new strategies. In addition, teachers who determine to introduce futures studies, techniques and images into their classrooms will find that their students are motivated, interested and involved, ready to take a role in shaping their own future.

In 1974, Alvin Toffler began his book *Learning for Tomorrow* with these sentences: *"All education springs from some image of the future. If the image of the future held by a society is grossly inaccurate, its educational system will betray its youth."* If we do not wish to betray our youth, our educational planners and administrators must take this challenge seriously. There is an urgent need for an integrated approach to planning and decision making which will study the past, understand the present, and develop broad based yet flexible plans for the future based on sound values and a vision of a better world for all.

References

Berman, P. (1981). Educational change: An implementation paradigm. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), *Improving schools, using what we know*. Beverly Hills: SAGE.

Boulding, K. (1967). Expecting the unexpected. In *Designing education for the future, no. 1*. New York: Citation Press.

Capra, F. (1982, Dec.). The turning point: A new vision of reality. *The Futurist*, 19-24.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE.

Gage, N.L. (1989). Paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher, 18*(7), 4-10.

Green, T. (1973). *Educational planning in perspective*. Guilford, Surrey, England: Futures, IPC House.

Griffeth, D. (1958). Administration as decision-making. In A. Halpin (Ed.), *Administrative theory in education*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center.

Hanson, M. (1976). Beyond the bureaucratic model: a study of power and autonomy in educational decision-making. *Interchange, 7*(2), 27-38.

Harrison, J., & March, J.G. (1984). Decision making and post decision surprises. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29* (1), 26-42.

Henchey, N. (1977). The future of Quebec: Alternate scenarios. *McGill Journal of Education, xii*(1), 17-28.

House, E. R. (1981). Three perspectives on innovation: Technological, political, and cultural. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), *Improving schools: Using what we know*. London: SAGE.

Joseph, E. C. (1974). An introduction to studying the future. In S. Hencley & J. Yates (Eds.), *Futurism in education*. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Livingstone, D., & Lake, D.G. (1977). Preferred images of the future. *McGill Journal of Education, xii*(1), 95-110.

Lonsdale, R. C. (1971). Futurism: Its development, content, and methodology. In W. Hack et al. (Eds.), *Educational futurism*. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Makridakis, S., & Wheelwright, S. (1981). Forecasting an organization's futures. In P. Nystrom & W. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

March, J. G. (1981). Footnotes to organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*(4), 563-574.

McNamara, J.F. (1974). The design of technological forecasting studies. In S. Hencley & J. Yates (Eds.), *Futurism in education*. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organizations*. London: SAGE.

Ogawa, R.T., & Bossert, S.T. (1989). *Leadership as an organizational quality*. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March.

Schwartz, P., & Ogilvy, J. (1979). *The emergent paradigm: Changing patterns of thought and belief*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Shields, C. (1989). *Creating our future or accepting our fate*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Saskatchewan.

Thompson, D.C. (1977). The state of planning at McGill. *McGill Journal of Education, xii*(1), 42-56.

Tichy, N. (1983). *Managing strategic change*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Tichy, N. (1980). Problem cycles in organizations and the management of change. In J. Kimberly, R. Miles, et al. (Eds.), *The organizational life cycle*. London: Jossey-Bass.

Toffler, A. (1974). *Learning for tomorrow: The role of the future in education*. New York: Vintage Books.

IS THIS TRIP NECESSARY? NEEDS ASSESSMENT: A PERSONAL MEMOIR AND REAPPRAISAL

Belle Ruth Witkin

Part 2. Reappraisal and Prospect: 1981—

When reading some of the critical literature on needs assessment and trying to extrapolate from the theoretical perspectives offered to what occurs in practice, I am reminded of the story of the six blind men and the elephant. What one observes in the trunk, another finds as a contradiction in the ear or the tail. And none has a complete view of the "real" elephant. So it is with needs assessment. No needs assessments can be as neatly categorized as the theoretical models, many alternative paradigms are possible, and few of us see the whole elephant.

This paper is not a defense of educational needs assessment (ENA). Rather it is an attempt to clarify some issues, including the relationship between theory and practice. The two-part series is in part a response to papers in this journal by Weintraub (1988, 1989) in which she raised philosophical issues regarding the assumptions of needs assessment, the social science paradigm which (in her view) it reflects, and the effects that the process has on the students or clients whose needs are assessed. To provide a partial background for my own perspective on ENA, in Part 1 (Witkin, 1990[1]) I reviewed its history and development in the United States from 1965 to 1981, in the context of widespread social and educational change. In Part 2, I consider certain criticisms of ENA in the light of basic assumptions about the process, the relationship between ENA theories and practices, and their impact on schools and students; and offer my current thinking on the place of ENA in educational planning and renewal. I trust that the remarks will be taken as *ad rem*, not *ad feminam* (Weintraub, 1989).

I agree with Weintraub on many points, not least that scholarship does not occur in a vacuum, nor is it value free. No matter how objective a writer may desire or purport to be about a subject, or how broad the background, each person pays (selective) attention to the phenomena that accord with his own *schema* (in the terms of information theory; see Rumelhart, 1977). The recognition of this was one factor that prompted me to write about the origins of ENA in the framework of a personal memoir.

We have seen that in the U.S. the federal legislation of 1965 and subsequent years provided a major incentive for sustained efforts to make ENA the first step in systematic educational planning, especially at the district and state levels. The legislation, however, offered neither definitions nor methods. In effect, the charge was, "If you want supplementary funds for educational improvement or innovation, you'd better make a case for your request. What are the student needs that your program will address? How do you know? And how will you know that it did any good?" (the evaluation question). Educators in different roles turned to the task of translating the general guidelines into practical applications—proposing paradigms and definitions, designing needs assessment procedures, trying them out, and disseminating the results. Both planning and evaluation emerged in the next decade as (relatively) new fields of expertise.

Other social forces also supported an interest in needs assessment and influenced its divergent practices. Among them were the notions of participatory management in the schools, accountability of the schools to the community, the educator as change agent

(analogous to the agricultural field agent), the concept of careful planning as a basis for budgeting (and not vice versa), and the right of parents, students, and teachers to share in decisions about goals and programs. Coupled with these was the recognition that better ways must be found to put scarce resources to the best use for all students—to set priorities. The last concept assumed that some needs are more important or urgent than others, and that no school system has an unlimited reservoir of funds, energy, or time to address all the needs.

Needs assessment was viewed as only the first step, albeit an important one, in the process of planning new or revised programs. At its deepest layer the assumptions about ENA were profoundly democratic: (1) that it is better to base educational change on the analysis of needs than on administrative fiat; (2) that such change should involve identifying unmet educational needs of students; (3) that the identification of needs and priorities should be linked to educational goals mutually agreed upon by a broad representation of the school-community; (4) that educational programs can and should be developed to meet the needs; and (5) that there are many possible ways of assessing needs and of arriving at consensus on goals and directions for planning.

Once begun, the practice of needs assessment became widespread not only for justifying funded projects, but also for long-range planning and organizational renewal. Out of these experiences came more diverse models and methods, occurring at almost every level and area of education and increasing in popularity and utilization (Stufflebeam,McCormick, Brinkerhoff, & Nelson, 1985).

Debates about ENA have tended to center on such matters as definitions of need and validity or feasibility of various methods used. Weintraub has raised some interesting questions from the standpoint of epistemology. To what extent do they reflect either the theory or practices of educational needs assessment? Some of Weintraub's objections apply more accurately to practices in health and social services than to educational needs assessment. Not the least of the differences is that ENA is less likely to equate needs assessment with market research—with finding or creating a market for services. My concern in this discussion, however, is with needs assessment in *education*.

This paper also focuses on needs assessment in the United States. In the imaginary dialogue that I offered in a previous issue (Witkin, 1988) one speaker mentions that "perhaps things are simpler in Canada," a statement that Weintraub mistakenly interpreted as a denigration of that country. Not at all. Needs assessment occupies a rather different place in education in Canada than it does in the United States, and school planners there may not be under the same kinds of constraints as here. To my knowledge, neither Ottawa nor the provincial parliaments enacted the kinds of legislation which both mandated and supported ENA at various levels in the U.S.[2] Furthermore, in Canada needs assessment has played a much bigger role in the delivery of social services than in education.

Not that Canada did not undertake ENAs and contribute to theory and methodology. Examples are the collaboration in British Columbia between community colleges and the provincial ministry in designing effective processes for engaging the community and educators in dialogue to improve or initiate services to the community (Lund & McGechaen, 1981); the refinement of social indicators in ENA for community adult education programming (Dickinson, 1981; Province of British Columbia, 1984; for a discussion of issues in this regard see Rubenson, 1982); new methods of determining priorities (Sork, 1979, 1982); and models for assessment of training needs (Misanchuk 1982; Misanchuk & Scissons, 1978). By 1985, when I was invited to give a day-long workshop on needs assessment at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association in Toronto, it was evident that there was a lively interest throughout the country in ENA.[3]

Program Planning Before and After ENA

Until the advent of systems planning and ENA, school districts in the U.S. typically operated as closed systems (see Likert, 1967) from the standpoint of information flow for decisions on goals and planning. Communication in such systems was mainly hierarchical, top-down, with little input upwards (students to teachers to administrators) and from outside the system (parents, community; Witkin, 1975). And to the extent that the educational system was a *loosely-coupled system*, with loose interdependence between units (such as classrooms), procedures, and decisions (Weick, 1976), lateral communication (especially among teachers to share new ideas, ways of promoting better classroom climate, and the like) was scanty.

Kaplan (1973) noted three stages in educational planning: Stage I, essentially *prescriptive*, in which the function was to support a set of *a priori* assumptions; Stage II, in which planners moved to promote *efficiency* in the system; and the emergence of Stage III, in which educational planners became increasingly concerned with an *ascriptive* role. He found these questions being raised in the schools:

> What *should* be the purpose of education? Whom should it serve? What segments of society are presently disenfranchised?. . .What basic changes in structure, methodology, and program are warranted and how can these be realized? (Kaplan, 1973, p. 3)

The more comprehensive ENA models of the 1970s sought to provide a framework for initiating discussion of such questions.

Before ENA, central office and building administrators usually made curricular and program decisions with little or no counsel from teachers, and with none from students, parents, or the community. In a nationwide study Hoepfner (1974) found that principals made assumptions about student needs, as well as programs (if any) to meet them, largely on the basis of their own information, biases, and predilections. Standardized tests were assumed to indicate student progress and needs, but their scope was (and is) severely limited.[4] Hoepfner found that, out of a set of 106 educational goals validated in a nationwide study, only a small proportion of tests used by the schools related to those goals. Unfortunately, that is still true.

The deleterious effect of top-down decision making is not much mitigated by the fact that policy is set by elected school boards who are supposed to reflect community concerns. But school governance is typically hierarchical, and the extent to which educational decisions are influenced by educational or social theory varies considerably with the educational level and sophistication of school boards and administrators.

The advent of ENA encouraged planning based on locally-determined goals and objectives. Decisions about needs and programs to meet them came to be viewed as a shared concern between school personnel and the community. Opinions were solicited from teachers, students, parents, and others in the community; new projects were required to use advisory committees composed of representative groups of parents, both for application of grants and during project implementation and evaluation; and public opinion became a potent force in movements in the schools.

It would be ingenuous to claim that ENA in itself brought about these changes, or that shared decision making was universal. But ENA did encourage a partnership among various groups in the school-community to view planning in terms of interactions in the *whole* system, to provide a rational basis for decisions that were formerly based on personal preference or prejudice, and to be a corrective to unilateral decision making.

Which brings me to the matter of "rational" planning. It should be remembered that in the 1960s and 1970s the term was not pejorative. Indeed, when compared with the piecemeal, sometimes self-serving methods then current, the notion of systematic, rational planning was positively liberating. Far from disempowering students or teachers, ENA brought them actively into the arena of public policy making. One tool for this was the systems approach, about which I will have more to say later.

Of course, many measures taken by districts to improve the curriculum, raise achievement levels, and meet specific needs of students are not based on systematic planning. They are often responses to pressure from single-issue groups in the community or to court orders,[5] and are as much political as educational decisions. Typical examples are the addition of ethnic studies to the curriculum, busing students out of neighborhood schools to achieve better racial balance, changes in methods of teaching reading, and bilingual education.

ENA, then, was a countervailing force, since it provided methods for getting input from *all* stakeholder groups regarding unmet needs and priorities. Since the purpose of ENA was to *change* the status quo, I am at a loss to understand Weintraub's charge that "sweeping claims about the imputed democratic nature of (for example) needs assessment are simply standards for the inherently conservative defense of what is" (1989, p. 8).

Since the withdrawal in 1981 of most federal funding for ENA studies, many school systems have reverted to unilateral (administrative) decision making. Some critics believe that very little has changed in school governance from their inception. As Shanker (1990) puts it, school systems operate "very much like a command economy, and even the attempts to reform them over the past several years have mostly followed the model of a command economy: top-down directives; excessive regulations; standardization and further bureaucratization" (p. 21). The extent to which ENA has served to broaden the base of policy and decision making at the local level remains problematic.

Critiques of ENA

Critiques of ENA have formed around five issues: definitions of need and of needs assessment; methodologies for identifying and analyzing needs and for setting priorities on needs for purposes of program planning; the debate over means and ends; lack of adequate utilization of results of ENA studies; and finally, the criticism of ENA as a reflection of the cult of positivism, and a tool for the perpetuation of practices that oppress, rather than liberate, students.

