

Alternative Futures for Faculties of Education

John H. M. Andrews
university of british columbia

The article attempts to predict mid-range futures of Faculties of Education in Canadian universities through analyses stemming from organization theory. Some worst case scenarios are presented as the end result of natural tendencies within organizations. These scenarios represent various forms of drift and can be avoided only through specific countervailing action. Some best case scenarios are then presented as different models to which faculties may aspire. The perspective of the paper is to get beyond the fine-tuning or tactical changes which occupy most of our attention, to focus upon choices among strategic alternatives involving substantially different missions.

Cet article tente de prévoir à court terme l'avenir des facultés d'éducation canadiennes, en utilisant un modèle basé sur l'analyse des structures d'organisation de ces facultés. On nous présente quelques types de situations désastreuses qui trouvent leurs explications à l'intérieur même de leurs structures. Ces scénarios représentent divers courants qu'il serait possible d'éviter en appliquant simplement quelques corrections (mesures compensatoires). Les scénarios montrant une situation à son meilleur, sont présentés comme divers modèles vers lesquels les universités peuvent tendre. Dans la perspective de cette étude, il est possible d'aller au-delà des beaux mots (belles théories) ou des changements de tactique qui nous préoccupent, pour nous concentrer surtout sur des choix entre les diverses possibilités stratégiques impliquant pour une grande part, différents engagements.

Faculties of Education in Canada have reasonably similar past histories and somewhat similar present purposes and practices. But what of their futures? This paper's central concern is to outline the options open to Faculties of Education. The main emphasis, then, is not so much deterministic as it is to provide a basis for intervention. The point is not primarily to identify the organizational karma upon which to base predictions of the future, but to see the development of an organization as it confronts potentially destructive forces and potentially creative opportunities. It is true that the brightness or bleakness of the future may be strongly influenced by environmental constraints. But the future is also determined by the leadership and decision-making elements of the organization. Thus, while one organization may simply drift into its future, another may strive for at least partial control. If control is to be achieved, however, the organization must have a clear view of its desired future. My purpose is to present a set of possible futures, which, however incomplete, may stimulate discussion on the topic.

For a topic of such apparent importance, it is remarkable that the literature contains little that is directly applicable. No doubt the absence of

a fully satisfactory methodology for addressing the topic has been a common deterrent. Points of view as diverse as social philosophy, futurology, political science, and many others might all make important contributions but each also is limited in perspective. The usual academic strategy in the face of such a problem is simply to encourage observations from all possible sources in the hope that later some consensus may emerge. In that spirit, I shall proceed from the two perspectives of the education generalist and the student of organization theory. The former, acquired from experience as an administrator of a Faculty of Education, tends to contribute subjectively with judgments about social and organizational needs and purposes. The latter, utilizing knowledge drawn from the formal study of organizations and their behaviour, tends to contribute more objective insights into the limits, capabilities, and likelihoods of organizations. While useful, the combination, like other perspectives, is less than fully satisfactory.

The time frame for the term "futures" can obviously vary widely. In rejecting the distant future, I concur with John Maynard Keynes that in the long term we are all dead. The short term also seems unsatisfactory because such futures are almost an inevitable extension of the present. I prefer what may be referred to as mid-range futures. This is a time frame which avoids a nebular view yet gets beyond the fine-tuning or tactical considerations which occupy most of our attention. The need is to focus on choices among strategic alternatives involving substantially different missions. Concretely this may be thought of roughly as beyond 10 or 15 years.

HISTORICAL CONSTRAINTS

Faculties of Education in Canada are usually the product of a merger of one or more normal schools, designed to train elementary teachers, with a university department or school, designed to train secondary teachers. These mergers began with the University of Alberta in 1945 and swept the country until near completion by 1970. Thus the present 48 faculties vary in age from roughly 15 to 40 years. They also vary in size from just a few faculty members to about 300.

