

Planning and the educational administrator

C. E. Beeby

Unesco: International Institute for
Educational Planning

Fundamentals of educational planning—4

Included in the series:*

1. *What is Educational Planning?*
P. H. Coombs
2. *The Relation of Educational Plans to Economic and Social Planning*
R. Poignant
3. *Educational Planning and Human Resource Development*
F. Harbison
4. *Planning and the Educational Administrator*
C. E. Beeby
5. *The Social Context of Educational Planning*
C. A. Anderson
6. *The Costing of Educational Plans*
J. Vaizey, J. D. Chesswas

* Also published in French. Other titles to appear



Published in 1967 by the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Place de Fontenoy, 75 Paris-7^e
Printed by Koninklijke Drukkerij G. J. Thieme, N.V., Nimeguen
Cover design by Bruno Pfäffli

© Unesco 1967 IIEP.66/IL.4/A
Printed in the Netherlands

Fundamentals of educational planning

The booklets in this series are written primarily for two groups: those engaged in—or preparing for—educational planning and administration, especially in developing countries; and others, less specialized, such as senior government officials and civic leaders, who seek a more general understanding of educational planning and of how it can be of help to over-all national development. They are devised to be of use either for self study or in formal training programmes.

The modern conception of educational planning has attracted specialists from many disciplines. Each of them tends to see planning rather differently. The purpose of some of the booklets is to help these people explain their particular points of view to one another and to the younger men and women who are being trained to replace them some day. But behind this diversity there is a new and growing unity. Specialists and administrators in developing countries are coming to accept certain basic principles and practices that owe something to the separate disciplines but are yet a unique contribution to knowledge by a body of pioneers who have had to attack together educational problems more urgent and difficult than any the world had ever known. So other booklets in the series represent this common experience, and provide in short compass some of the best available ideas and experience concerning selected aspects of educational planning.

Since readers will vary so widely in their backgrounds, the authors have been given the difficult task of introducing their subjects from the beginning, explaining technical terms that may be commonplace to some but a mystery to others, and yet adhering to scholarly standards and never writing down to their readers, who, except in some particular speciality, are in no sense unsophisticated. This approach has the ad-

vantage that it makes the booklets readily intelligible to the general reader.

Although the series, under the general editorship of C. E. Beeby, has been planned on a definite pattern, no attempt has been made to avoid differences, or even contradictions, in the views expressed by the authors. It would be premature, in the Institute's view, to lay down a neat and tidy official doctrine in this new and rapidly evolving field of knowledge and practice. Thus, while the views are the responsibility of the authors, and may not always be shared by Unesco or the Institute, they are believed to warrant attention in the international market-place of ideas. In short, this seems the appropriate moment to make visible a cross-section of the opinions of authorities whose combined experience covers many disciplines and a high proportion of the countries of the world.

Foreword

As general editor of this series of booklets, C. E. Beeby has expressed to me some mild embarrassment at having himself written one that so deliberately sets out to describe educational planning from the sectional point of view of one of the professional groups now engaged in this complex activity. This, of course, is just what we hoped he would do, because one of the main purposes of the series, as we envisaged from the start, was to enable specialists of all kinds to discuss educational planning from their particular background and outlook. In this instance, the outlook is that of a top educational administrator, such as the man in charge of a ministry of education, which is a familiar role for Dr. Beeby.

The author pays valuable attention to the need for mutual understanding and good working relationships between educational authorities and planners on the one hand, and those (often economists by training) who are responsible for the planning of over-all economic and social development on the other hand. This is admittedly not always an easy relationship, especially at first, because the difficulties of communication which arise among professional groups that are reared on different concepts and semantics die slowly.

The experience of the Institute over the past three years, however, has convinced us that any such differences concerning educational planning are relatively superficial, and that a reasonable and tentative pegging out of claims in this new and rapidly growing field will reveal a wider area of agreement and common interest than at first appeared to be the case.