I have dealt with the first four issues in detail elsewhere (Witkin, 1984, pp. 5-16; and Witkin, 1991). Before turning to the issue of positivism, I will comment briefly on the matter of definition and its linkage to goals, since misunderstandings on this point often lead to false conclusions about ENA purposes and consequences.

Definition of Need

The prime source of confusion about definition is that the concept of need as a discrepancy is a linguistic artifact. The statement of a discrepancy isn't an "objective" reality, nor is it necessarily stable in nature and magnitude. It doesn't exist "out there"—indeed, if need = discrepancy, the need itself is like the hole in the doughnut, existing only by reference to what is around it. It is this abstract concept which is so slippery and impossible of real definition, for the "need" cannot be defined except by its boundaries—"what is" and "what should be"—and those two parameters are in themselves difficult to define.[6]

A mistaken notion of the "what should be" parameter confuses the problem with its solution—regarding "need" as identical with a product or a program designed to meet the need. Thus, Guba and Lincoln (1989) object to many needs assessments as exploiting and disempowering stakeholders: "Needs assessments too often identify just those needs that the sponsor's product happens to be capable of fulfilling, to which the sponsor happens to be capable of providing a response, or which the sponsor's values dictate ought to exist as needs of the target group" (p. 52).

This is a misreading of the purpose of needs assessment in educational planning. Our language perpetuates this confusion. It is easier to conceptualize "I need . . ." (food, a job, ability to speak French, or whatever) than to define "a need" of students in a given context. Yet the job or the language ability are in truth not the need itself, but a possible answer to a perhaps undefined state of affairs.

Contrary to Guba and Lincoln's objection, if we reject the concept of needs assessment as market research (as I strongly do), the ENA *empowers* stakeholders. The needs assessor works in a negotiating posture with stakeholders to help them identify their own values, goals, concerns, and issues. The purpose is *not* to sell or to justify a product or a service. Consideration of the merits of alternative programs to meet the needs comes later in the planning process.

The question of definition needs rethinking in the light of needs assessment paradigms and purposes, but that is the subject of another paper. Suffice it to say that the present concept is a linguistic landmine.

Goal-based Planning

One parameter of the discrepancy definition of need is the delineation of goals and student outcomes; from the outset, ENA was linked to goal-based planning. In fact, the rise of ENA coincided with a strong movement to evaluate the merit of programs on their achievement of specified goals (Popham, 1988) and to appraise teacher performance not on their inputs, but on student performance on specified outcomes. Although Scriven (1973) introduced the concept of goal-free evaluation (but offered no guidelines for implementation; Guba and Lincoln, 1981), ENA and most planning models have been goal-based. Alternative models are cited later in this paper. A dissenting view comes from Langer (1989) who considers the orientation on outcomes a prime example of how our education has contributed to "mindlessness":

> From kindergarten on, the focus of schooling is usually on goals rather than on the process by which they are achieved. This single-minded pursuit of one outcome or another, from tying shoelaces to getting into Harvard, makes it difficult to have a mindful attitude about life.
>
> Throughout our lives, an outcome orientation in social situations can induce mindlessness . . . In contrast, a process orientation . . . asks "How do I do it?" instead of "Can I do it?". . . [The guiding principle here is] *there are no failures, only ineffective solutions.* (pp. 33-34)

Although learning objectives can, and often are, stated as processes to be experienced, the matter of devising goal-free assessments is much more complex. Guba and Lincoln (1981) observed that at the operational level Scriven was not very helpful in describing how

goal-free evaluation should be actually carried out, and made no definitive recommendations on how to generate a needs assessment.

Theoretical Issues

My concerns about needs assessment have been mainly with the design and application of procedures. Neither clarification of definition nor improved practices and implementation are important, however, if the very concept of needs assessment is faulty, or grows out of a flawed philosophy of education. Weintraub raises many objections to needs assessment; but instead of considering them point by point, or debating the niceties of scholarly discourse, I propose to address what I understand to be the heart of her critique—the alliance of needs assessment with technocracy and positivism—and to present an alternative perspective.

Needs Assessment, Technocracy, and Positivism

Weintraub's principal criticisms seem to be (1) that needs assessment reflects the dominance of technocracy in educational planning, and (2) that it is embedded in the "cult of positivism." She views these theoretical frameworks for needs assessment as obscuring important debates about the social order, among them the origins of thought that "permit us to... separate efficiency from impact, technology from its uses, the powerful from the weak, the planner from the planned, the expert from the ignorant, the rulers from the ruled..."(1989, p. 6)[7].

There are two points here: that needs assessment is embedded in technocracy and positivism, and the implication that the use of needs assessment separates the powerful from the weak, and so on. To deal with these charges, one must be clear as to whether Weintraub is basing her statements on the *theoretical bases* of needs assessment, or on its *methodology* and *applications*. Certainly, she ascribes to it an invidious role in perpetuating or promoting ends that are destructive to the individual and to society.

Let us consider four questions:

1. To what extent is needs assessment purely technocratic?
2. To what extent do needs assessment *theories* reflect a positivist form of research or inquiry?
3. To what extent do needs assessment *practices* conform to positivist models? What are the implications for those practices?
4. What is the *impact*, if any, that needs assessment has on school governance, school climate, and for empowering or disempowering students and teachers?

1. *The Technocratic Nature of Needs Assessment*

I understand by this that Weintraub views needs assessment as uncritically relying on an alliance of technology and rationality, and that its proponents advocate utility, efficacy, and efficiency without considering their consequences.

There has been very little coherent theory of ENA apart from theories of educational planning. Until recently, most planning theories were based on linear, goal-based models, in which the end result was a plan designed to guide action toward program development, innovation, or organizational renewal in the school or district. The role of ENA in such planning was to achieve community consensus on educational goals, as well as some sense of priorities for allocating resources. Many needs assessments are limited to opinion surveys to prioritize goals—that is, they do not carry out the rest of the discrepancy definition by determining standards for goal attainment, or examining issues, causes, and the like. I believe

that a prime purpose of ENA is to set priorities for program planning, and that the analysis of discrepancies is only one way to establish a basis for that. ENA can operate on many different levels of complexity—from a thorough-going review of the entire organization for the purposes of renewal, to assessing unmet needs of students in a particular area that might require supplementary services. The nature of the ENA is determined by its purpose in contributing information to the planning effort being undertaken at the building or district level.

The aspect that gives ENA its technological character is the use of the *systems approach* as both theory and method. As theory, it conceptualizes schools as complex, interacting organizations in which whatever happens in one part affects the whole; it recognizes the stochastic nature of events in a system, and eschews the "band aid" approach to planning. As method, systems analysis provides a framework for determining the steps of the projected needs assessment, for organizing and scheduling activities and target dates for completion, and for monitoring progress. The introduction of systems analysis was an improvement over earlier methods, which might be characterized as no planning, "putting out the brush fires" or "muddling through." Far from being narrowly technological, "Systems analysis shifted the empirical focus from a narrow efficiency orientation to a broader perspective emphasizing the multiple evaluation criteria of complex phenomena" (Fischer, 1985, p. 234).

Systems analysis does appear to be linear and sequential, although the analyses show interactions of events, feedback loops, and so on. Most school administrators who don the hat of planner use the systems approach as a convenient tool for scheduling. The flow charts, Gantt charts, and PERT charts used by ENA planners serve as blueprints for the conduct and monitoring of the assessment. They also promote communication among the people involved in planning and carrying out the assessment. Similar graphic devices are also used to display projected steps in developing a school plan, in which the first stage is the assessment of needs.

This sort of technology neither empowers nor disempowers students and teachers. The important consideration is the nature of the *activities* designed to assess needs, and ways in which they involve stakeholders.

2. *Needs Assessment and Positivism*

Is ENA a positivist form of research? The answer is yes and no.

Kemmis (1989, p. 7), drawing on Habermas (1972), summarizes the major features of three approaches to educational science: positivist, interpretive (historical-hermeneutic), and critical. The following features, abstracted from his categories, are pertinent to our inquiry:

Positivist. Views education as a "phenomenon" and schooling as a delivery system (technology); uses natural-scientific, experimental, and "quantitive" methods; expresses educational values in preparing individuals for a given form of social life; and views educational reform in terms of research, development, and dissemination, bureaucracy, and corporate management.

Interpretive. Views education as a developmental process, and schooling as lived experience; uses historical, "qualitative," and ethno-methodological methods; values "growth" and the self-actualization of individuals within a meritocratic form of social life; and views educational reform as enlightened action, liberal-individualist, and reconstructionist.

Critical. Views education as a social project, and schooling as an institution for social and cultural reproduction and transformation; uses critical social science method and

emancipatory action research; sees values in the metaphor of "empowerment," in which individuals collectively produce and transform existing forms of social life through action in history; and views educational reform as contestational, communitarian, with reproduction and transformation through collective action.

As we review various ENA models[8] we find a mix of positivist and interpretive or hermeneutic approaches. Positivist features are evident in attempts to discover "objective" data (rather than to use only opinions of various publics), to devise statistical methods of quantifying results (particularly of opinion surveys), and to synthesize different kinds of data to determine priorities for action. Yet needs assessors do not claim that the assessments reveal scientific "truth." Many interpretive/hermeneutic approaches are used as well.

In one sense ENA is not a form of research at all. Its aim is not to determine "truth," scientifically or otherwise. Rather, it serves as a form of inquiry to give focus to planning. A better idea of the actual nature of ENA can be gleaned by examining its principal methods: (a) the written survey, in essence an opinion poll (planners sometimes show a touching faith in the legitimacy and usefulness of their polls); (b) group interactive methods to invite brainstorming and consensus on goals and other elements of the assessment; and (c) collation of existing indicators of student achievement, classroom climate, demographics, and the like. Group methods tend to be more interpretive than positivist.

The operating question for the planners is, "What opinions and other types of information will be most useful for making decisions about program directions?" We have seen that the discrepancy definition of need relies heavily on inferences from the parameters of "what should be" and "what is." ENA methods concentrate on defining those parameters in whatever ways seem appropriate. The usefulness of the data is one important criterion.

Does the practice of ENA, whether positivist or not, obscure important debates about the social order? It is certainly not intended to. There is no national consensus on the goals or purposes of public education in this country. ENA may or may not provide a forum for raising questions about the fundamental nature of schooling and society. The fundamental questions are more likely to be raised in reports of national commissions and in scholarly publications than in local school planning. Those parents who profoundly object to the goals and practices (or lack of moral education or intellectual stimulation or discipline) in their local school system, and fail to make their views prevail, generally opt for leaving the system, if they can—either to send their children to private or parochial school, or to provide home schooling.[9] Poor families, unfortunately, have fewer choices.

In the early days, when some districts had the luxury of spending a year or more on community goal-setting, the debate on goals certainly revealed the values of the participants. Those districts that used the Worldwide Education Model, for example (Eastmond, Sr., 1974) focused on values and concerns of their constituents. There is little documentation about the content of discussions in those meetings, which lasted for several days and involved whole communities. From the written reports of *results*, however, it seems clear that the concerns reflected what particular groups of parents and others wanted for the children *in their community*. The needs assessment was intended to be a guide for action to improve education locally, not to reform or overthrow the whole system.

As long as the discussion remains on the level of theory, it is almost impossible to evaluate the intentions or impact of needs assessments. I am therefore turning our attention to what actually occurs in needs assessments, as distinct from theory, designs, or even written reports.

3. *Needs Assessment Practices*

To what extent do ENA practices correspond to social science theories? To determine this requires a phenomenological approach. We need studies based on actual observation of needs assessments in action, as well as on observation in classrooms, interviews with students and other stakeholders, and reports of the needs assessors and decision makers. Evaluations of needs assessments show that there is often a considerable gap between scholarship and practice.

In my imaginary dialogue (Witkin, 1988) one speaker remarks that Weintraub's article "*seemed* to be discussing needs assessment, but not anything that I'm familiar with" (p. 4). That statement referred to ENA practices, not theory, based on my familiarity with hundreds of actual needs assessments. An observer would find that needs assessments wear a variety of forms, some of them quite contradictory to others. The conduct of the assessment often turns out to be looser, "messier," less linear and predictable, and less manageable than the neat flow charts and reports would lead one to expect. Once begun, they often seem to acquire a life of their own. In practice, educational planning is not as linear or "scientific" as the models assume. In fact, ". . . the implementation of plans occurs [almost always] in a context of unbounded surprise" (Isenberg and Johnston, 1989, p. 16).

4. *The Impact of ENA*

To determine the effect that either the theory or practice of needs assessment has on students and on the life of the school, we must look at three phases: (a) what happens during the *conduct* of the needs assessment; (b) the extent to which needs assessment *results* are reflected in the educational plan; and (c) the *impact*, if any, that the findings of the assessment have in the classroom and on school governance.

I take it that one objection to a positivist or technocratic approach is that it puts students (and teachers, too) in the position of having things done *to* them, or decided *for* them. That is not necessarily true in the *conduct* of the assessment, when large numbers of stakeholders, students among them, have an active role in determining needs, their nature, and their magnitude or importance. When *results* of the ENA come to be incorporated in a program plan, however, there may be less cause for rejoicing. Much depends on whether the needs assessor(s) also have a significant role in the program planning. In most school systems, once the needs are determined, planning is still largely a top-down affair. One administrator or a small group develops the plan, with little or no consultation from major stakeholders who were involved in the assessment.