Both of the two components of the typical new Faculty of Education were simply intended to train teachers. This applied even to the typical university unit for the training of secondary teachers. While the university usually emphasizes scholarship and research, the "school" of education was typically small enough to avoid scrutiny and hence to avoid compliance. Such was not the case, however, when a large faculty appeared with both a staff and mission alien to university expectations. Needless to say the stormy birth and childhood of the typical faculty has left a legacy of persistent tensions in its relationships with its parent organization. The dilemma is heightened, moreover, by tensions, which

are often equal and opposite, in its relationship with its constituent teacher groups and school systems. As a result, the mission of the faculty has been forged as a delicate balance between the field's utilitarianism and the scholarly pursuits of the university. Essentially, the faculty places teacher education at its centre, with graduate study, research and development (R and D), and service to the professional field at the periphery. This, then, is the present mission for most Faculties of Education. It exists under considerable tension as a result of its negotiated origin, and it is thus not easily changed. Moreover it is only marginally acceptable to the contesting environmental forces and, therefore, often produces within the faculty contesting ideological factions. The legacy, then, is one of a mission which is highly resistant to change, producing low support from its environment, and factions within the organization. It is from this background that we look to the future, to examine the prospects and choices.

FUTURES TO AVOID

What happens to organizations which are allowed simply to drift in rudderless fashion with the natural degenerative forces which impinge on all organizations? These worst case scenarios are focussed on initially because, to be realistic, they will no doubt be the actual futures of at least some of the Faculties of Education. Indeed they depict the present condition of some. More constructively, however, the initial focus on worst cases helps to enable a healthy organization to recognize its potential weaknesses. "Know thyself" may be as useful advice to an organization as to an individual.

The passive model

This model is of an organization which has become stagnant and unproductive. Feedback from its major environmental systems is largely negative and it is marginal whether it will be allowed to survive in its present form over a long period. Repeated jolts from the environment have occurred as warnings, but little positive response has occurred. Internally the model is typified by organizational burnout or arteriosclerosis. Members have a high comfort index. In its earlier days the faculty may have been an adventurous place in which to work but now it is depressive. Some of its members may remain productive but most will not. For those who do, the organization is a hindrance rather than a help.

The model's essential characteristic is a loss of commitment to the goals, that is, to the mission. Characteristically, professional workers have a high level of individual commitment to professional goals. Faculties of Education, therefore, have a strong advantage over non-professional organizations in avoiding the passive model. Nonetheless, over the years the enthusiasm of commitment to the ideology or mission of the

organization has given way to a lethargic preoccupation with techniques, routines, regulations, and internal politics – a withdrawal inward from the outer world's turbulence. This is the effect Hopkins (1982, p. 26) calls innovative fatigue. It also illustrates the concept of entropy used by analogy from physics by Katz and Kahn (1966, p. 150). In physics entropy is the rate of degradation of energy from higher to lower forms. In organizations it is seen as the tendency toward a lack of resource transformation and lack of commitment which must be arrested or even reversed if the organization is to survive. This negative entropy they call negentropy.

Despite the dysfunction of this condition both for the individuals in the faculty and for society, it seems that some degree of the condition is already well-entrenched in many Faculties of Education. A recent study of Canadian Faculties of Education by Hopkins (1982, pp. 15–31) has identified five evenly distributed categories of faculties grouped according to their sagas. The "saga" is a mythology which emerges from the historical emotional experience of the institution. Paraphrased, these categories are:

- (1) *Institutional retrenchment*—a saga where there has been prolonged pressure for change which has largely been resisted. Faculty members are now unconcerned about change and focus on normal duties.
- (2) *Paralyzed into inaction*—the faculty is overwhelmed by the external forces acting upon it and feels powerless to do anything in reply. It does nothing until action is forced on it.
- (3) *Innovative fatigue and suspicion*—this may precede the previous saga. The struggle to change has taken its toll and has not been very successful. Members treat even well-meaning attempts at change with suspicion and hostility.
- (4) *Slowed by myth*—this faculty has a recent history of success, the roots of which are now partially anachronistic but are nevertheless guiding present direction. Faculty members are benignly comfortable and unwilling to risk the uncertainty of continued change.
- (5) *Relatively free to change*—this faculty does not have inhibiting myths though it confronts other organizational and ecological barriers to change. It is aware of its limitations and businesslike in approach to everyday tasks and future possible directions. It has open leadership, good relations with the field, good internal communication, is well integrated into the university, relatively small, and has an ability to mobilize resources.