The author is now a research associate in the Center for Studies in Education and Development of the Graduate School of Education at

Harvard University. He was for twenty years director of education for New Zealand with some responsibilities also for education in that country's Pacific Island dependencies. Dr. Beeby was at one time Assistant Director-General of Unesco, and was later a member, and then chairman, of its executive board, while serving at the same time as New Zealand's ambassador to France. He has acted as educational consultant in a number of developing countries and to several international organizations. He served the IIEP well, apart from being general editor of this series, by planning and co-chairing its Symposium on the Qualitative Aspects of Educational Planning in summer 1966. Good background for this was his latest book, 'The Quality of Education in Developing Countries' (Harvard University Press).

PHILIP H. COOMBS
Director, IIEP

Planning and the educational administrator

The definition of terms is usually the dreariest method of opening any statement, but on this occasion I can see no alternative. Educational planning is still in that amorphous state where there is no agreement even as to its boundaries. Each of us comes to it from a different direction, and the track we have followed determines in no small measure the shape and content of what we see before us. And there is little point in running to the dictionary for a definition; educational planning has taken on new dimensions over the past decade, and its perimeter cannot be mapped from theory alone, but has to be painstakingly pegged out in practice before it can be enshrined in a verbal formula that most people will accept.

In the meantime, every specialist evolves the definition that best suits his purposes, his past experience, and, if you like, his prejudices. The fact that definitions vary does not necessarily mean that some of them are wrong in any logical sense. They expand or contract the boundaries of the subject and lay different emphases on elements within it, but what educational planning is, in fact, in any country will be decided by the politicians and by the interplay of powers. It must not be assumed from this that, intellectually speaking, educational planning can continue for all time to be all things to all men, or that it is of no significance what definition we accept. In an area as complex as this, politicians must lean heavily on professionals, and the kind of definition the experts adopt will influence the administrative mechanism that is set up to do the planning. For example, if the making of a plan is regarded as something that can be separated intellectually from its implementation, this will affect the educational administrator's place in the planning hierarchy. A cynical outsider might have some basis for assuming that any

individual's definition of educational planning reflects in some degree his judgement of the part that specialists of his type should play in it. I see nothing wrong in this. Such competing claims, if made by reasonable men with the humility their present state of ignorance demands of all who are engaged in planning, should lead to a better working partnership between specialists who, up till now, have had little experience on a common task. The definition that appears on page 13 differs in emphasis, and perhaps even in material respects, from those given or assumed by the writers of other booklets, since it is written quite openly from the point of view of an educational administrator. This calls for no apology, and other booklets in the series will correct any imbalance.

The educational administrator

It does call, however, for a clearer statement of just who the 'educational administrator' is, whose part in planning is to be discussed. In this essay the term is used in a restrictive sense to denote the few senior administrators in a ministry or a state department of education who come closest to the people who are responsible for over-all economic and social planning. Even with this restriction it covers some very different types. Unless otherwise stated, no distinction is made between politicians and career administrators, between ministers and permanent secretaries or directors-general of education. In addition to his policy-making functions as a member of cabinet, a minister of education shares with his officials a complex set of administrative duties the allocation of which varies with the country and with the personalities involved. Since officials in most cases exercise their executive powers in the name of the minister, it would be unreasonable to exclude him from the category of administrators. In the eyes of the public, indeed, the minister and his most senior official should be one and indivisible.

The minister's own knowledge of education cannot be taken for granted. In Africa, where, in the days before independence, teaching was the first channel of employment open to educated Africans, many ministers have themselves been members of the profession, but in many other countries the minister of education, whatever his skill as an administrator, will have little or no direct professional knowledge of education. Even some of the senior administrators in the ministry or department of education will lack professional training in education. For example, in some of the countries that were formerly under British rule, it is cus-

tomary to have as the senior civil servant in the ministry of education a permanent secretary who is a member of an élite corps of general administrators, who move from one ministry to another. Within this kind of system, the next man in line will normally be a director or director-general of education who is the chief authority on professional matters, but, in countries where a whole group of officials change with the government or the ministry, it is not unusual to find several of the most senior posts held by persons whose training in education is lacking or minimal.