The attrition in involvement of stakeholders in developing a program plan is linked to failure to utilize ENA results at all. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that many needs assessment reports stay on the shelf[10] or that recommendations may be ignored or overridden by higher-level administrators and school boards. The situation is analogous to the fate of innovative projects that received seed money from ESEA Title III funds for design and demonstration. A follow-up study by the Rand Corporation of 300 such projects five years after completion found that most of them had vanished, and that they had little long-range effect on the schools (Berman, 1979).

Late in the 1970s some of us began urging that a closer link should be forged between the needs assessment and the implementation processes. Accordingly, working with parents, high school students, and teachers, we developed some lively group decision-making processes that helped the participants to clarify the issues and to use their new insights on needs to move into action planning for better programs in the schools (Wickens, 1980; for an

alternate approach see Witkin and Richardson, 1983). Most school planners do not use such linkage strategies, however.

We must further ask, what is the evidence that the democratic practices used in most ENAs have any important *impact* on the day-to-day life in the schools—on school governance or classroom practices? There is simply no evidence on this point. In fact, there have been no studies on either the incidence of ENA in America (especially since 1981) or of its effect on teaching and learning. ENA recommendations may not even be carried out; they are most likely to be when the ENA is used in a limited way to substantiate requests for categorical funds, such as to supply teacher aides in the classroom. But unless provisions for student involvement (such as collaborative learning) are included in the ENA findings and recommendations, there may be little carry-over from the democratic conduct of the ENA to the classroom.

ENA doesn't set out deliberately to disempower students. In the inquiry stage, it gives students a larger role in matters affecting their education than they can generally expect. But regardless of how democratic the actual needs assessment is, the ENA alone has little power to affect the governance of the school or the empowerment of students. That ability rests with the locus of power and change in school systems, which I will discuss later.

Other Criticisms

Education and the Economic Order

Weintraub charges that needs assessment puts education in the service of the economic order. But that relationship has little to do with ENA and would exist if ENA disappeared today. Kemmis (1989) notes that in Australia, Britain, and the United States "education has increasingly been brought under the dominion of economic imperatives. Education is no longer a mark of civilisation. Mathematics and science (for example) are needed not to understand the world, but to control it [which no longer means] 'in the national interests of humankind' [as during the Enlightenment], but 'in the national interest' (which is increasingly narrowly interpreted in terms of economic interests)" (p. 35). Recent history in those countries, he contends, demonstrates how unimportant educational theory has become to the development of educational policy, organization and practice.

Kraft and Tyler (1989) assert that a primary purpose of public education is to prepare students to succeed in the job market, but that the schools are not doing this very well. The economic aim of education is not imposed on students, but is in large part a response to community and student expectations.[11]

Weintraub cited Florida's community college planning cycle (Tucker, 1974). In the mid-1970s, when that model was showcased at a national conference, the concept was considered highly innovative and useful. First, the model was proposed only for *community colleges*, in which (by law) one of the three major purposes served is career/vocational training (the other two being general adult education and preparation for transfer to four-year colleges). Second, community colleges in the U.S. are supposed to serve the needs of the local community, and to respond to the demands of the adults it serves. The student who attends college *for the purpose of vocational preparation* expects to find out what the local job market really is, and to receive training appropriate to those jobs. The ability of the college to respond in a timely fashion with curricular offerings appropriate to the present and projected employment needs of that community was considered important, not only by the college

administration, but also by the community, particularly since business firms were loath to publicize their projections for employment (in order not to give an edge to their competitors).

The Florida scheme was light-years ahead of anything available at the time, since it linked state and local departments of employment information, and employer plans, to college curricula, and on a timely basis. The consortium of colleges had identified an expressed need of adult students to receive information and short-term training for entry-level jobs in a shifting job market. This econometric model (one of the very few extant for needs assessment) was not something imposed by needs assessors, but developed in response to community pressure for more realistic interfaces between the college and the business community.

Students as Conscript Clients

Because education in America is compulsory to age 16, students may well be regarded as conscript. After all, "societies would not create schools and states would not fund and administer them were it not for their importance in sustaining and developing the forms of life of a society" (Kemmis, 1989, p. 8). Kemmis further observes that education has functions not only for *individuals*, but for the *society*, through the development of culture. Yet ENA in itself has very little power to affect the situation. The nature of schooling would not change if ENA were to disappear tomorrow. Nor is there much that even a more enlightened posture for ENA could do to change the underlying educational structure.

Political Factors

Weintraub finds a contradiction between claims that ENA reflects a humanistic partnership model and Kaufman's championship of technology over the "let's-do-it-the-way-we-all-agree" syndrome. I believe that this is a misreading of Kaufman's intent. Far from dismissing social debate, Kaufman's viewpoint is that rational decision making is better than unilateral, top-down decisions made by administrators or school boards, which may be based on personal bias, pressure from single-issue groups, or simply agreement without input from the broader school-community.

In a sense, all educational decisions are political—that is, they represent compromises reached by the interplay of conflicting forces and dialogue among interested parties. Forester (1989) states that "If planners ignore those in power, they assure their own powerlessness. . . . Whether or not power corrupts, the lack of power surely frustrates" (p. 17). Far from dismissing political factors, ENA seeks to broaden the base of debate on important issues of student need. Needs assessors are rarely in a position of power. Yet they do their best to ensure that there will be democratic citizen participation in the needs assessment, and, they hope, in the total planning process. This issue is also one that cannot be resolved by invoking theory.

The Locus of Change in Schools

What goes on in the classroom day-to-day? As a recent report by Schmuck and Schmuck (1990) makes clear, the picture, at least in small-town schools in America, is a dismal one. The authors spent over five months studying 25 districts in 21 states, observing and interviewing educators, policymakers, and students in 80 small-town schools (district size ranging from about 500 to 2,000). They concluded that the democracy of the small school, which is a vortex for the life of the entire community, has little to do with academic

life. In spite of small classes, there is very little give-and-take of discussion; elected student leaders feel that they have little influence over school operations (although they do organize social events, assemblies, and the like); student councils are either ineffective or inoperative, and surveys of student attitudes (found in two schools only) were for the purpose of responding to state mandates for school *evaluation*, rather than local initiatives for school planning and improvement.

There is no reason to suppose that the situation is much different in medium- and large-size school districts in America. In other words, regardless of what democratic and nontechnocratic procedures might be used in assessing needs, only a radical change in administrators' views of school governance, and teacher implementation of collaborative learning (among other things), would make any difference to students in the long run. The real sources of fundamental change in schooling are not likely to come from needs assessors or educational planners. Education in America is fragmented and plagued by the search for quick solutions, by fascination with fads that quickly come and go, and by short public and organizational memories. It is ill-equipped to cope with either the pace or scope of change in the student population and in the community. Calls for reform rarely have a lasting effect. Recent criticisms have centered on such factors as the curriculum, low standards for graduation, the short school year (the U.S. has one of the shortest in the industrialized world; Bartlett, 1990); failure of leadership of elected and appointed officials and boards, educational equity, and organizational structure and communication. The latest to hit the headlines is the call for sweeping reform in teacher training, which John Goodlad compares to a badly run railroad (Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik, 1990).

The Current Status of ENA

With the loss of federal incentives since 1981, there appears to be an attrition in the use of comprehensive ENAs for organizational renewal in schools. One indicator of interest is the appearance of ENA programs at the annual meetings of such groups as The American Educational Research Association, the American Evaluation Association, and the International Society for Educational Planning, which used to feature papers, symposia and workshops on ENA. Very few such programs are now listed. Although the American Evaluation Association recently organized a needs assessment interest group, its members represent mainly the health and social services field, not education.

Publications

In a search of journals and ERIC documents of the last decade I found reports of educational needs of local business and industry, counseling needs of siblings of mentally retarded children, community education needs, staff development needs, educational needs and aspirations of older adult community college students, and identification of word processing skills and knowledge needed by entry-level secretarial employees.

Of the 35 citations under needs assessment listed in the July 1988 to June 1989 *Educational Index*, only 11 might be categorized as the assessment of student needs, most of them limited to specific populations with special needs. The rest were assessments of teacher needs (including one for science teachers' professional needs in Jordan and Malaysia), and training needs in business. Recent books on needs assessment include studies of older Hispanics in Omaha, strategies for health education and health promotion, needs of foreign students from developing nations in U.S. colleges and universities, needs of adults, of industries for biotechnology, and of the dying.

Such studies have little to do with the use of needs assessment to set priorities for or to guide the direction of general educational planning or organizational renewal. The area of need is already defined—often a very narrow one, such as health or mental retardation. And there is an emphasis on the needs of the people or organizations who *serve* the specified groups, on the desire for specified services, and the extent to which needs assessment surveys predict the use of such services.

Two recent books on needs assessment that are more comprehensive are one on theory and methods (Johnson et al., 1987) and needs assessment in post-16 education in Great Britain (Packwood and Whitaker, 1988). The Johnson et al. work, which discusses the political and social contexts of needs assessment, asserts that the essence of needs assessment is citizen participation in decision making. The editors also claim that needs assessment addresses precisely the issues of community integration, self-help and empowerment. The focus of the book is on community intervention in the U.S. and in international development, rather than on education. It is clear, however, that the purposes and methods advocated are not technocratic and manipulative.

New Planning Models and Recent Case Studies

To a large extent, ENA developed as a self-contained activity designed to be carried out prior to developing a program plan, with the results incorporated in the plan. Like needs assessors, educational planners used the tools of systems analysis, setting goals and developing methods-means analyses and time lines.

Thoughtful observers are now calling for more diversity of paradigms in educational planning. Hamilton (1991) considers alternative approaches that contrast with rational planning models, which ignore the critical characteristic that "planning is first and foremost a social and political activity" (p. 32). Instead of planning viewed "as a goal-setting, sequential, systematic, value-free, and quantitatively based activity . . . the alternative perspective emphasizes the importance of values, beliefs, power, collaboration, consensus building, conflict, negotiation, and willfulness in planning" (p. 21). Planners are also considering the role of culture, improvisation, policy making, the legal environment, and collaborative planning in improving the whole planning process (Carlson and Awkerman, 1991; see particularly chapters by Carlson, Inbar, Tanner, Hagen, and Miller and Buttram).

A partial view of the role of needs assessment in current planning is provided by four case studies of school district planning (Carlson and Awkerman, 1991). Following is a brief summary of their salient features, with authors and chapter numbers of the book cited.

The Oklahoma public schools plan (Stellar and Crawford, Chapter 17) used school level social indicators of instruction, environment, and achievement. Although there was no phase labeled needs assessment, the plan is presented in the context of "providing administrators with information for focusing the planning effort" (p. 319). The plan used causal modeling that linked school-based educational indicators, context, and school achievement, and related them to district goals.

The long-range planning scheme of the District of Columbia schools (Anderson, Chapter 18) is a linear model favoring top-down planning. In 1977 the district established and prioritized instructional goals using the Phi Delta Kappa model. Ten years later there was a system-wide needs assessment, apparently also mainly to establish goal priorities.

The Broward County Public Schools, eighth largest system in the country, established a five-year plan that included data gathering for planning, developing goal areas, operational

planning, and monitoring (Kalan and Kinzer, Chapter 19). In the third year of the plan the Board of Counselors began analyzing issues and concerns that had emerged and the progress of the system toward meeting the 55 goals.

The state of Wisconsin has prepared a comprehensive planning framework for use in PK-12 school districts in the state, which begins and ends with the Board of Education (Martin, Chapter 20). Phase 1, labeled a needs analysis, included an opinion poll, nominal group processes, and Delphi technique. The process has been applied to the development of budgets and construction, but no results or applications are described.

If the above case studies are typical, it appears that analysis of needs is embedded in rather traditional ways in school plans. There is little evidence yet as to the extent that alternative methods of planning might affect the conduct and implementation of needs assessments.

A *Responsive Constructivist Paradigm*

Guba and Lincoln (1989) offer a useful paradigm of evaluation that might be considered in relation to ENA. They see evaluation as having gone through three prior generations: (1) *measurement* of various attributes of school children through testing; (2) *description* of patterns of strengths and weaknesses with respect to objectives; and (3) *judgments* regarding worth. It was in the third stage that the discrepancy evaluation model arose (although later than Kaufman's ENA discrepancy definition).

Guba and Lincoln find serious flaws in all of the above, and propose a fourth generation approach, which they label *responsive constructivist evaluation*. This approach represents a large step beyond their previous positions about quantitative vs. qualitative (or naturalistic) evaluation methods. Fourth generation evaluation uses stakeholder claims, concerns, and issues as organizers, and argues for a "discovery" rather than "verification" approach (the latter being served by the positivist paradigm). Fourth generation evaluation would be based on responsiveness in all stages to stakeholder claims, and would stress making evaluative assessments on the basis of each situation, rather than striving for generalizability.

I do not view needs assessment as a subset of evaluation research, although I agree that ENAs are meant to be specific to a given situation, not generalizable in the research sense. There is a clear distinction (albeit relatedness) between evaluation and program planning (but that is the subject of another paper). Nevertheless, my thinking in recent years about approaches to needs assessment has been paralleling that of Guba and Lincoln. (For some non-traditional approaches and consideration of communication issues and greater stakeholder involvement see the Saratoga and Apex models and Chapters 5, 9, 11, and 12 in Witkin, 1984; Witkin and Richardson, 1983; Witkin and Eastmond, 1988; and Witkin, 1991. The approaches suggested, however, all assume some role for goals or issues as a framework for the assessment.)