As these sagas are examined in comparison with what is called here the Passive Model, it would seem that the first three rather clearly fit with the essential feature of lack of commitment to the legitimate mission and the fourth would seem to be an incipient case. When it is recalled that Hopkins found these sagas evenly distributed, it is disturbing to consider

that as many as 60 to 80% of present Faculties of Education exhibit some degree of the characteristics of the Passive Model. Actually this is not an unexpected finding because studies of organizations of all sorts have often seen this Passive Model as a normal condition; they see each organization as a system being pushed and pulled out of control as it interacts with its superordinate environmental systems. A typical determinist view is expressed by Kaufman.

The evidence of mankind caught up in complexes of forces that sweep us along, often in directions many or most of us may be unhappy about, is regarded simply as proof of failure to think and act rationally, or of the machinations of a few evil leaders, or of both, but not of inherent incapability to manipulate these forces. (Kaufman, 1973, p. 307)

More recently, however, the recognition of the looseness of coupling of the system to its environment (Weick, 1976) has produced greater optimism for the potential exercise of system autonomy under certain conditions and, thus, some capacity for self-determination. While the Passive Model may currently be a common condition and perhaps will thus continue in the future, current research like that of Hopkins indicates that some do avoid it. It will, however, always be an uphill struggle to do so.

The distorted model

As in the Passive Model, the organization portrayed in this model has lost sight of its legitimate mission. However, it differs in that the legitimate mission is replaced with a new mission. The energy level of the faculty remains high but this high level of commitment is toward one or more distorted missions. All organizations work to some extent toward goals of personal benefit to their members (Perrow, 1978; Griffiths, 1979). But when goals related to the self-interest of faculty members and administrators are antagonistic to the legitimate mission of the organization and yet displace that mission, the organization exemplifies the Distorted Model. Faculties of Education like other university units are peculiarly susceptible to this effect because, as Clark and Guba (1980, p. 77) point out, "the culture of institutions of higher education is predominantly ideographic (i.e., emphasizing the self-actualization of the professor) rather than nomothetic (i.e., emphasizing the goals of the institution)." While "predominantly" may be too strong a word, the tendency certainly seems to exist. Thus it is apparent that distorted missions may emerge through imperceptible drift. This occurs through a process of personal and group rationalizations that various new self-interest goals are, in fact, means toward the end of the legitimate mission. Cases where this reasoning is not self-deceptive but authentic are referred to later.

Possible variants of the Distorted Model are as numerous as the range

of rewards an organization may bestow upon its members. Some are so obviously related to personal benefit (such as salary, tenure, etc.) as to be excluded from the idiosyncratic realm and are subjected to bargaining which places specific formal limits on the extent of the organization's distortion in directions considered contrary to its formal goals. The most important reward not included in such strictures, and easily rationalized, however, is higher status. Thus the most common distortion would seem to be the status-seeking faculty. Several forms of this are particularly common.

One form is what might be called the Elitist Model. Here academic standards are so rigorously applied to prospective teachers that they exceed any known relationship to teaching effectiveness. Also in this model the emphasis of the faculty may be shifted from undergraduate teacher preparation to graduate work. Another form is the Academic Model which eschews the crass practicalities of teaching, preferring to see the study of education as a basic academic discipline. It may also prefer to follow the example of law in escaping altogether from the practicum by shifting it totally to the profession. In general it solves that most basic tension within a Faculty of Education between professional demands and those of the university by going fully for the higher status of the two – the university. It attempts to emulate a Faculty of Arts, however destructive this may be for the mission that society has set for it. As described here it resembles somewhat the “mission-free” Faculty of Education described by Clark and Guba in the results from a large study in the United States:

