DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 598 EA 004 906

AUTHOR D'Oyley, Vince
TITLE A Few Issues and Ideas in Replanning Education.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 16p.; Abstracted from speech given before International Society of Educational Planners Annual Conference (2nd, Atlanta, Georgia, June 18-20, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Committees; Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Accountability; *Educational Change; *Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Educational Practice; Models; Organization; Policy Formation; *Resource Allocations; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Weber (Max)

ABSTRACT

Educational planning involves both the notions of ordering any unordered educational system and that of replanning an institutional and policy framework according to new criteria. Planning refers to that situation where there are relatively few or no constraints on the planning process from existing educational institutions or current policy process. There is always a tension between the emergence and definition of new educational goals in answer to certain problems and the existing institutions and practices. One of the major tasks of educational planners is to try to resolve this tension. Educational replanning, on the other hand, is that educational planning necessitated by new, often unanticipated demands--demands subject to various kinds of economic, political, and social constraints as well as the constraints presented by previous planning decisions. When replanning sets or helps to set new goals and objectives for the educational process, it is innovative; and when criteria, methods, and policies are revised in order to achieve accepted goals and objectives in the light of changing circumstances, it is reconstructive. The techniques of the committee and the ingenuity and strategem of the lone thinker are two models that have been of prime importance in ensuring effective educational planning. (Author)

A few Issues and Ideas in replanning education*

by Vince D'Oyley

Educational planning is concerned with the ordering of objectives and strategies within the general field of education. Like any attempt to order knowledge, it has the task of raising questions about the organization of education systems and their objectives. It must recognize and articulate the problems which arise from the adoption by particular educational systems of certain goals and from the proposed and actual use of certain organizational models. In terms of the problems thus articulated, it points out alternative policies for achieving particular objectives. It costs alternative policies in terms of a particular objective or a number of objectives; it also analyses, recommends and makes warnings. Educational planning is not educational administration, although a planner may, at times, be called upon to act, to manage and to coordinate. When the educational planner is primarily concerned with the efficient organization of the day to day implementation of policies, he may be said to be bureaucratised beyond what is usual for an effective planner. Has he not then become an educational administrator?

Planning and re-planning

Planning and re-planning are concepts which point to what I regard as two distinctive aspects of the objective which is educational change. Educational planning takes place primarily as a modification of a previously unplanned system. Educational policy in a particular institution may be the result of a more-or-less haphazard process for making decisions, subject or

*Abstracted from my speech, "Issues, Models and Realities in Educational Planning", at the International Society of Educational Planners' conference in Atlanta, Georgia in Spring, 1972. Appreciation is expressed especially to members of that panel chaired by John Holland and to Gordon Churchill, Research Associate, OISE.

not to personality and ideological conflicts. An extreme situation of this type would be capricious guesswork. Or it may be that the institutional foundations for a new institution have yet to be formulated within a policy framework. Planning refers, then, to the introduction of an ordered system, to a situation where disorder and disarrangement exists. Re-planning occurs when planning conceptions are applied to a situation where the institutional framework or order already exists and in a more or less planned form. Re-planning has, then, two aspects: (i) either in a given situation, the pre-defined goals are accepted and an attempt is made to outline alternative policies and patterns for achieving these goals; (ii) or moreso where the goals themselves are interpreted, questioned and re-defined because of their inappropriateness in terms of wider policy considerations. Alternative methods for achieving the re-defined goal or goals then emerge. But, in both cases, either the goals are accepted or changed, policy and alternative proposals have to be fashioned so as to fit in with an existing institutional order or to modify it or to discard it.

The distinction between planning and re-planning now hopefully becomes clearer: it relates to the question of constraints presented (a) by an institutional order and (b) by any planning process itself. The institutional order presents organizational constraints and the constraints of a particular professional ethic. A government department of transport may view transport problems as purely traffic engineering problems rather than as social problems, the perspective of a bureaucratic ethos based on the training of professional traffic engineers. A regional university or a group of academicians, on the other hand, may not see the worth in emphasizing technological or any other branch of advanced education for a region.

Constraints produced by the planning process are often an outcome of time. To plan is to perceive, analyze and attempt to evolve answers to problems and issues in education in the context of a time period. Often, effective planning can only take place over a long term period or perhaps over a medium period. This is necessarily so for two reasons: the policy and structural problems with which educational planners concern themselves, such as whether more technicians should be trained and in what areas, are not without implications for the long run and such problems are of such a nature that they do not admit to structural short-term solutions.