Reappraisal—Is This Trip Necessary?

When I began writing this series, I thought I had the answer to this question—a qualified Yes— *if* certain changes were made in the practices, in the relationship between the assessment and short- and long-range district or school-level plans, and in the ability to receive a commitment for follow-through from top-level administration. We had inadequate information on the state of the art, but knew that too many activities under the rubric of ENA were merely *pro forma* exercises to supply test data and certain statistical information to state departments of education to substantiate requests for categorical or block grants.

In many medium size or large districts, staff members with the title of planner, researcher, or evaluator find their influence reduced to providing the superintendent with periodic test data. They have little power to affect the course of district renewal. Sweeping changes in large districts beset with problems of drugs, violence, high dropout rates, and racial tensions occur not as the result of needs assessments but in response to pressure groups. Changes are reactive, on a piecemeal basis, not proactive.

At its inception ENA offered an exciting and potentially liberating force for spreading the base of educational decision making on needs and priorities to the whole community. We should recognize, however, that at its best it could play only a modest role in school reform. A quarter century after its official recognition on the national agenda, the time is ripe for another look at ENA if it is to continue to be viable and to engage the school-community in a real effort toward educational renewal.

As this series of papers took shape, I have come to recognize issues other than ambiguity of definition, deficiencies in ENA practices, utilization of results, and the like. Perhaps we should rethink the purpose and practices of needs assessment in the light of new paradigms such as Guba and Lincoln's fourth generation evaluation, as well as innovative models of planning. Does goal-free planning have anything to offer? Should needs assessment continue to be considered a distinct phase of planning, with its own agenda and procedures? Is the distinction between needs and their solutions (such as programs or services) valid? Do we need fresh definitions? Does it make sense to examine ENA in the light of social science paradigms?

Critical Theory

Weintraub's critique appears to be grounded in critical social theory, which sought to promote political consciousness and self-actualization. She contrasts this view with the system approach of needs assessment. But Fischer (1985) observes that the methods of social interpretation and political critique offer no procedures for judging among competing hypotheses, and that "the proper response was to increase the empirical rigor of social and policy science through the adoption of a naturalistic systems framework" (p. 234).

Critical social theory assumes a dyadic conception of power, and the necessity for a group to meet the power of its oppressors. As Fay (1987) puts it, "Critical science anticipates forms of social life in which their members are transparent to themselves and are collectively autonomous" (p. 8); he adds that "humans . . . exist only as part of a system of relationships, a system the parts of which they will never be able fully to control" (p. 9). Fay proposes a modification of the theory to recognize that humans are also "embodied, traditional, historical, and embedded creatures" (p. 9). He concludes that the failure to appreciate the ways in which humans are inevitably circumscribed "has often been responsible for the terrible irony that many revolutions inspired by a critical theory, far from bringing clarity and autonomy to those involved, have instead brought tyranny" (p. 9).

State of the Art

Yes, there is life after positivism, but I doubt whether that is the most important issue. It seems idle to debate philosophies of needs assessment when we know very little about either its incidence or the practices in education, not only in K-12 schools, but in higher education, intermediate agencies, and state agencies.

To ascertain the state of ENA today we need a phenomenological study similar to that of Schmuck and Schmuck (1990). Failing that, we might start with a qualitative meta-

analysis of recently-published needs studies, followed by case studies of a representative sample of ENAs in different types of settings.[12] There is little evidence at present of the extent to which theoretical models are actually implemented. What writers on theory are conducting or directing needs assessments? How many needs assessors/planners undertake an ENA in accordance with a particular theory? What are the habits of mind that inform the needs studies?

The study should also include research on the *impact* of ENA findings in the schools, possibly in the context of organizational theory. There is a dearth of testable hypotheses. We lack comparative, longitudinal studies of ENAs, planning, and implementation.

Grounds for Debate

What are the grounds for a fruitful debate about the role and purposes of ENA? The debate should be for edification, not for the promulgation of a particular form of inquiry. Is it helpful to assert that ENA is or is not technocratic and positivist? What *should* be its role in empowering students?

I can supply a number of horror stories about needs assessments that really did attempt to empower students, only to be thwarted because we had not been sufficiently cognizant of the realities of school governance and politics. For one illustration see Lehnen and Witkin (1977; the case is described in Witkin, 1984, pp. 89-90).

Weintraub views needs assessment as caught in the "cult" of positivism (Weintraub, 1989). Positivism is no more a cult than is hermeneutics or critical theory or any other paradigm for knowing (or knowing about) the world. The merits and worth of ENA can hardly be determined by discussion solely on the level of such paradigms. As the semanticists caution, "The map is not the territory." My objection to some of the critiques of needs assessment by Weintraub, Scriven, and Guba and Lincoln, among others, is that they appear to know the maps but not the territory—to be insufficiently grounded in the realities of ENA. Such grounding comes not only through familiarity with scholarly models, but from involvement in and observation of many different types of needs assessments practices in different settings.

Not but that the view from practices has its own pitfalls. Critics of social science methodologies have questioned the distinction between theory and practice. But we can hardly make progress toward evaluating needs assessment without considering *both* parameters. The direct knowledge of applications furnishes a corrective to too much reliance on abstract models for inferences about the world of educational planning.

As I have implied above, the adherence to rational planning models may be faulty not so much because of the planning itself, but because of failure to make an impact. Benveniste (1989) confirms my view that planners who want to make a real difference must become actively involved in implementation of their plans. He argues that planners and policy makers who cling to the role of technical specialists providing rational, objective analyses for policymakers and managers to carry into action, are doomed to find that their plans have little or no impact. Since ENA is only the first step in an educational plan, it is even further away from impact on the students whose needs are assessed.

To deal adequately with the assumptions and inferences drawn from Weintraub's assertions about needs assessment and positivism would take a much more comprehensive analysis than can be done here. There is little chance of evaluating the merits of needs assessment as long as the debate stays on the level of sweeping generalizations based on

assumptions about disempowerment, and fails to recognize the arena in which ENA was intended to operate and what it can and cannot do. One must be clear as to the claims for the role of needs assessment in education, and the purposes it serves or could/should potentially serve.

Empowerment of students is only one issue. We need to look at the whole range of possibilities for ways in which education can meet the challenge of providing a nurturing environment for the intellectual and personal growth of students. Nor, as Kemmis (1987) reminds us, can we neglect the role of education in society.

Prospects for the Future

In the past I have stuck my neck out to suggest some perspectives for the future of ENA, particularly along the lines of increasing the effectiveness of needs assessment practices. Today I am more inclined to agree with Cicero's remarks to the Roman senate: "It seems to me that no soothsayer should be able to look at another soothsayer without laughing."

Nevertheless, it is probably time for those of us who have been committed to needs assessment in educational planning to begin a colloquy that would address some of the issues raised by Weintraub and others—including the *responsibility* of ENA to provide a forum for questioning widely-held values, and the *power* of ENA to effect any significant changes in the broader arena of education. We lack an adequate data base, and we might have to invent new paradigms. But, as the noted Rabbi Tarfon said in another context, "It is not thy duty to complete the work, but neither are you free to desist from it."

Notes

1. The journal was erroneously dated Summer1989, instead of 1990.

2. Personal communication from Cicely Watson, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and former president of ISEP; Nov. 1983.

3. For a more comprehensive discussion of the use of ENA in Canada as well as in some developing countries see Witkin (1984). It should be noted that OISE, which provides consultation to Canadian school systems and ministries, as well as training planners in many developing countries, was way ahead of U.S. schools in using trends analysis and the like for long-range educational planning.

4. Results may also be meaningless. The Associated Press reported that a national study found norms of standardized tests greatly skewed because of widespread cheating and improper coaching by teachers and principals (*Seattle Times*, Sept. 9, 1989).

5. Two examples of severe sanctions: In June, 1989, the Kentucky Supreme Court declared that state's entire system of public education unconstitutional, and in April 1990 Kentucky enacted the most sweeping educational reform legislation in the country. And as this is written, the Seattle (Washington) school district, the largest in the state, is threatened with takeover by the state unless its leadership improves in a major way.

6. One of the most vocal critics of needs assessment definitions has been Michael Scriven. His views are capsulized in a section of reprints of papers from the 1970s by Scriven, Waterman, and Roth in the June 1990 issue of *Evaluation Practice* (Traces, 1990). The writers generally view needs assessment as part of evaluation, rather than planning, but the discussion raises issues that can still be found in journals. One might, however, question the extent to which Scriven has designed or conducted real needs assessment.

7. I do not understand her statement that "planners and educators, administrators and bureaucrats" become "so enmeshed in the industries of lucrative atrocity" (p. 7) in defense of her analogy of the mindset of bureaucrats of the Holocaust with the mindset of educational planners. Despite her disclaimer that proponents of needs assessment technology are not to be equated with Stiers, the implication is clearly there that they share a basic mindset. The analogy sheds more heat than light, and tells us little about educational planners.

8. Most ENAs are not based on mathematical modeling. I use the term model in a generic sense to indicate any coherent design, set of procedures, or set of instruments intended to guide the assessment.

9. The call for parental choice for public schooling has surfaced periodically in many states in the last two decades, usually in legislation to permit voucher systems. Now it has become a raging issue, backed by efforts to move power and influence away from centralized bureaucracies to the local school level (Clune and Witte, 1990).

10. I once spent several weeks tracing the fate of a promising ENA design that had been piloted in Michigan. When I finally located the former project director, who now worked in Connecticut, I learned that the design had never been implemented. I later adapted its salient features (with proper attribution, of course) for a cyclical, issues-based model that heavily involved high school teachers and students in both the design and implementation (Saratoga model, Witkin, 1984).

11. Such expectations may be myopic. For years, employers told needs assessors that a *prime requirement was the ability to communicate*, and that technical skills could often be learned on the job. This finding had little influence on students until recently. Now a new generation is catching on. One of the hottest sellers in T-shirts at the University of Washington in Seattle reads, "English: It's not just a muffin. . . It's a major." The English department reports that undergraduates are lining up to designate English as their major, with the enrollment doubling since 1985, making the department one of the largest in the country. The renewed interest in reading, writing, and intellectual pursuits, however, is linked at least partially to career opportunities for liberal arts graduates in many fields, including science.

12. J. N. Eastmond, Jr., professor at Utah State University, and I are preparing a pilot study for a qualitative meta-analysis.

References

Adams, D. (1991). Planning models and paradigms. In R. V. Carlson & G. Awkerman (Eds.), *Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices.* Chapter 1, pp. 5-20. New York: Longman.

Bartlett, M. J. (1990). The case for more school days. *The Atlantic, 266* (5), 78-106.

Benveniste, G. (1989). *Mastering the politics of planning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berman, P. (1979). Implications of the Rand Report. Paper presented at annual meeting of California Society of Educational Planners, Auditors, and Evaluators, San Francisco.

Carlson, R. V., & Awkerman, G. (1991). *Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices.* New York: Longman.

Clune, W. H., & Witte, J. F. (1990). *Choice and control in American education.* 2 vols. Stanford Series in Education and Public Policy. New York: Falmer Press.

Dickinson, G. (1981). *Getting to know your community: Data for community adult education programming in British Columbia.* Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education, Continuing Education Branch.

Eastmond, J. N., Sr. (1974). *Needs assessment: A manual of procedures for educators.* Salt Lake City, UT: Worldwide Education and Research Institute.

Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science: Liberation and its limits.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fischer, F. (1985). Critical evaluation of public policy: A methodological case study. In J. Forester, *Critical theory and public life,* pp. 231-257. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A., (Eds.) (1990). *Places where teachers are taught.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests.* Trans. J. J. Shapiro. London: Heinemann.

Hamilton, D. N. (1991). An alternative to rational planning models. In R. V. Carlson & G. Awkerman (Eds.), *Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices.* Chap. 2, pp. 21-48. New York: Longman.

Hoepfner, R. (1974). Published tests and the needs of educational accountability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 34,* 103-109.

Isenberg, R., & Johnston, A. P. (1989). Policy, planning and nonlineraity. In *Educational Planning, 7* (4), 16-26.

Johnson, D. E., Meiller, L. R., Miller, L. C., & Summers, G. F. (Eds.) (1987). *Needs assessment: Theory and methods.* Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Kaplan, B. A. (1973). Participatory planning in educational decision making. Paper presented at annual meeting of International Society of Educational Planners and American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Kemmis, S. (March, 1989). Metatheory and metapractice in educational theorising and research. Unpublished manuscript. Based on arguments in W. Carr & S. Kemmis, *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research.* London: Falmer, 1986.

Kraft, R. H. P., & Tyler, E. W. (1989). Educational planning for the 21st century. *Educational Planning, 7* (4), 27-37.

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lehnen, P. A., & Witkin, B. R. Focus group interview and needs assessment report. Reports to Marina High School and San Lorenzo High School. Hayward, CA: Alameda County Office of Education.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lund, B., & McGechaen, S. (1981). *CE programmer's manual.* Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education, Continuing Education Branch.

Misanchuk, E. R. (1982, May). Toward a multi-component model of educational and training needs. Paper presented at annual meeting of Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Dallas, TX.