A final and large group of ... (Faculties of Education) ... can be considered “mission-free,” that is, they view the activities of the ... (Faculty) ... as a service or support function for the ... (university) ... in which they are located and neither maintain nor strive for a set of professional missions that are distinguishable from the overall institutional mission. (1980, p. 83)

Obviously, seeking higher status may be functional for the goals as well as dysfunctional. When normal schools were incorporated into universities there resulted a substantial increase in status for the profession generally, yet most observers would see this development as functional for the mission of teacher education. In many cases higher status is functional when accompanied by greater division of labour. For example, within the country or within a province it is probably functional for some institutions to specialize more in graduate work than others. Where desirable, however, such differentiation would be expected to result more from systematic planning rather than from distortion or drift within an individual organization. Another common way in which higher status may be functional is in helping the faculty to bargain with its environment for resources. This may be of great importance because, as Clark and Guba (1980, p. 78) found, the Faculty of Education on almost all campuses has been below average in prestige and as a result has been left

with a weaker bargaining hand. Thus the classic means-ends dilemma applies. Distorting the mission of a Faculty of Education in order to increase its competitiveness for resources is clearly a short-sighted strategy. Still, if seeking higher status is possible without compromise of the mission it is a reasonable course of action. The ultimate arbiter of whether or not the mission has been distorted is not internal ideology or rational justification but the reaction of the constituency which set the mission in the first place. Organizational self-interest which coincides with the public interest will be approved but, if judged to be not in the public interest, will be rebuffed. By "public interest" is meant the overall resultant of environmental pressures.

The Distorted Model, therefore, like the Passive Model appears to be commonly represented among present Faculties of Education. Unfortunately, both may remain common because they result from natural forces. While it is not my purpose to focus upon remedies for these degenerate states, some preliminary research has produced results which are at least promising. Among references worth consulting are Kimberly and Miles (1980), Fullan (1982), Hopkins (1982), and Starbuck and Nystrom (1981).

The deprived model

This model represents a Faculty of Education which is resource starved. The condition may result from factors beyond the control of the faculty, such as decreased enrolment and general economic decline. In other cases it may result from the particular organization's low competitiveness in the struggle for resources. Faculties of Education appear to be particularly vulnerable to this deprived condition both because of their weak bargaining position on campus (Clark and Guba, 1980, p. 78) and because of the vulnerability of universities in general, in times of economic pressure.

The effects of deprivation on an organization are not entirely clear. A substantial part of the literature sees it as a major obstacle to effectiveness. Cyert (1978) for example, points out that as organizational slack disappears, so do promotional opportunities and the ability of universities to recruit new faculty with fresh ideas. Further, because of the increased conflict under retrenchment conditions it is difficult to retain high-quality managers. He concludes that the greatest danger in a period of decline is that individuals lose their drive for excellence. Excellence in higher education, he says, has usually been bought through surplus funds, not from priority setting and reallocation.

Others take a more optimistic view. Starbuck et al. (1978), for example, point out that the Chinese ideogram for crisis combines two simple symbols, the one for danger and the one for opportunity. Yet even here the dangers are acknowledged even though the focus is upon ways of maximizing even minimal opportunities.

The obvious conclusion seems to be confirmed by the literature, then, that the Deprived Model is to be avoided if possible. While much help is available on how to avoid, cope with, and even capitalize on these conditions (e.g., Mingle et al., 1981), many basic factors lie beyond the control of the faculties. As a result, an individual faculty, by its own efforts, may moderate its plight, but it is unlikely to escape undamaged. It may be optimistically noted, however, that as much as this model dominates the present, the cyclical nature of the economy will, it is hoped, make it much less common in the mid-range future.