Thus, the commitment of resources to a particular educational policy places actual and potential limitations on future educational policy, the first kind of constraint. And in a world where the links between education and the social and mental health as well as economic welfare of the community become more and more apparent, decisions in the education field increasingly influence the possibility for alternative actions in other areas of the society and the economy. The decision to set up liberal studies and technical schools intermediate between high school and university is, in part, influenced by the need for certain kinds of manpower in the economy but can also be reached in terms of an argument for social justice.

Planning, in education as in other fields, by its very nature produces constraints of a generally long-term nature, particularly, but not only, where it involves large investments in physical capital. Franz Dumont perceived this problem in post-colonial French Africa in his book, False Start in Africa. The immediate influence of the imperial ideology in leading countries like Ghana to invest large sums of money in

university education rather than vocational education in agriculture and industry meant that the problems of economic and social development were increased, not lessened. The broad notion of planning involves a notion of the commitment of energy over a period of time and the constraints produced by this commitment.

The argument so far may appear to have overtones of the Popperian distinction between holistic and piecemeal planning or "social engineering" (Karl Popper: The Open Society and its Enemies, vi). "Holistic planning" is that planning which was couched in terms of planning everything social from a comparative tabula rasa. This comparative tabula rasa is a conception that results from ignorance or disregard of existing political and social structures and relationships. If there are no recognized structural constraints of this nature, then the philosophy of commitment to a future state can lead to actions which will often result in untold human suffering.

Better, many say, to adopt a piecemeal approach and tackle problems as they arise in the real world. But the piecemeal approach is not an answer either, because it is too tied to the rapid turnover of events and problems in the social world. It is not necessarily social tinkering but it can easily lead to the tinkering frame of mind which fails to see serious underlying faults.

But the piecemeal approach does emphasize the importance of flexibility in human and social affairs which the holistic or philosophy of commitment approach does not. To have commitment without flexibility is to commit oneself to ends in disregard of means. To have too much flexibility is to daily unselectively among many means to no end.

Effective planning must relate means and ends, and to do this well it must be flexible planning with a built-in "value" commitment.

Flexible planning enables us to take account of empirical events in our policy-making. To understand the concrete and empirical is not to attach ourselves totally to it, as too many modern social scientists are prone to do, but to try to integrate that empirical social knowledge into an understanding of historical policy and planning decisions with current political demands and with a thorough understanding of social and educational philosophy. Flexible planning is, then, "re-planning" It is the planning of further educational developments in terms of current issues and problems, in terms of constraints presented by past decisions, in terms of social and educational philosophy and [illegible] of economic and sociological knowledge. Only then can we evolve new criteria for existing goals or evolve new goals in the education field. Flexible planning is probably our best hope for effective reconstructions.

On accountability

The question of accountability is closely linked to our previous discussion. Educational planners have the task of collecting, analyzing and providing information about education and related topics that will both facilitate responsible decision-making by administrators and trustees and render those decisions accountable to the general public or community and to the student population. It involves understanding the reasons for which decisions were made in the past and assessing these reasons in terms of the data marshalled and utilised by the decision makers. It involves the provision of all relevant data and other knowledge bases for making new decisions and providing these not only to administrators, politicians, teachers and trustees but also to the

community. This pattern will continually demand developing ways in which the public can be brought into the decision-making process and even the day-to-day running of many educational establishments. Frameworks and arrangements for measuring the extent of public participation in decisions must be evolved for many of the reasons given above in respect to necessary planning and resulting commitments and controls. The necessity for flexible planning also illustrates the necessity for greater accounting to the public about what decisions are reached, who benefits from them and why.

On financing

A third point in which we are interested is the financing of education. What resources are available, how are these to be disbursed, and for what reasons? The earlier developing importance of the application of social cost-benefit analysis to some of these questions illustrates the recognition of the wider implications of decisions about the allocation of resources. As E. J. Mishan pointed out in Encounter some years ago, the general social cost-benefit approach in economics is still at the rabbit and horse stew stage. One horse and one rabbit in a stew (50:50) but, curiously, the stew still tastes of horse.