Misanchuk, E. R., & Scissons, E. H. (1978). *Saskatoon business training needs identification study: Final report.* Saskatoon: University of Sasketchewan.

Packwood, T., & Whitaker, T. (1988). *Needs assessment in post-16 education.* London: Falmer Press.

Popham, W. J. (1988). *Educational evaluation.* 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Province of British Columbia (1984, Aug.). *Getting to know your community: Data for community adult education programming.* 2nd Ed. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education, Continuing Education Branch.

Rubenson, K. (1982, Nov.). Adult education and the distribution of individual resources. Paper presented at Conference on Economic and Social Indicators, sponsored by Ministry of Education, Province of British Columbia. New Westminster, BC.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). *Introduction to human information processing.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schmuck, P., & Schmuck, R. (1990). Democratic participation in small-town schools. In *Educational Researcher, 19* (8), 14-19.

Scriven, M. (1973). Goal-free evaluation. In E. R. House (Ed.), *School evaluation: The politics and process.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Shanker, A. (1990). Perestroika in the classroom. *New Perspectives Quarterly, 7* (4), 20-22.

Sork, T. J. (1979, April). Development and validation of a normative process model for determining priority of need in community adult education. Paper presented at Adult Education Research Conference, Ann Arbor, MI.

Sork, T. J. (1982). *Determining priorities.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.

Stufflebeam, D. L., McCormick, C. H., Brinkerhoff, R. O., & Nelson, C. O. (1985). *Conducting educational needs assessments.* Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Tanner, C. K. (1991). Planning in the context of state policy making. In R. V. Carlson & G. Awkerman (Eds.), *Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices.* Chap. 5, 87-107. New York: Longman.

Traces (1990). Reprints of articles by M. Scriven, J. Roth, & S. Waterman. *Evaluation Practice, 11*(2), 135-143.

Tucker, K. D. (1974). *A model for community needs assessment.* Report to Central Florida Community Colleges' Consortium. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely-coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 1-19.

Weintraub, L. S. (1988). 'We don't need no ejikayshun': Needs assessment reassessed. *Educational Planning, 6* (4), 24-38.

Weintraub, L. S. (1989). Planning and the cult of positivism: A needs assessment rejoinder. *Educational Planning, 7* (3), 4-12.

Wickens, D. (1980). *Games people oughta play: A group process for needs assessment and decision-making for elementary and secondary schools.* A manual for the facilitator. Hayward, CA: Alameda County Office of Education. (ED 189 089).

Witkin, B. R. (1975, April). Communication strategies in public policy decision making: An analysis of processes in major needs assessment models from a systems point of view. Paper presented at meeting of International Communication Association, Chicago.

Witkin, B. R. (1984). *Assessing needs in educational and social programs: Using information to make decisions, set priorities, and allocate resources.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Witkin, B. R. (1988). To the editor. *Educational Planning, 7* (2), 3-4.

Witkin, B. R. (1990). Is this trip necessary? Needs assessment: A personal memoir and reappraisal. Part 1. *Educational Planning, 8* (1), 44-54.

Witkin, B. R. (1991). Setting priorities: Needs assessment in a time of change. In R. V. Carlson & G. Awkerman (Eds.), *Educational planning: Concepts, strategies, and practices* (pp. 246-266). New York: Longman.

Witkin, B. R. & Eastmond, J. N., Jr. (1989). Bringing focus to the needs assessment study: The pre-assessment phase. *Educational Planning, 6*(4), 12-23.

Witkin, B. R. & Richardson, J. (1983). *APEX needs assessment for secondary schools.* Manual. Hayward, CA: Alameda County Office of Education.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

B. Kathryn Jones and Stephen Biles

Organization Development (OD) is often depicted as a body of knowledge, a professional field, and a behavioral strategy for changing organizations. It has evolved from practice, experimentation and the exercise of judgment by decision makers trying to grapple with organizations as they exist in the real world. Research validation for intuitive and subjective techniques has contributed to the development of OD as a legitimate domain of the behavioral sciences (Tichy & Hornstein, 1976). While technical tools of OD have much to offer education and have, in fact, been utilized in many different educational settings, critical syntheses of educational applications are few. This synthesis reviews developments and applications of OD over the past twenty years which have a relevance for education.

This synthesis addresses five basic questions: (1) What is OD? (2) What are the decision tools of OD? (3) How has OD been applied in educational organizations? (4) What are the limitations and objections to OD? and, (5) How is OD likely to influence educational decision making in the immediate future? Responses to the first four questions document a significant domain of progress in explaining human behavior in educational organizations and, more importantly, adapting these explanations into strategies to meet the needs of educational decision makers. Findings for the last question identify eight specific planning and management issues where OD can be used to effectively improve organizational productivity.

What Is OD?

Just as OD as a field has evolved, so has the definition developed as it progressed from intuitive practice, to experimentation, then to validation. The progression can be charted in three stages: (1) *functional*, focusing on practice and behaviors; (2) *experimental*, establishing a concise theory; and (3) *interactional*, relating theory and practice to organizations in the everyday world. Specific definitions appearing in the literature for the past twenty years are linked to these three stages in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Organization Development: An Emerging Discipline

The definition of organization development has evolved through three stages of development: functional, experimental and interactional. These stages can be charted historically over the past twenty years.

Stage One. Functional: Focusing on Practice and Behavior

- Response to change (Bennis, 1989; Sieber, 1968)
- Prescriptive actions (Tannebaum & Davis, 1969)
- Sustained effort (Miles & Schmuck, 1971)

[Table 1 continued]

- Long-range effort (French & Bell, 1973; Friedlander & Brown, 1974)
- Change strategy (Boyer & Crockett, 1973)
- Effort to introduce planned change (Harvey & Brown, 1976)

Stage Two. Experimental: Establishing a Concise Theory

- Education process (Bennis, 1976; Coughlin, 1979)
- Theory, method, value system (Derr, 1974)
- Philosophy of technology (Kimberly & Nielson, 1975; Morrison, 1981)
- Set of assumptions confronting change (Schmuck, Runkel, Arends & Arends, 1977)
- Social interventions (Cunningham, 1982)

Stage Three. Interactional: Relating Theory to Practice in Decision Making

- Organization self-development and renewal (Fullan, Miles & Taylor, 1981)
- Increase internal problem-solving capabilities (Elkholm, 1986; Huse, 1982)
- Interactionist position to integrate perspectives (Gowler & Legg, 1978)
- Pervasive value approach (Wallace, 1983)
- Emerging discipline with unique tools (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Historically, OD was practiced using knowledge and techniques in a pragmatic manner in an effort to introduce planned change to the organization (Bennis, 1973). As practice became extensive, experimentation using the tools changed the definition from an activity orientation to a more theoretical basis. Terms such as "collection of techniques" and "set of mechanisms" were replaced with such ideas as "change strategy" and "educational process" emphasizing a broader perspective for the field (Bennis, 1976). Combining theory and practice, the definition of OD has recently become more interactional (Gowler & Legg, 1978). In current evaluation literature, OD tools are often linked with terms such as "strategic planning" and "educational development," showing the broadening influence of OD in the fields of education and administration (Hood, 1985). The relation of objectives for change and tools to achieve these objectives have accurately been refined into a model of OD that calls for three steps: (1) Obtaining valid data on real issues; (2) sharing the data with appropriate stakeholders; and (3) decision making based on the appropriate OD tool (Bennis, 1981). OD now can be defined as an emerging discipline concerned with applying its unique tools to an organization striving to achieve greater effectiveness (Huse & Cummings, 1985).

Decision Tools of OD

Organizational theorists have developed OD tools and strategies to deal with new technology and changing values in organizations. While solving problems on a day-to-day

basis administrators have adapted the role of the decision tools of OD from three different perspectives: (1) organizational levels (Elbing, 1978), (2) problem types (Bennis, 1981c) and (3) a series of administrative steps (Seiler, 1967).

Organizational Levels

The level of analysis method reflects the necessity to separate, for purposes of analysis, the different social realms which influence individual administrators and, in turn, are influenced by administrative actions. With this in mind, McNamara and Chisolm (1988) suggested that most basic decision tools of OD can be linked directly to one of the four specific organizational levels that move from a focus on individual renewal (level one) toward organization renewal (level four). Their suggestion is used to construct Table 2 which describes and classifies twelve of the decision tools most frequently used in OD interventions.

TABLE 2

A Classification of Decision Tools by Organizational Levels

Organization Development approaches to **Individual** renewal

At the individual level, organization development interventions are used to enhance personal competency. To improve the individual level of competency, organization development activities focus on:

Job enrichment: A means of increasing job satisfaction by increasing skill variety, task identity, significance of the task, autonomy, and feedback (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Sensitivity training: A method of helping individuals develop greater self-awareness and becoming more sensitive to their effects on others (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Goal setting and planning: Joint activities involving managers and subordinates in setting goals, monitoring them, and providing counseling and support when necessary (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Organization Development approaches to **Team** renewal

At this level, the organization team is the locus of renewal activity. The objectives are (1) to improve conditions that lead to task accomplishment and (2) to strengthen interpersonal relations that would lead to more positive attitudes. To improve the level of competency in the functioning of the team, intervention stategies include:

Team building: A process of helping a group become more effective in accomplishing tasks and in satisfying the needs of group members (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Role analysis: A technique aimed at defining a particular job's duties and responsibilities through group interaction involving the role holder and relevant others (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Consulting pairs: A technique in which an expert outside the organization along with the team develops solutions to organization problems more objectively than just the team (Varney, 1977)

Organization Development approaches to **Intergroup** renewal

At this level, organization development interventions are used to improve skills in working relations among teams or units within the organization. The objective is to strengthen relations such that cooperation is enhanced. Intervention strategies which facilitate this end include:

Intergroup problem solving: Activities between two or more groups in an organization that enhance the relationship and provide solutions acceptable to all (Schein, 1969)

Process consultation: An intervention strategy which focuses on diagnosing and restating problems and passing this skill on to group members (Schein, 1969)

Confrontation meeting: A formal encounter to help both parties express perceptions, focus on differences, and engage in problem solving to resolve the differences (Schmuck & Runkel, 1985)

Organization Development approaches to **Organization** renewal

At this level, organization improvement is sought to bring about greater efficiency in planning, organizing, and communicating organization goals and activities. The objective is to improve the functioning of the organization. Intervention strategies include:

Grid training: A highly structured intervention consisting of six phases designed to analyze an entire organization and increase its overall effectiveness through improved planning and communications (Blake & Mouton, 1976)

Group processes: Organization strategies that provide groups with mechanisms for getting feedback, designing decision-making procedures, establishing clear communications and participating in leadership functions (Schein, 1969)

Survey feedback: An intervention strategy whereby information is gathered about the organization and then given to managers and employees to diagnose problems and plan for solutions (Huse & Cummings, 1985)

Problem Types

An assumption of the level of analysis model of classification is that the level provides the context for the problem statement. However, administrators view problems not only from the context (level) where the problem occurs, but also from the specific type of problem encountered which may cross levels. This perspective on decision tools provides evidence for Getzels' (1979) position on the central importance of problem-finding. Getzels argues that finding and formulating a productive organizational research problem is often as significant

an intellectual and creative achievement as is providing a solution to a problem once it has been found and formulated. Table 3 elaborates OD tools (as defined in Table 2) from the perspective of problem types.

TABLE 3

A Classification of Decision Tools by Problem Types

Problem Types	Decision Tools
Identification of appropriate mission and values	Group processes, job enrichment, goal setting and planning
Human collaboration and conflict	Sensitivity training, confrontation meeting, role analysis
Control and leadership	Team building
Coping with, and resistance to, change	Consulting pairs, intergroup problem solving
Utilization of human resources	Grid training
Communications between hierarchical ranks	Survey feedback
Rapid growth	Process consultation
Mangagement and career development	Role analysis

Administrative Problem Steps

Decision making in an organization requires the administrator to focus on a number of issues. Specifically, these issues are (a) defining the context or level where the problem is (Table 2), (b) accurately determining the type of problem to be solved (Table 3), and (c) systematically applying the appropriate OD tool. Answers to these critical issues are difficult to generate because administrators are typically overextended in their workload or do not have adequate time to perform the necessary diagnostic work. They, therefore, may tend to view problem solving as a systematic or step-by-step process. Table 4 follows the scope and sequence of the administrative problem-solving model advanced by Seiler (1967). It first describes the problem-solving process in steps and then identifies appropriate OD decision tools for each step.

TABLE 4

A Classification of Decision Tools by Administrative Problem Solving Steps

Administrative Problem Steps	Decision Tools
(1) Awareness of general issue	Sensitivity training
(2) Collection of information pertinent to the issue	Role analysis, survey feedback
(3) Analysis of information	Confrontation meeting, grid training
(4) Statement of problem underlying the issue	Process consultation
(5) Establishing possible choices of action related to the problem	Consulting pairs, intergroup problem solving
(6) Selection of choice(s) against goal criteria	Goal setting and planning
(7) Implementation of selected choice(s)	Job enrichment
(8) Collection of information outcomes of the implementation	Team building

The tools of OD are obviously no longer the exclusive domain of organizational theorists. In educational organizations, administrators may view these tools from a level perspective, a problem-type perspective or a process perspective. Their viewpoint depends upon the issue involved. The two following examples demonstrate the successful application of OD tools in strategic decision-making incidents. The first case involves all three critical issues in administrative problem solving: (1) defining the level of the problem, (2) accurately determining the type of problem and (3) systematically applying the appropriate tool(s).