These three futures to be avoided, the Passive, Distorted, and Deprived Models, are degenerative states which singly or in combination are major pitfalls toward which Faculties of Education are inexorably pushed. Statistical projections from data presented by Hopkins (1982) and Clark and Guba (1980) would suggest that many Faculties of Education will succumb in the future as in the past and present. Where this is the case, these faculties will be in continual conflict with environments whose hostility results from negative judgments of the faculties' performance. If positive response does not occur, the environments will become increasingly punitive. Unfortunately it is difficult for organizations to escape from this vicious cycle through their own initiative. Their very condition precludes mustering the internal energy and commitment to confront the problem. Thus through conflict and directives the environment takes action to enforce at least marginally acceptable performance or even, at times, to require major re-structuring. All this can best be avoided by taking strong preventive initiatives while the faculty is still at least moderately healthy. That means agreeing upon specific desirable future targets through strategic planning and then building strong commitment to those goals.

FUTURES TO CONSIDER

Actually achieving best case scenarios must obviously be difficult or its occurrence would be more frequent. While the purpose here is to examine possible scenarios, rather than implementation strategies, a major obstacle to desirable futures does deserve mention. Success stems from more than strategic planning, building commitment, and resisting counter-productive forces. It usually involves increased resources and, in particular, money. Many faculties may well be deterred, in fact, from setting ambitious goals in view of the financial realities. Indeed this may be the wisest course in that it avoids what Clark and Guba (1980, p. 79) refer to as "mission overreach." This is especially true when the environments are hostile or excessively turbulent. But avoidance may also be overly cautious because of the interdependence among plans, success, and funding. The dilemma is that plans usually cannot be implemented without funding, yet funding is usually forthcoming not for plans but for

success. This is the Catch 22 of organizational development in universities. The fact that some organizations do become successful suggests, however, that it is not insuperable. The solution appears to lie in a spiraling upward with small increments of unfunded success leading to subsequent funding which, in turn, funds the next round. However risky this solution may seem it no doubt underlines the importance of courage in achieving success. But what does success look like? What are some successful scenarios?

The excellent conventional model

This model has the conventional mission for a Faculty of Education and the conventional programs and processes, but it differs from other faculties in the excellence it achieves within the standard format. By conventional mission is meant a primary focus on initial teacher preparation with an important but secondary emphasis upon graduate studies, R and D, and service to the profession. This model has been and likely will remain the aspiration of most Faculties of Education. There is high personal satisfaction for those working in the faculty and, while environments are seldom totally satisfied with performance, in this case the support is strong in at least the more important sectors. On the national scene the faculty is well known and highly regarded.

Since success breeds success, this model can be relatively stable as an organizational form and may persist in healthy condition over a long period of time. Yet the degenerative forces are always ready to strike. A particular point of vulnerability is complacency, or as Hopkins (1982, p. 29) labels the type, "slowed by myth" which, in effect, is staying with a successful formula after it has become anachronistic. Another is the seeking of even further status, though in distorted ways. In this case the excellence, far from compensating for the distortion, actually compounds its effects.

The creative model

The essence of the Creative Model is that it has successfully departed from the conventional faculty in some significant way. It has departed from the usual mission, the usual program, the usual internal structures, environmental relationships or some other major element of the conventional faculty. The term "creative" is used rather than "innovative" to imply social acceptance and even approval of the invention. In this sense, innovativeness becomes creativity if it is subsequently judged to be a useful contribution.

The Creative Model is not likely to be common as an ongoing organizational style, though it may occur more frequently as a short-term phenomenon. The problem is that studies of such organizations find their

creativity hard to maintain in the face of engendered pressures pushing them back toward conventionality and routine. As Miles puts it, "Members once eager to devote all their energy to the enterprise grew weary and ... (leaders) ... suffered "burnout." All these factors contributed to the drift within these ... (creative) ... enterprises toward conventionality" (1980, p. 437).