We may, therefore, have to wait some time before the social cost-benefit approach has a real practicability in a substantive sense rather than being an esoteric technical exercise. But, undoubtedly, educational planners must increasingly use and help to refine such techniques to facilitate policy and decision-making in the educational field, particularly in view of the implications of such decisions for developments in other areas.

To summarize, educational planning involves both the notion of ordering any unordered educational system and the notion of re-planning an institutional and policy framework according to new criteria. Planning refers to that situation where there are relatively few or no constraints on the planning process from existing educational institutions or current policy process. To encapsulate the point, there is always a tension between the emergence and definition of new educational goals in answer to certain problems and the existing institutions and practices. It is one of the major tasks of educational planners to try and resolve this tension. We have established that, to achieve this, educational planners must aim and argue for flexible planning but not loose planning. By loose planning, we mean the paradox of planning without any particular aim; by flexible planning, we mean planning for definite aims, goals and policies but, with the realization that goals and policies may change and, hence, require structured alterations in proposed plans. The suggested course of action is neither as difficult, one hopes, as it may appear to some, nor as simple as it may appear to others. It is both an attitude and a technique.

If the actual planning of, and planning for, change in educational practices is the central task of educational planning, the two other issues we have mentioned, financing and accounting, are both part of the required planning process and factors exterior to it with respect to the limitations placed on any planning intentions and process by the need for accountability to the public, to school and government administrators and to the school children, and by the availability of financial resources with which to implement changes.

The problem of accounting is, undoubtedly, increased if we are to adopt flexible planning. Flexible planning means, we have suggested, an attitude towards making policy and initiating action based on definite aims and goals yet modifiable in the light of important events and evidence. Yet, to convey this approach to the various people to whom the educational planner must relate, is no minor task.

The committee and the insight of the unusual individual

Educational re-planning is that planning of education which occurs to meet new, often unanticipated demands which are subject to various kinds of economic, political and social constraints and the constraints presented by previous planning decisions. Educational re-planning has, then, both an innovative and a reconstructive role. It is innovative when it sets or helps to set new goals and objectives for the educational process. It is reconstructive when criteria, methods and policies are revised in order to achieve accepted goals and objectives in the light of changing circumstances. These being the tasks of educational re-planning, the question remains: Who is to undertake these tasks, who can be regarded as the 'legitimate authority' in this planning process? The problem of authority has, of course, been central to the tradition of western political and social thought since Plato. Probably, the most concise attempt to recognize and conceptualize the problem of authority in modern times was that of Max Weber in the first two decades of this century. Weber's attempted application of sociological generalizations and concepts is well known but it is his theory of the ideal types of authority which laid the framework for a large number of analyses of the problems of authority in political and social life to follow.

The ideal type is for Weber, an "intellectualization": it cannot be found in purity in any existing society. But, it is a construction, what we might call a model, based on similar traits and circumstances which an astute mind can identify in many different societies at the same time and in different periods of time and in the same society over different periods of time. The analysis is inherently sociological, historical and philosophical: historical, because it looks at the actual and the concrete; sociological, because it draws and applies sociological generalizations from the historical actions of individuals and institutions; philosophical, because it is constantly examining and re-examining the conceptual bases by which man attempts to understand his society and its history.

Weber put forward, then, a theory of the ideal types of authority or, more precisely, domination.[1] The ideal types are: traditional authority, which is divided into two categories of patrimonial authority and paternal kingship; charismatic authority (based on the recognized superior qualities of an individual); and rational-legal authority (the historical basis for modern bureaucracy). As we have mentioned, although these types of authority have a historical and empirical basis, they are not to be found in any particular respective historical period. Thus, charismatic leadership can exist in an extreme form of modern bureaucracy, as in parts of Europe earlier in this century. The point about the ideal types of authority is that they do help us to understand and draw distinctions between the authoritative bases for decisions about politics and society in any historical time or place.

We need to consider the process of re-planning education in the light of such models to assess the importance or predominance of different ways of determining policy and making decisions. My colleague, Michael Katz, for instance, claims that the search in nineteenth century American education for an institutional form that would fit the social context rested on four alternatives or four modes of organization. The models, for which he gives convincing historical arguments, are: paternalistic voluntarism, democratic localism, corporate voluntarism and incipient bureaucracy.[2] These models are still mainly applicable to some areas of American and Canadian developments in education in the twentieth century, except that what was an incipient bureaucracy in the nineteenth century has now become either a mature bureaucracy or one rapidly approaching that state of fullness and complexity. We have witnessed clashes between democratic localism and matured bureaucracy over the last twenty-five years; we have also observed a wholesome concubinage between paternalistic voluntarism and matured bureaucracy, an arrangement which, so long as it lasts, should be made productive, not destructive.