Example 1: Process Consultation in a Public School District

Problem Statement. One of the first problems encountered by a new superintendent of a large school district was a need to expand policies and procedures to deal with a drug abuse case in a junior high school (Snapp & Davidson, 1982). The superintendent sought the assistance of a resident school psychologist to act as a process consultant (Schein, 1969) to resolve the problem. The superintendent believed this OD strategy would contribute to the district's policy decision making in three significant ways by (1) providing expert information (knowledge of behavioral interventions); (2) reframing the situation to yield a more precise diagnosis of the problem; and (3) extending the problem-solving skills within central administration.

Solution strategy. The school psychologist, after gathering information at the junior high and throughout the district, first reformulated the problem in terms of the junior high school and district having a parallel need. Next, the school psychologist developed alternate solutions (behavioral interventions) to resolve the problem. Together the superintendent and school psychologist selected and, with the professional staff, successfully implemented a specific series of behavioral interventions aimed not only at impacting drug usage at the junior high school, but also providing impetus for qualitative change in dealing with drug abuse districtwide.

Outcomes. Based on the success of this cooperative venture, the school psychologist became the primary agent for managing the school district's discipline systems, and also became directly involved in the resolution of the school district problems involving students' rights, parent-school conflicts, and integration efforts at the classroom level. Outcomes for the district of this process consultation included reorganization of the district to give the resident school psychologist a key role in decisions regarding planning and implementing discipline policies. The venture also gave district personnel a working model for how a process consultant can provide technical assistance in all four phases of Simon's (1977) managerial decision model: (1) **intelligence activity** which consists of searching the environment for occasions (problems) calling for decisions; (2) **design activity** which centers on inventing, developing and analyzing possible courses of action; (3) **choice activity** which encompasses the actual selecting of a particular course of action from those available; and (4) **review activity** which consists of evaluating past choices.

Example 2: Group Processes in an Urban University

The second case illustrates a number of OD strategies focusing on group processes — the level of problem solution.

Problem statement. Top-level administrators at the University of Cincinnati, while grappling with ways to introduce more effective long-range planning within realistic budget constraints, realized they lacked direct involvement and support of faculty (Bolton & Boyer, 1973). The existing decision-making process was dichotomized between faculty and central administration, severely constraining communication of values, goals and outcomes. Consequently, central administration had increasingly taken responsibility for budgeting. Moreover, faculty had felt alienated from the budget process and threatened by the likelihood that major funding decisions and plans were ignoring their professional judgments and visions for the university.

Solution strategy. To overcome this difficulty, top level administrators commissioned a campus-based research institute to design training in group processes. Along with the department heads, a four-phase model was developed and implemented over a six-month period. In phase one, each department collected data and documented faculty concerns about the university. The second phase was dedicated to sharing feedback and discussing the collected data by faculty and administrators. Phase three was used to identify common goals and concerns. The final phase was devoted to training department heads who would then be expected to take the major leadership role in maintaining clear communication among all stakeholders.

This intervention significantly altered the long-range planning by increasing the shared knowledge base and incorporating faculty priorities used in goal clarification and budget negotiations. The success of this OD strategy confirmed administrators' beliefs that this

training must be an ongoing process because it (1) encourages and improves open and honest disagreements and (2) attaches value to the confrontation and resolution of differences held by a variety of stakeholders in the university (Schmuck & Runkel, 1985). They were certain that budget negotiations now reflected more involvement and more stakeholders, therefore, more support and commitment from all. In a word, the university came to realize that the application of this decision tool dramatically increased the institution's ability to solve its own problems and improve the quality of its worklife.

To look at the specific applications of OD in educational organizations requires separating the incidents between those occurring in a school setting and those occurring in a university setting. While the values underlying OD tools are constant, the tools are adaptable to different environments. So even though both school and university may use an OD decision tool, their experiences may be quite different.

OD Uses in Schools

In a recent review of OD in the school (Fullan, Miles & Taylor, 1981) OD was described as a useful strategy for policy planning and management. The probability of an OD program's success, however, was estimated to be only about 50%. This 50:50 ratio of success or failure results primarily from two variables: level of competence of OD practitioners and certain school characteristics. Six school characteristics are most commonly cited as impediments to OD facilitation: (1) goal diffusion and confusion (Miles & Schmuck, 1971); (2) suboptimal technical capability (Sieber, 1968; Lortie, 1977); (3) low levels of interdependence among district schools (Bidwell, 1965; Weick, 1976); (4) boundary management problems (Levine, 1980); (5) noncompetitive resource bases (Carlson, 1980); and (6) decentralization of standards and authority (Miles, 1977).

Despite such pervasive obstacles, schools have reported effectively employing OD (Schmuck & Runkel, 1985). Five schools in the Washington, D.C., area recently piloted school-based management plans using OD tools that enhanced the participatory decision-making process (Neal, 1988). They incorporated input from parents, teachers, students and principals within a framework of school board policy and administrative regulation to show how the use of OD tools can predictably contribute to the changing roles of the school board and central staff. This current shift in some schools from a "top-down" to "bottom-up" management approach illustrates successful implementation of OD tools. The most commonly used tools in the decision-making process in schools are documented in the right hand column of Table 5. The left side of the table links each decision tool to the specific organizational problem that was resolved. For example, conflict management problems are most often resolved using either role analysis or group processes.

TABLE 5

Application of Organization Development Strategies in the Schools

Problem Area	Decision Tools
Conflict management	Role analysis (Canary & Spitzberg, 1989), group processes (Keys & Bartunek, 1979)

[Table 5 continued]

School/Environment interface	Intergroup problem solving (Scheinfeld, 1979; Darling & Brownlee, 1984)
Decentralization and experimentation	Group processes (Mohrman, Mohrman, Cooke & Duncan, 1977)
Development of subunits	Goal setting (Coad, 1976), team building (Schmuck & Runkel, 1985; Friedlander & Brown, 1974)
Personnel development	Survey feedback (Cooke & Coughlan, 1979; Fullan, Miles & Taylor, 1978), job enrichment (Schmuck & Runkel, 1985)

Considering the apparent usefulness of OD tools in decision making (and in spite of pervasive obstacles), three guidelines to optimize OD's effectiveness in schools have been suggested. First, assess the school's readiness to participate (Runkel & Schmuck, 1976). Second, employ newly developed or adapted OD models suited to current needs or varied situations (Scheinfeld, 1977; Tichy, 1978; and Bassin & Gross, 1978). Third, use alternate strategies such as curriculum changes or revised policies whenever OD does not seem appropriate or likely to succeed (Elkholm, 1986). The third recommendation urges practitioners, after having determined a full-scale OD effort would be futile, to not forego the potential benefits of OD's fundamental principles—reflexivity and participatory decision making.

OD Uses in Higher Education

That the third recommendation to schools is also a popular concept in higher education administrative theory is not surprising considering the highly visible managerial success of participatory decision making in industry (Peters & Waterman, 1983). Administrators in educational organizations are often called upon to match industry's managerial success in their own environment. In a popular text of readings on organizational behavior (Davis, 1972), the concept that higher education should match industry's success seems to be a given. Not one of the almost one hundred examples used to demonstrate effective decision making in Davis' (1977) book came from higher education. They came from industry and (in a limited number) from public schools. Many training programs for administrators use industry's experiences as a basis. In an educational administration text that currently enjoys widespread use, the chapter about traditional administrative theory reports over half of its references from business (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983).

It should be recognized that institutions of higher education are different in many systematic properties from those in industry. Table 6 describes key differences affecting decision making. The overall impression gained from comparing the two types of organizations' approaches to planned change is that industry tends to be institution-centered (i.e., uses terms like "production," " team"), while higher education tends toward individual

development (i.e., uses terms like "diverse goal structure," "professional independence"). The basic values promoted by OD, reflexivity and participatory decision making, have found a friendlier environment in which to flourish in industry than in higher education.

TABLE 6

Systematic Properties Affecting the Organization Development Experience in Industry and University Settings

Property	Industry	University
Purpose	Efficient production	Diverse goal structure
Environmental constraints	Self-contained	Highly dependent on external sources (state & federal governments)
Decision making processes	Integrated team approach	Pluralistic subsystems; low interdependence
Product hallmarks	Easily identified and measured	Ill-defined and difficult to measure
Employee attitude	Identity with institution rather than profession	Personal/professional independence
Value structure	High investment in resources	Rewards for individual professional success
Clientele	Consumers	Students

So even though OD has been visibly successful in industry, the experience is not necessarily paralleled in higher education. The only characteristic of both systems that is comparable is the clientele. Because of this, it is not surprising that most of the earlier reports of applications of OD tools primarily involved activities with students, classrooms and extra-curricular activities, and have only recently begun addressing faculty or development of the organization itself.

All of this should not indicate a total lack of success in applying OD tools in higher education. The reports of the successful applications of OD tools in higher education are most easily conceptualized from the vantage point of roles from which OD specialists have sought to facilitate planned change. Table 7 lists three roles that applied the tools of OD: (1) internal and external consultant, (2) formal leader, and (3) staff institute. These descriptions of OD tools may seem primitive compared to industrial applications. However, in an interesting sense, attempts to describe activities that are more intuitive than scientific can be extremely sophisticated. That is, higher education OD practitioners have found out how their organizations work by trying to change them.

TABLE 7

Application of Organization Development in Higher Education

Role	Decision Tools
Internal or external consultant (Bolton & Boyer, 1973; Levinson, 1972; Schein, 1969)	Intergroup problem solving, process consultation, group processes
Formal leader (Jenks, 1973; Bennis, 1973)	Team building, consulting pairs, survey feedback
Staff institute (Crockett, 1970)	Process consultation, grid training

Given the historical trend of universities to focus on individual development as the avenue of organizational change, administrators entered in long-term, broad-scale organizational change in higher education may recognize the potential of using OD tools for decision making. Just as industry and schools found the participatory nature of the tools could gain active support and involvement for new behaviors, universities have increasingly employed these strategies for more effective decision making (Bennis, 1989; Huse & Cummings, 1985). Organizational processes in universities have diagnosed power and conflict management as central dynamics (Baldridge, 1971; Corrigan, 1985). This diagnosis suggests decision tools (specifically OD tools) devoted to these two areas can be as successfully adapted to the higher education environment as they have been in industry.

Limitations and Objections

OD is now one of the largest divisions of the Academy of Management. Over the last two decades, the growing number of articles, books, conferences and workshops reflect the increasing viability of the field. However, leading theorists and practitioners (Bennis, 1981a; Burke, 1978, 1982; Daft, 1983; Huse & Cummings, 1985) believe that organization development is best described as a legitimate domain of the behavioral sciences (a) still in its infancy as a discipline, (b) not yet theoretically advanced or broadly researched, and (c) clearly in transition.

Burke's (1978) state-of-the-art review documents eight general limitations of and objections to OD: (a) it has a cosmetic approach (Mills, 1975); (b) it possesses characteristics of a fad (Bowers, 1976); (c) it is anti-intellectual (Strauss, 1973); (d) it lacks real theory (Levinson, 1972); (e) it is a religious movement (Harvey, 1974); (f) it is often misrepresented by mislabeling (Kahn, 1974); (g) it is a term that has reached obsolescence (Jones & Pfeiffer, 1977); and (h) it is an ill-defined concept (Herzberg, 1974).

Burke (1978) identified transitions that reframe the limitations of and objections to OD in terms of necessary modifications. These transitions indicate change in seven areas of OD: (a) **Focus** - from an almost exclusive business-industrial orientation to many different types of organizations; (b) **Approach** - from advocating a specific managerial style to contingency planning; (c) **Primary Value** - from democracy to authenticity; (d) **Theoretical Framework-**

from social technology of laboratory training to a broader range of behavioral tools that fit actual organization decision systems; (e) **Role of Consultant** - from a non-directive, process-oriented practitioner to an authoritative specialist actively concerned with organizational outcomes; (f) **Change Agent** - from thinking of the practitioner of OD as the change agent to thinking of the line manager or administrator as the change agent; (g) **Function** - from glamorous name for training to a legitimate organizational function with attendant power and official status. These proposed transitions continue to guide current theory and practice (Daft, 1983; Huse & Cummings, 1985).

Future Directions

Future directions for the application of OD are advanced in Bennis (1981b), Burke (1978,1982), Daft (1983), Fullan et al. (1981), Huse & Cummings (1985), and Kur (1981). Positions taken by these theorists are reflected in Morrison's (1981) forecast, which claims that experts engaged in human resource functions will apply OD to address eight commonly encountered decision issues: (a) integrating high technology into the workplace; (b) transforming technical experts into effective managers; (c) transferring technology across departments within a large, complex organization; (d) developing management styles that enhance productivity and efficiency; (e) managing rapid technological change in a complex organization; (f) accommodating creativity in the management of scientists and engineers who design and produce the technology that gives a company its competitive edge; (g) dealing with changing values in the workforce (especially those of young employees); and (h) updating and renewing technical knowledge to ensure a competitive edge. In higher education, the emergence of university-based centers that link university and government in participatory decision making portends new and creative uses for OD beyond traditional thought (McCarthy & Hall, 1989).