In general, there has been found to be a built-in tension within the organization between creativity and the regulation-governed, routine operation which seeks efficiency (Miles, 1980, p. 438). The difficulty of sustaining a creative organization, in our case a creative Faculty of Education, makes the occurrence of one all the more crucially important to progress in education. Such a centre will be at the cutting edge of new developments. It will be inventing and refining what may well be common practice in the future.

A natural question which arises is how can an organization be creative by departing from the standard mission. Since the environments of an organization create and validate its mission, how can the organization succeed in changing it without risking punitive action? Is such an attempt not producing, by definition, a Distorted Model? The point is that in the Distorted Model the mission is changed in such a way as to be perceived as benefiting members of the organization at the expense of the public interest. The creative change of mission produces the opposite reaction. The relevant publics judge the changed mission to be more in their own interest than the previously prescribed mission. Since the distinction between the two depends upon a judgment after the fact of change, it is apparent that experimenting with the mission is a high-risk venture. Nonetheless, it is an essential process if our social institutions are to evolve with changing conditions.

The process of identifying particular examples of creative models is highly speculative. Those identified may or may not have merit in their own right but are intended primarily to show the kinds of things some Faculties of Education should set their sights on if they aspire to the Creative Model.

The macro education model

There was a time, particularly in the United States, but to an extent also in Canada, when Faculties of Education or the equivalent were looked to for leadership in the whole enterprise of education. This was particularly true in the earlier part of this century when professors of education, after a period of animated public debate, proceeded to lead our elementary and secondary schools toward what was called Progressive Education. But when this development peaked and came under attack in the 1950s, teacher training organizations withdrew from leadership at such a high level of educational policy. They have not reappeared since. This

abdication of leadership may be because previous leadership emphasized social ideology which may seem alien within the new university-based setting. It may simply be because of a distaste for the public fray. Still, it may be more than coincidental that the disappearance occurred at the same time as the development of specialized departments within the new Faculties of Education. The generalist educator, concerned with the macro problems of education, has been replaced by specialists seeking improved practices within the confines of each of the large number of sub-specializations. Even the educational philosophers, long prominent in leadership, retreated to concerns within their own discipline. As a result our society has a serious lack of leadership in the major educational issues. Much work is being done on micro improvements but little at the macro level.

This circumstance suggests that Faculties of Education might consider as their goal for the future the Macro Education Model. This would involve extending presently accepted missions and accepting the risk of rejection by those who would potentially be influenced by the leadership.

What would such a model look like? Presumably in most respects it would be a conventional faculty. It would be performing with excellence in all the usual functions but its special focus, within its R and D program, would be bringing all possible resources, internal and external, to bear on speculation about and design of whole new approaches to education and on the testing of promising alternatives. The involvement of external resources must be stressed because the whole concept would require direct partnerships with all sectors of the educational community. Though specialized departments may be responsible for fragmentation of thinking about education, these narrower foci are useful for micro development. The holistic view, however, would best be expressed through an integrative mechanism like a Centre or a Policy Institute. Possibly the experimental or laboratory school might be resurrected as a controlled environment for trial implementation of new holistic learning systems.

Various kinds of alternative learning systems might emerge. Some of the vague visions of the de-schooling advocates might even yield sound community-based alternatives if seriously and positively pursued. At the other extreme, various traditional purposes might be accomplished through more closely controlled learning environments than is now customary. There is even one currently available macro system which has had fairly extensive research with encouraging results. This is the mastery learning system put forward by Benjamin Bloom (1981). The basic tenets are that the large differences in learning abilities usually observed among students result artificially from the expectation that they will be there and from accumulated incomplete learning at lower levels. If differences in capacity are minimized rather than exaggerated and if complete learning is required at each level, students show much less tendency to level off at a

point in the educational system which supposedly represents their maximum capacity. Not only are the limits removed but results show the rate of learning of different students to be similar enough to be accommodated within a single class grouping. For a proposal which promises such dramatic improvements in education, which comes from such a credible source, it might be expected to produce a major wave of research and experimentation. But not so! Its implications are so broad as to include such disparate fields as learning theory and school organization, as well as raising basic questions of social philosophy including the bases of the whole system of occupational credentialling and equality of opportunity. Its very breadth removes it from anyone's field of study so it has remained for many years as a proposal without serious attention. It is exactly the kind of macro education proposal, then, which might serve as the major R and D focus for an entire faculty of specialists.