---

[1]Parsons and Henderson translate Weber's Theory of Social & Economic Organization Concept as "authority" but domination is a more accurate translation as it implies political control of some over others, whether by consent or not. Cf. Gunther Ross, Claus Wittlich, ed. Max Weber, Economy and Society, VI, and Gerth & Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.

[2]M. B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, New York: Prager, 1971.

The educational systems of some other societies, less complex than the American society, can often be understood mainly in terms of two or three of these organization models. In the nineteenth century in Jamaica and a few other Caribbean areas the pattern was, at best, mainly paternalistic voluntarism, aided later by incipient bureaucracy, with an occasional dash of corporate voluntarism. The situation in Canada for a while resembled that in Jamaica, both being less complex than the United States.

But, particularly in Canada and, I think, in general, whatever is the base of a certain education system in the light of Katz' organization models, two techniques have been of prime importance in ensuring effective educational planning. These are the committee, and the ingenuity and stratagem of the lone thinker who, if not a John Dewey, has strongly influenced educational planning decisions.

It has been a standard practice in the tradition of re-shaping and re-organizing education change in Britain and North America, to appoint a committee,often the Royal Commission. Thus, were the major acts contributing to the expansion of primary and secondary education in nineteenth and twentieth century Britain (such as the Foster Act in 1902 and the Butler Act in 1944) drawn up on the basis of Royal Commissions' findings and reports. Thus also, was the reorganization of higher education in Britain undertaken recently after the Report from the Robbins Commission.

A recent example in Canada is the 1968 Hall-Dennis Commission on education in Ontario, whose report, Living and Learning, broke some radically new grounds in terms of conceptual approaches to educational problems and practices. Two later examples are the U.S. College Entrance Examination Board's Report of its Commission on Tests, Righting the Balance (1970) and the well known current post-secondary report, The Learning Society (1972).

What then, are the advantages of the approach to educational planning problems through the Royal Commission type of committee? One of the advantages is the presence of various types of professionals who are able to address their expertise to the issues and problems at hand. Thus, the membership of the Hall-Dennis Commission in Canada consisted of a jurist, a school principal, four professors, one psychologist, six educators from the Ministry of Education, Teachers' Colleges and schools and four members from the fields of law, accountancy and business -- all with experience at the local school board

level. To illustrate c to a tradition, we can also d a comparison with the Lumb Commission in Jamaica which reported in 1898. Its membership consisted of a pulsne Judge (Charles Lumb); two churchmen-educators (Archbishop Nuttall and Bishop Gordon) and the principal of the largest West Indian Teachers' College (W. Gillies). These Commissions like so many others were chaired or coordinated by individuals already noted for their ability to recognize and think through national problems and policies.

More important than the presence of various kinds of expertise on the Committee is the fact that therein a forum is created for dialogue between experts and ad hoc groups whose views would not otherwise be heard in concert. It ought to be clear that this important feature does not apply to committees per se but only to certain types of committees. The pattern or tradition for arriving at committee membership is, therefore, very important. Although I am postulating the committee as a central adjunct to many of Katz' organizational models, the advantages of this type of committee may go unrealized. For instance, a committee within the realm of the bureaucratic may well draw its membership from within the bureaucracy alone and, therefore, be potentially subject to the dangers and weaknesses of a bureaucratic ethos, either of the bureaucracy as a whole or from its individual divisions. In the first place, the bureacratic ethos which engages a particular way of looking at problems and coping with them, can come to a biased judgment in the case of many issues. In both Britain and the United States, for example, bureaucrats are astounded when told by members of the public and sociologists that slum dwellers, for a number of quite rational reasons, might not want to be moved out of their homes into shining new (albeit public) dwellings.