For administrators in educational organizations, even though substantially more is known about the use of OD tools than twenty years ago, there remains the challenge of acting upon the accumulated knowledge. Cultural elements unique to schools and universities which hold the organizations together must be emphasized in decision making (Firestone & Corbett, 1988). A thorough knowledge of OD including theory and tools will enhance the decision maker's expertise in handling the common decision issues in making educational organizations more effective.

Acknowledgements

The conceptual framework developed in this review has profited from the involvement and participation of the authors in the Decision Science Research Group, Department of Educational Administration, Texas A&M University. Group members who provided theoretical insights and specific articles used in the review include James F. McNamara (Group leader), Grace Chisolm, Mary Ann Dickson, Florence Guido-DiBrito, Michael Hart, Mary-Claire Maggio, Jane McDonald, Evangeline McJameson, and Frank Walters.

References

Baldridge, J.V. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university.* New York; John Wiley.

Bassin, M. & Gross, T. (1978). *Organization development, a viable method of change for urban secondary schools: Assessment of a pragmatic model of high school self-renewal.* Paper presented at American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada). (ED 155241).

Bennis, W.G. (1989). Why leaders can't lead. *Training and Development Journal, 43*(4), 35-39.

Bennis, W.G. (1981a). *Changing organizations.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bennis, W.G. (1981b). Organization development at the crossroads. *Training and Development Journal, 35*(4), 19-26.

Bennis, W.G. (1981c). *Organization development: Its nature and prospects.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W.G. (Ed.) (1976). *The planning of change* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bennis, W.G. (1973). An OD expert in the cat bird's seat: An interview with Warren Bennis. In R.K. Boyer & C. Crockett (Eds.). *Special issue: Organizational development in higher education, 44*(5), 389-398.

Bidwell, C.E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J.G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations.* Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Blake, R. & Mouton, J. (1976). *Organization change by design.* Austin, TX: Scientific Methods.

Bolton, C.K. & Boyer, R.K. (1973). Organization development for academic departments. *Journal of Higher Education, 44*(5), 339-351.

Bowers, D.G. (1976). Organization development: Promises, performances, possibilities. *Organizational Dynamics, 4*(4), 50-62.

Boyer, R.K. & Crockett, C. (Eds.). (1973). Organizational development in higher education: Special issue. *Journal of Higher Education, 44*(5), 339-351.

Burke, W.W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Burke, W.W. (Ed.). (1978). *The cutting edge: Current theory and practice in organization development.* LaJolla, CA: University Associates.

Canary, D.J. & Spitzberg, B.H. (1989). A model of perceived competence of conflict strategies. *Human Communication Research, 15*(4), 630- 649.

Carlson, J.B. (1980). Human service educators in the real world. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(5), 27-30.

Coad, R.A. (1976). *The effects of an organization development program on satisfaction, group process, climate, leadership and student achievement.* Paper presented at American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA). (ED 120937).

Cooke, R.A. & Coughlan, R.J. (1979). Developing collective decision-making and problem-solving structures in schools. *Group & Organization Studies, 4*(1), 71-92.

Corrigan, D. (1985). Politics and teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(5), 27-30.

Coughlin, P.J. (1979). Understanding and evaluating the organization development process. *The Journal of the College & University Personnel Association, 36*(1), 8-11.

Crockett, W. J. (1970). Team building--one approach to organizational development. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 6* (3), 291-307.

Cunningham, W.G. (1982). *Systematic planning for educational change.* Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Daft, R. (1983). *Organization theory and design.* St. Paul, MN: West.

Darling, J.R. & Brownlee, L.J. (1984). Conflict management in the academic institution. *Texas Tech Journal of Education, 11*(3), 243-257.

Davis, K. (1977). *Organizational behavior: A book of readings* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Derr, C.B. (Ed.). (1974). *Organizational development in urban school systems.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Elbing, A. (1978). *Behavioral decisions in organizations* (2nd ed.). Dallas: Scott, Foreman.

Elkholm, M. (1986). Studies of the innovation process in compulsory school. *School Research Newsletter, 8*, 2-17.

Firestone, W.A. & Corbett, N.D. (1988). Planned organizational change. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research in educational administration.* New York: Longman.

French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1973). A definition and history of organization development: Some comments. In K. Davis (Ed.). *Organizational behavior: A book of readings.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Friedlander, F. & Brown, L.D. (1974). Organizational development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 25*, 313-341.

Fullan, M., Miles, M.B. & Taylor, G. (1981). Organizational development in schools: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research, 50*(1), 121-183.

Getzels, J.W. (1979) . Problem-finding and research in educational administration. In G.L. Immergart & W.L. Boyd (Eds.). *Problem finding in educational administration: Trends in research and theory.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Gowler, D. & Legg, K. (1978). Participation in context: Towards a synthesis of the theory and practice of organizational change. *Journal of Management Studies, 15*(2), 149-175.

Harvey, J.B. (1974). Organization development as a religious movement. *Training and Development Journal, 28*(3), 24-27.

Harvey, D.F. & Brown, D.R. (1976). *An experimental approach to organizational development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herzberg, F. (1974). The wise old Turk. *Harvard Business Review, 52*(5), 70-80.

Hood, P.D. (1985). The view of a program director. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7*(3), 238-242.

Huse, E.F. (1982). *Management.* St. Paul, MN: West.

Huse, E.F. & Cummings, T.G. (1985). *Organization development and change* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.

Jenks, R.S. (1973) . An internal change agent's role in restructuring university governance. *Journal of Higher Education, 44*(5), 370-379.

Jones, J.E. & Pfeiffer, J.W. (1977). On the obsolescence of the term organizational development. *Group & Organization Studies, 1*(3), 263-264.

Kahn, R.L. (1974). Organizational development: Some problems and proposals. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 10*, 485-502.

Keys, C.V. & Bartunek, J.M. (1979). *Organization development in schools: Goal agreement, process skills and diffusion of change.* New York: John Wiley.

Kimberly, J.F. & Nielson, W. (1975). Organization development and change in organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 20*(2), 191-206.

Kimbrough, R.B. & Nunnery, M.Y. (1983). *Educational administration: An introduction.* New York: MacMillan.

Kur, E.C. (1981). OD: Perspectives, processes and prospects. *Training and Development Journal, 35*(4), 28-34.

Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails: The institutionalization and termination of innovation in higher education.* New York: MacMillan.

Levinson, H. (1972). The clinical psychologist as organizational diagnostician. *Professional Psychology, 3*(1), 35-40.

Lortie, D. (1977). *Networks and organizational rationality in American public schools.* Paper prepared by the Network Development Staff, School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, National Institute of Education (Washington, DC). (ED 181871).

McCarthy, M.M. & Hall, G.C. (1989). The emergence of the university-based education policy centers. *ERIC/CEM Trends and Issues Series*, Number 2.

McNamara, J.F. & Chisolm, G.B. (1988). The technical tools of decision making. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research in educational administration.* New York: Longman.

Miles, M.B. & Schmuck, R.A. (1971). Improving schools through organizational development: An overview. In M.B. Miles & R.A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Organization development in the schools.* Palo Alto, CA: National Press.

Miles, M.B. (1977). *On networking.* Paper prepared by the Network Development Staff, School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, National Institute of Education (Washington, DC). (ED181874).

Mills, T. (1975). Human resources—Why the new concern? *Harvard Business Review, 53*(2), 120-134.

Mohrman, S., Mohrman, A., Cooke, R. & Duncan, R. (1977). A survey-feedback and problem solving intervention in a school district. In P. Mirvis & D. Berg (Eds.), *Failures in organization development and change.* Toronto, Canada: Wiley-Interscience.

Morrison, P. (1981). High technology, rapid change, and world competition in the eighties: The place for OD. *Group & Organization Studies, 6*(4), 395-402.

Neal, R.G. (1988). *School-based management: An advanced model.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Negotiators and Contract Administrators, San Francisco. (ED 301949).

Peters, T.J. & Waterman, R.H. (1983). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies.* New York: Harper & Row.

Runkel, P. & Schmuck, R. (1976). *Organization development in schools: A review of research findings from Oregon.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Schein, E.H. (1969). *Process consultation: Its role in organizational development.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Scheinfeld, D. (1979). A three-faceted design for renewing urban elementary schools. *Theory Into Practice, 18*(2), 114-125.

Schmuck, R.A. & Runkel, P.J. (1985). *The handbook of organizational development in schools* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends, J. & Arends, R. (1977). *The second handbook of organizational development in schools* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Seiber, S.D. (1968). The case of the misconstrued technique. *Phi Delta Kappan, 49*, 273-276.

Seiler, J.A. (1967). *Systems analysis in organizational behavior*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin and Dorsey.

Simon, H. A. (1977). *The new science of management decision* (rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Snapp, M. & Davidson, J.L. (1982). Systems interventions for school psychologists: A case study. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Strauss, G. (1973). Organizational development: Credits and debits. *Organizational Dynamics, 1*(3), 2-19.

Tannebaum, R. & Davis, S.A. (1969). Values, man, and organizations. *Industrial Management Review, 1*, 67-86.

Tichy, N.M. (1978). Current and future trends for change agentry. *Group & Organization Studies, 3*(4), 467-482.

Tichy, N.M. & Hornstein, H.A. (1976). Stand when your number is called: An empirical attempt to classify types of social change agents. *Human Relations, 29*(10), 945-967.

Varney, G.H. (1977). *Organization development for managers*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wallace, R.C. (1983, April). *School district initiatives in response to board priorities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada). (ED 233471).

Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-19.

BOOK REVIEW

Solnit, Albert with Charles Reed, et. al. *The Job of the Practicing Planner* (American Planning Association, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637), 1988.

When new housing developments are proposed, or other land use policies are changed, city planning takes on added importance for school officials. Zoning laws, municipal ordinances and codes and administrative regulations may influence where a new school building is needed, as well as the restrictions which will apply to that facility. This guidebook covers many key elements for practitioners on the regulatory side of the planning professions.

The majority of chapters in this work are directed towards land use planning as it relates to local zoning, agencies, research, consulting or think tanks. In addition, some chapters offer more generic information for planners — "Skills Needed to be an Effective Practicing Planner" or "Ethics and the Planner."

Educational planners can enhance their skills and approaches by reading about planning in other fields and then trying to transfer the knowledge to educational issues. Some of this volume is technical, but it is relatively easy to follow for someone with a planning background. Some concepts are readily adaptable to education. For example, the authors write:

> The main goal in planning no longer is to control events. Today the goal is to participate in outcomes. We now understand that we do not know what we need to know to make the world what we want it to be. We should feel our way into many futures, with special attentions to the worthiness of what we do now, especially with respect to what we want to avoid. We will not have error-free reactions, and so we need to include error-detecting systems in our response. Hard data is no longer enough. Value changes must be tracked, errors embraced, and broad public participation invited.

Planning for the future means going from a control to a learning mode (p.11). The same statement could be lifted from a book on educational planning, making this book of possible use to planners in education as well as other fields.

Reviewed by Dr. Arthur W. Steller
Superintendent of Schools
Oklahoma City Public Schools

MINUTES OF A FORUM ON THE PREPARATION OF PLANNERS

Recorded by Ronald A. Lindahl

At the 1990 Annual Meeting of the International Society for Educational Planning, held this past October in Atlanta, Georgia, members of the Society met in open forum to discuss the relationships between planning theory, university programs related to educational planning, and current practice in the field. The purpose of this article is to serve as a brief synopsis of that discussion.

Robert Beach (Memphis State University) opened the formal discussion with a brief overview of the predominant theoretical models taught by most university programs including the rational comprehensive, incremental, mixed scanning, and goal-free approaches. He also cited tactical planning tools commonly taught in university programs, e.g., PERT, CPM, and cohort forecasting. He challenged the many practitioner participants in the forum to reflect on what they have used in their daily work from this knowledge/theory base and to extend this to reflect on what skills/knowledge bases they commonly use that were not included in their preparation programs.

Pat Mahon related this question to his experience as principal of Shiloh High School in Lithonia, Georgia. He stressed the need to determine where his school should plan to be five years from now and stressed action planning approaches as being the most appropriate to this task. In addition, Pat obviated the practitioner's need for societal and global impact forecasting, especially as trends might affect or relate to such issues as dropouts or teaching practices.

Glenn Pelecky, from the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency, stressed the importance to educational planners of developing leadership and management skills to complement their technical skills. He noted that their abilities of persuasion or of group facilitation often were crucial factors in the success of their planning efforts. This was emphasized to be complementary to their technical skills, as reinforced by Jerome Boettcher, of the Appleton Area School District in Appleton, Wisconsin. Jerry discussed the importance of such technical expertise as a strong background in demographics, including the ability to access and analyze census data to determine its implications for local districts.

Carolyn Snyder, Director of Planning for the Fayette County Public Schools of Lexington, Kentucky, reflected on current trends toward "site-based-management" and the challenge this is posing to district-level planners. In such situations, Carolyn's experience has suggested that the planner must provide much more assistance to the campus in developing "empowerment" than in pure planning skills.