The macro teacher education model

It might be expected, because the central mission of Faculties of Education is teacher education, that research and experimentation with teacher education programs would be a common preoccupation. Again not so! And again possibly because the comprehensive nature of such programs makes such R and D difficult within the usual structure of faculty specializations. Creative Faculties, however, might emerge which develop a true multidisciplinary focus on teacher education. These faculties would undertake research, design, and experimental implementation with the expectation of basic modification of the faculty's own programs. Some faculties have been active in this area in the recent past through emphasis upon such approaches as alternative programs, experimental field-based programs or extended practica. Indeed, a good example is the new Centre for the Study of Teacher Education at U.B.C. following upon earlier emphases on development of alternative programs.

The specialized mission model

This kind of Creative Model results from new ways of accomplishing a division of labour among a number of Faculties of Education forming a provincial or even a national grouping. Thus either through planning or by role evolution, a given faculty would become specialized in some particular parts of the normal mission. So it might specialize in preparing kindergarten, or deaf education teachers or in graduate programs of outstanding quality or in R and D emphasis or in forging new kinds of relationships with professional practitioners. As important as such departures from the normal mission may be, they can be considered creative only when sanctioned by the environment. This is the fine line distinguishing them from the distorted model discussed previously.

The extended clientele model

Another possible creative venture would be broadening the usual clientele from almost exclusive focus on teaching personnel for elementary and secondary schools to other occupations. Interest in this innovation arises naturally in the face of declining enrolments; but for this emphasis to be creative, it would have to go beyond mere survival concerns and be seen as contributive to an important social need. Certainly a strong case can be made for the need to adapt Faculties of Education to the preparation of educators within business, industry, government, human services, and many other areas (Demetrulias and Deutsch, 1982).

Functional integration model

A final example of a Creative Model might be that which integrates all needs of the education profession. This represents a departure from the usual mission in that it goes beyond initial teacher preparation and graduate work. It attempts an integration of these functions as they relate to continuing professional education which until now, in Canada, had been an area characterized more by intentions than by performance. In a sense it shifts what faculties have generally called professional service from a peripheral place in their mission to a central position.

A good deal of initial work has been done in this area, particularly in Britain where it served as a common substitute mission in the face of declining enrolments. These circumstances, however, were less than ideal for such an innovation, particularly with respect to crucial motivational elements, so that in better conditions this kind of program is still very much a pioneering venture.

COMMENT

I have attempted to look into the future to see what Faculties of Education might look like some time ahead. The effort has been primarily speculative regarding the range of desirable futures from which faculties may select. It has also been predictive in suggesting that in the absence of strong leadership and high commitment, faculties will sink into one or more of the three degenerate conditions described. These futures to be avoided, were called the Passive, Distorted and Deprived Models.

Avoidance is best accomplished by positive purpose, however, so that selecting and pursuing a clearly defined desirable future may be the best way of preventing the drift into ineffectiveness. For that purpose an illustrative menu of possible desirable futures was presented. The two major categories were the Excellent Conventional Model and the Creative Model. Within the latter category were the Macro Education, the Macro

Teacher Education, and Specialized Mission, the Extended Clientele and the Functional Integration Models.

The models are neither mutually exclusive nor discontinuous. Several may exist in the same faculty at the same time. Some combinations would likely be mutually detractive, others supportive. If the point is to provide models to be selected as an overall plan for the future, however, there may be strategic value in avoiding unnecessary complexity. It may be well, though, to combine the Excellent Conventional Model with one of the creative models. One would not expect the achievement of increments of higher quality to generate as much internal excitement as implementing an innovation. Its very conventionality may well make implementation difficult. If so it could draw sustenance from the robustness of an innovative atmosphere.