A committee within the realm of an established organization is not infrequently subject to the tendency for differences within the committee to be a reflection, not of differences over trying to decide the problem and evolve answers to it which will, of course, arise from different approaches to the

problem, but to be a reflection of differences which are a result of a defence of a divisional ethos or expertise. This often happens between different professional bureaucracies, a ministry of health and a business organization, a ministry of education and one of technology. In such situations, debate easily can become a conflict and compromise between defensive and different expertise and, in the extreme, miss completely the problem before the committee for consideration. The corporate voluntarism and democratic localism models are hardly subject to the same levels of constraints as the bureaucratic model. But committees under the corporate voluntarism system could be subject to the resulting bias of corporate defensiveness, and a committee in the democratic localism model may become victim to the conflicts of personal ambition, personal animosities and such like.

The committee, then, must be as much of the nature of the Royal Commissions as is possible. Recruitment must take place outside the system as well as inside in order to ensure that the committee advantages of expertise, notable leadership, representation from many-sided interests and dialogue are realized. This does not mean that problems will not arise: a notable leader may achieve public approbation: Beeching on the British railways; Longford on pornography. Disagreement may emerge from within the commission, as in the case of Sidney and Beatrice Webb's minority dissent and report from the British Poor Law Commission in 1910. But these occurrences can open the issues to wider public debate which is one reason for having the commission in the first place.

Though we have noted the importance of committees in the re-planning of education, we should not ignore the role of the lone thinker or the individual whose thinking sometimes can contribute, in an overwhelming way, to educational change. The controversial example I should like to use here is that of Booker T. Washington. It was at the Exposition in Atlanta in September, 1895 that Booker T. Washington enunciated some important and far-reaching principles which he felt should affect the directions and trends in education for large segments of the American minority population. These principles were, that:

1. since the underprivileged live by their hands there is nec[illegible]dify labour with the hands;
2. [illegible]pr[illegible]eged should cast down buckets of opportunity to the underprivileged with the latter accepting.

That Booker T. Washington's statements in Atlanta influenced American education, there can be little doubt; how else would Theodore Roosevelt have been accused of selling out to that man? How else could the negro emphasis on vocational education be explained? Booker T. Washington was, himself, a recipient of much of the money available for that poor minority and did use his beneficiencies for educational improvements. Even in that age of no television, Booker T. Washington had some influence on Jamaican education. The American George Hicks, an inspector of schools in Jamaica, and the Presbyterian minister William Gillies were conversant with Booker's views, which were discussed in the Lumb Commission in the 1890's as well as in the "authoritative" body, the Board of Education in Kingston.

The principles enunciated then by Booker and acted upon by him and others with the dollars patronsingly given by powerful forces in North America set the narrow limits from which minority (women are seen here as a minority) education and those people's social advance have not been unshackled. One may therefore ask: As an ingenious educational planner, what cause did Booker T. Washington serve? Why have his principles and plans been so universalised and long lasting? Did he promulgate new principles or merely codify and encapsulate what was popular with the powerful elite? Wherein was he reconstructive?

The Tanzanian President, Julius Nyerere[3] is a walking example of the importance of what we have called the unusual individual's insight into problems of education, unusual individuals not necessarily because they are in some sense exceptional though they might be, nor because they are noted educationists like Pestalozzi but because, in coping with problems which are of broader context than education itself, they enunciate new principles of education. Like Dumont, Nyerere emphasizes the importance of agrarian and technical-vocational education in preference to the time-honoured colonial virtues of a university education.

---

[3]See his essay, Education for Self-Reliance. See also Franz Dumont, False Start in Africa.

The two techniques for active re-planning of education as discussed herein have some characteristics of the Weberian ideal type. Not the actual ide[illegible]uthority delineated by Max Weber[4] but the concept of the ideal t[illegible] it is a truism to say of unusual individuals and committees that they are not everywhere alike or identical. But both types have a significant role to play in the re-planning of education wherever it may take place, and this is true even in this age of advanced technology with its search for individual autonomy without harmful alienation.

---

[4] It may appear that our committee model too closely resembles in many ways Weber's model of collegial rational -- legal authority, and that our "unusual individual" resembles Weber's charismatic personage. But our models and Weber's types are not identical.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dumont, Franz. *False Start In Africa*
London, Sphere Books, 1966

Katz, M. B. *Class, Bureaucracy and Schools*
New York, Prager, 1971

Mishan, E. J. "The Spillover Enemy," *Encounter*,
Volume XXXIII, No. 6, Dec. 1969

Nyerere, J. "Education for Self-Reliance," Tanu Pamphlet
East African Publishing House, 1967.

Various books with translations of Max Weber's ideas.