Kathryn Gerbino, of the Shendehowa Central School District in Clifton Park, New York, picked up on this theme, posing that rational theories do not fit well in irrational organizations characterized by bureaucracies, vested stakeholders, and the cultural climates typical of many school districts. She viewed the current challenge to educational planners as transcending mastery of traditional planning methods, but being able to promote a true "paradigm shift," thus avoiding the common pattern of effecting only minor changes in the system's effectiveness or purpose. Jan Cummings, a school board member from the Broward County Public Schools in Florida and a private consultant in educational planning, expanded

on the need to diagnose and understand organizational culture and on the need to *sustain* behavior changes. She noted that one of the primary tasks facing planners is the design or identification of proper ways to collect data on these two crucial aspects of the organization, and on means of analyzing such data.

Ken Ducote, of the New Orleans Public Schools, closed this portion of the discussion by reflecting on the many outside forces that impact the district's planning process, often diverting its attention, resources, or energies from key issues. He discussed state mandates, which often create "solutions in search of problems" and may govern the manner in which a district's success is perceived. In light of this, Ken posed a key skill of the educational planner as being that of knowing how to motivate people to take control of their own destiny, of developing institutional loci of control in an often irrational environment.

At this point the discussion was directed at the issue of how preparatory programs for educational planners might be improved. Robert LaGrone, Director of Planning for the El Paso Independent School District in El Paso, Texas, decried the teaching of statistics with an emphasis on calculation formulae, rather than on "what do you do with the statistics once you know them?" He noted that this change in emphasis became feasible when computers could be programmed to do the calculations, thus freeing the planner to concentrate on data analysis. He also questioned the traditional state requirements that school personnel be certified through university programs, often not staffed by faculty with practitioner experience. He concluded that this tends to produce educational programs containing too much theory of limited practical use.

Donn Gresso, of East Tennessee State University, joined this discussion, noting that too many university departments of educational leadership are missing opportunities to learn about educational planning. He used Ken Ducote's previous discussion on state mandates as an illustration, advocating that universities examine the discrepancies between theory and practice and search for viable alternatives. Glenn Pelecky noted that it would be interesting for universities to investigate the extent to which these state mandates may have arisen from a previous void of planning by local districts.

Frank Cranley, of the Imperial Unified School District, Imperial, California, advocated that university programs develop in their students the ability to "learn to learn"; to tolerate and deal effectively with dichotomies, ambiguities, and volatile situations; and to be divergent and dynamic thinkers.

Jan Cummings stressed the need for university programs to build certain technical skills, such as environmental scanning. However, she also noted that for planners to have success with their planning or problem-solving models, they must also be trained in group process and facilitation skills. Similarly, they must be prepared to examine their organization's culture and to find ways to develop both commitment to and ownership of plans that are developed.

Dan Inbar, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, extended on this theme, noting that universities often lapse into a technological conceptualization of the role of educational planners, emphasizing the collection of data about what might be, instead of "creating" data to motivate people to think of what "should" be. He advocated the demystification of the planning process and cautioned that planners, and university programs helping to prepare planners, "not mistake probability for certainty."

Mark Baron, of the University of Alabama, suggested that practica, e.g., internships, may be feasible mechanisms by which universities assist students to understand better how theory merges, or fails to merge, with practice.

Pat Mahon, reflecting from the principal's vantage, envisioned the planning process as being a key means by which a principal acts as a leader, as contrasted with being a manager. Hugh Mowery, of Pondre School District R-1, in Fort Collins, Colorado, viewed this point from the perspective of highly centralized districts, noting that if district-level planners establish the priorities *for* principals, the district is, essentially, conveying the message that it views principals as managers, rather than as visionaries. Glenn Pelecky noted that this tends to happen when superintendents view planning as a technical-level task, rather than assuming planning as one of their own major roles, involving the creation of a vision and fostering of appropriate decision-making. As Glenn stated, "It is riskier to lead than to react."

Hugh Mowery addressed the volatile issue of scarce resources, noting that this prevalent scarcity forces planners to develop both consensus-building and conflict-resolution skills. Joseph Pessima, currently at the University of Pittsburgh, examined this issue from his professional experience in Sierra Leone, noting that too many planners analyze data and then attempt to impose their findings and solutions on the organizations they serve. He advocated that universities assist planners in learning how to "involve" people in the planning process, with heavy emphases on human relations skills and non-authoritative persuasion. Kathryn Gerbino expressed this as being a shift of the planner's perceived role from "sage on the stage, to guide on the side."

Rosalba del Vecchio, of the Yonkers Public Schools in New York, called for university programs to develop students' abilities in integrating global and linear thinking styles, thus enabling them better to prepare themselves and their organizations for uncomfortable paradigm shifts, not merely for linear change. Charles Young Jr., of the Joliet Public School District #86, in Joliet, Illinois, tied this discussion into Larry Cuban's ideas on second-order change. He cited the need for a visionary superintendent and a school board willing to accomplish second-order change. Consequently, universities must prepare students to be able to *lead* and to develop the school boards with whom they work to be willing, and capable, of facing this challenge.

A most fitting summary of this interesting session was provided by Frank La Gotic, a member of the Alachua County School Board in Gainesville, Florida. Frank concluded that universities must prepare educational planners to "get people to do planning when they don't want to." He also challenged universities to provide their students with the tools to continue learning and developing their own knowledge and skills throughout their lives.

In reflecting on this year's forum, and comparing/contrasting the discussions with those of other years, the facilitators, Robert Beach (Memphis State University), William McInerney (Purdue University) and Ron Lindahl (University of Texas at El Paso) concluded that a significant change seems to be emerging in the role of educational planner, as perceived by practitioners exercising that role. A definite shift is apparent from the technically-oriented discussions of just a few brief years ago to this year's discussion, in which such terms as "leadership," "vision," "empowerment," "communication," and "facilitator" seemed to predominate. This shift parallels Bob Beach's opening review of the professional literature on educational planning, in which the predominant theoretical models also appear to have shifted from a technologically-based rational-comprehensive model to more interactive models such as "action planning" or "goal-free planning." If these shifts in both theory and practice have, indeed, occurred, there are strong implications for university programs assisting in the preparation of educational planners and leaders. Such programs must not only reflect these shifts, but anticipate future directions as well.

Secretary's Report 1990-1991

The 21st annual conference of the International Society for Educational Planning was held October 13-16, 1990, at the Omni Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia. Hosted by our stalwart Georgia contingent, the conference was structured around the theme Educational Planning for the 21st Century: Strategy, Technology, and the Future. Thanks are due to the conference planning committee members: Larry Gess, Marian Dabney, Leslie Fowler, Nancy Mier, John Rhodes, and Myra Tolbert. A special thinks is owed to Ray Bouchillon who worked tirelessly (and probably sleeplessly) to arrange the conference and keep it running smoothly.

We elected six persons to the Board of Directors:

Dan Inbar	one year term
Glen Earthman	one year term
Joseph Pessima	three year term
Ray Bouchillon	three year term
Ron Lindahl	three year term
Rosalba Del Veccio	three year term

Our officers for 1990-1991 are:

President	Ken Ducote
Vice President	Ann Harrison
Secretary/Treasurer	Bill Mclnerney

President Ducote urged the conference attendees to submit articles to the Society's journal, *Educational Planning*. He noted that articles by and about practitioners are especially welcome, and that they are often missing from other sources of planning literature.

An acknowledgement was made of the splendid work of Bob Carlson and Gary Awkerman in editing and seeing into print the new book of readings in educational planning, *Educational Planning: Concepts, Strategies, and Practices*, published by Longman (ISBN O-8013-0434-2).

Maridyth McBee conveyed the excitement of her colleagues in Oklahoma City at the prospect of hosting the 1991 conference.

Again I would call to the attention of the membership the standing committees. The chair is listed first. Interested persons are always welcome. If you need addresses, contact me.

Publications:	Ron Lindahl, Sandy Anderson, Bob Beach
International expansion:	Glen Earthman, Ben Graves, Allen Guy
Membership:	Ron Lindahl, John Fink, Doug Hamilton, Bob Mann
Finance:	George Crawford, Sandy Anderson, Herb Sheathelm

William D. Mclnerney
Secretary/Treasurer

Treasurer's Report
1989-1990

Income	
Balance forward	15,221.31
Denver conference	3,300.00
Dues & subscriptions	4,135.00
Interest	46.00
	22,702.31
Expenses	
Journal	4,241.13
Denver conference	3,852.41
Checks	2.00
	8,095.54
Income minus expenses	4,606.77
Cash on hand	
Indiana	3,495.95
Memphis	6,110.82
CD	5,000.00
	14,606.77
Liabilities	
Current (printing)	2,350.00
Estimated (journal)	6,325.00
Estimated (ISEP office)	1,000.00
	9,675.00
Estimated net worth	4,931.77

William D. McInerney
Secretary/Treasurer

ISEP 1991 ANNUAL FALL CONFERENCE

You are invited to participate in the ISEP 1991 Annual Conference. The event will take place at the Waterford Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 10-13,1991. Reservations at the Waterford may be obtained by calling (405) 848-4782. Room rates are $76.00 for either single or double occupancy. Please mention that you will be attending the ISEP Conference in order to get these special rates. Estimated conference registration costs, which include membership dues, journal subscription, three breadfasts, and two luncheons are $175.00 for professionals and $75.00 for full-time students.

CALL FOR CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

Proposals for presentations for the 1991 ISEP Conference are now being accepted. While presentations which relate to the theme for this year's conference are especially encouraged, papers of high quality and potential interest to the conference participants will be given serious consideration. Creative and innovative presentations which focus on planning for all levels and aspects of education are encouraged. Presenters are invited to discuss international, national, state/provincial or local experiences in planning.

Conference sessions will be 60 minutes long. Symposia and panel presentations may occupy two sessions. Roundtable and small-group discussions will comprise one session. Paper sessions will be grouped to allow at least 15 minutes for presentation of the paper and 15 minutes for audience discussion. All presenters must register for the conference.

Proposal Format:

Page 1:

- Title of the Presentation
- Name, title, affiliation, mailing address, and telephone number of each presenter/ participant. If there is to be more than one presenter, please list the primary presenter first.
- Type of presentation (such as symposium, paper, roundtable, panel or small-group discussion
- Special equipment needed
- Statement of approximately 25 words describing the presentation

Page 2:

- Title of the presentation
- One page summary of the presentation

Timeline:

Proposals are due July 25, 1991. Presenters will be notified of acceptance by August 15, 1991. Proposals should be submitted to:

ISEP Program Committee
Planning, Research, and Evaluation Department
Oklahoma City Public Schools
900 N. Klein
Oklahoma City, OK 73106

INVITATION TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

The editors of *Educational Planning*, a refereed journal of educational planning issues, invite the submission of original manuscripts for publication consideration. *Educational Planning* is the official journal of the International Society for Educational Planning.

The journal's audience includes national and provincial/state planners, university faculty, members of educational administration, school district administrators and planners, and other practitioners.

The publication's purpose is to serve as a meeting ground for the scholar-researcher and the practitioner-educator through the presentation of articles that have practical relevance to current issues and that broaden the knowledge base of the discipline. *Educational Planning* disseminates the results of pertinent educational research, presents contemporary ideas for consideration and provides general information to assist subscribers with their professional responsibilities.

Articles preferred for inclusion are manuscripts from practitioners, reports of empirical research, expository writings including analyses of topical problems, or anecdotal accounts. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed. The following criteria have been established for the submission of manuscripts:

1. Each manuscript submission must be accompanied by a letter signed by the author.

2. The length of the manuscript should not exceed 20 double-spaced, typewritten pages (including reference lists, tables, charts, and/or graphs).

3. Two copies of each manuscript should be submitted.

4. Lengthy tables, drawings, and charts should be scaled to an *Educational Planning* page and camera-ready.

5. A biographical sketch of each author should be attached to each manuscript.

6. The Editors prefer APA style.

All manuscripts will be evaluated on the basis of relevancy, substance, style and syntax, and ease of comprehension. Submission conveys permission to edit and publish as required. Authors are responsible for copyright clearance and accuracy of information presented.

Please submit manuscripts to:

Robert H. Beach, Editor
Educational Planning
Memphis State University
Building 48 - South Campus
Memphis, TN 38152

Notes

Notes

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

MEMBERSHIP / SUBSCRIPTION FORM

(PLEASE PRINT)

NAME: _____
Last First Middle

Organization and Department if applicable: _____

Mailing Address: _____
City State Zip Country

FEES: Professional Membership and Subscription to Educational Planning $35 US
Student Membership and Subscription to Educational Planning $15 US
Payment by check, money order, or PO required with application.

Return membership application and payment to: The International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP)
Dr. William D. McInerney, Treasurer
Educational Administration
Purdue University
G-10 South Campus Courts
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

ORGANIZATION	The Society was founded on December 10, 1970, in Washington, D.C. Over 50 local, state, national, and international planners attended the first organizational meeting. Since then its growth has demonstrated that there is need for a professional organization with educational planning as its exclusive concern.
PURPOSE	The International Society for Educational Planning was established to foster the professional knowledge and interests of educational planners. Through conferences and publications the Society promotes the interchange of ideas within the planning community. The membership includes persons from the ranks of governmental agencies, school-based practitioners, and higher education.
MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY	Membership in the Society is open to any person active or interested in educational planning and the purposes of the Society. To join the Society or renew a membership, please submit and complete the enclosed form. Please forward check and membership form to: ISEP Dr. William D. McInerney, Sec.-Treas. Educational Administration Purdue University G-10 South Campus Courts West Lafayette, IN 47907 USA

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
Memphis State University,
Bldg. 48 - South Campus
Memphis, TN 38152