As a final point, organizational studies have usually found substantial difference between those factors which contribute to the goals of the organization as opposed to those of the individuals in the organization. In Faculties of Education, however, the professional goals of the individual faculty usually parallel closely the goals of the faculty as an organization. Thus everyone benefits from the achievement of one of the higher order states described here. All that stands in the way are the forces of inertia, both organizational and personal.

NOTE

- ¹ This paper was prepared for the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, January 1983 in connection with the university's distinguished visitor program.

REFERENCES

- Bloom, Benjamin S. *All our children learning*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1981.
- Clark, David L., & Guba, Egon G. Schools, colleges, and departments of education: Demographic and contextual features. In D. E. Griffiths & Donald J. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dilemma of the deanship*. Danville, Ill.: Interstate, 1980.
- Cyert, Richard M. The management of universities of constant or decreasing size. *Public Administration Review*, 1978, 38 (4), 344-349.
- Demetrulias, Diana & Deutsch, Alleen. *New audiences for teacher education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1982.
- Fullan, Michael. *The meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE Press, 1982.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1979, 15 (3), 43-65.
- Hopkins, David. The problem of change in Canadian Teacher Education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 1982, 12 (2).
- Katz, Daniel & Kahn, Robert L. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Kaufman, Herbert. The direction of organizational evolution. *Public Administration Review*, 1973, 33.

- Kimberly, John R., Miles, Robert H. et al. *The organizational life cycle*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Miles, Robert H. Findings and implications of organizational life cycle research. In Kimberly and Miles, 1980.
- Mingle, James R. et al. *The challenges of retrenchment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Perrow, Charles. Demystifying organizations. In R. C. Sarri & Y. Hasenfeld (Eds.), *The management of human services*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Starbuck, William H., & Nystrom, Paul C. Designing and understanding organizations. In Paul C. Nystrom & William H. Starbuck, (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational design*, 1: IX–XXII. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Starbuck, William H., Greve, Arent, & L. T. Hedberg Bo, Responding to crises. *Journal of Business Administration*, 1978, 9, 111–137.
- Weick, Karl E. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1976, 21 (1), 1–19.

Dieser Bericht versucht kurzfristige Zukünfte für Fakultäten der Pädagogik in Kanada durch Anwendung eines Beispiels, das auf die Analyse der Organisierungstheorien dieser Fakultäten basiert ist, vorauszusagen. Einige katastrophale Fälle werden als Endresultat der natürlichen Entwicklungen in den Organisationen selbst dargestellt. Diese Szenarien stellen verschiedene Tendenzformen dar und können nur durch spezifische Ausgleichsmaße vermieden werden. Es werden dann einige vorbildliche Situationen als alternative Beispiele, wonach die Fakultäten streben könnten, dargestellt. Es ist die Absicht dieser Arbeit, über die Stufe der Ausgleichs oder taktischen Änderungen, womit wir uns meistens befassen, hinauszugehen, um unsere Aufmerksamkeit dann auf andere Möglichkeiten unter den strategischen Alternativen, die wesentlich verschiedene Aufgaben umfassen, zu richten.

Este artículo trata de predecir el futuro a plazo mediano de las facultades de educación de educación de las universidades canadienses utilizando un modelo basado en el análisis de las estructuras organizativas de las mismas. Se nos presenta algunos tipos de situaciones desastrosas que pueden explicarse por las estructuras mismas. Estas situaciones representan varias corrientes que sería posible evitar al aplicar simplemente algunas medidas compensatorias. Luego se presentan situaciones de mejor caso en tanto modelos que las universidades tendrían que tratar de emular. Desde el punto de vista de este estudio es posible llegar más allá de las teorías y los cambios tácticos de los que generalmente nos ocupamos, para concentrarnos sobre todo en las alternativas que nos ofrecen las varias posibilidades estratégicas que implican, por su parte, compromisos diferentes.

John H. M. Andrews is Professor of Educational Administration and Higher Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z5.