Although the pattern varies so widely, at some level in any ministry there will be found officials who have come up through the teaching profession or an allied service, and who are employed as general administrators, inspectors, curriculum specialists, or controllers of such activities as teacher training or vocational guidance. Whatever the qualifications of the minister and his most senior official, in a well-organized ministry they will have constant need for these specialists. The essence of a good administrator at the top level is that he rarely acts alone. He is surrounded by officials and advisers, and, whether or not he follows their advice, he would be stupid to act before hearing it. After spending most of my life as one, I find it difficult to think of the senior administrator as being quite an individual when he makes a decision or advises his government. He has at his command the accumulated experience and wisdom—and of course, the prejudices—of all his colleagues, and though he is something more than the spokesman for the group, he is also something more than an individual. If this smacks too much of bureaucratic mysticism, the administrator can be regarded as a man who is constantly and profoundly influenced by a number of experienced people on whom he is dependent for most of his facts and at least some of his judgments.

It is in this sense that the term educational administrator is used here. In any other sense some of the claims made for him would sound inflated. Administrators are rarely supermen, but they do represent an experience wider than any man could achieve alone.

Who then is the 'planner'? Any country that is moving towards educational planning in the modern sense tends to develop the operation at two different levels, one within the ministry and the other national. There is usually a unit (or units) in the ministry of education—and sometimes in other ministries as well if control is divided—which concerns itself with planning activities, or, at the very least, with the preparation of the material on which plans will be built. Some members of this unit will almost certainly have come up through the school system and

may be extremely knowledgeable both on planning procedures and on professional policy. The functions and status of the unit vary widely from place to place. In some ministries the head of the unit may be little more than a high-level technician providing facts and figures called for by an educationally sophisticated director or permanent secretary, who himself co-ordinates them for presentation to the minister and the government. In other cases, where the top officials are lethargic or lacking in real knowledge of the school system, the energetic head of a planning unit, with direct access to the minister, may come to exercise an influence on policy that goes far beyond mere techniques.

It would be useful to analyse for a number of countries, the respective roles in the process of planning of the different officials in a ministry or department of education. In some of them it might be possible to pick on one person in the ministry—ranging from the minister himself down to the head of the planning unit—who might be called ‘the planner’ in the sense that he had the predominant influence on the plan finally presented, but the picture is so kaleidoscopic that, in any generalized statement about the work within ministries of education, the term is better avoided. So I have fallen back on the concept of ‘the administrator’ as a composite figure who represents the planning as well as the organizational skills within the ministry. It will, I trust, be for another booklet in the series to tease out the lines of authority in the complex organization coming under the minister of education and to suggest ways in which it can most effectively contribute to planning in various circumstances. For present purposes, I shall ignore this problem entirely and shall concentrate on the relations between the ministry of education as a whole (‘the administrator’), and whatever mechanism the government has set up for over-all national planning. This also takes many forms, but there will normally be two elements, an expert body—whether it be treasury, or a planning commission, or some other *ad hoc* group—and cabinet or the chief executive who will make the final decisions. Within the expert group there will usually be one or more individuals who will concern themselves specially with the planning of education and kindred activities. These are the people referred to when ‘planner’ or ‘planning expert’ are used in this essay. In a well-knit system there will be constant communication—as well as a little inevitable tension—between these ‘planners’ and the officials of the ministry, just as the minister will play his own part in the deliberations of cabinet on the over-all economic and social plan. In a federal state or in one with decentralized control of the schools, there may be other politicians or officials who come into

the planning process at one stage or another.¹ It is against this background of delicately balanced powers and influences that one must seek a realistic definition of educational planning.

DEFINITION *Educational planning is the exercising of foresight in determining the policy, priorities and costs of an educational system, having due regard for economic and political realities, for the system's potential for growth, and for the needs of the country and of the pupils served by the system.*

This is obviously a much wider definition of planning than is often given, and reflects the administrator's inability to draw demarcations in a process that, in practice, seems to him to be continuous. It differs from some other recent definitions in several respects: (a) while stressing the importance of the new economic dimension to planning, it still covers processes that went on long before the economists became actively interested in the planning of education; (b) it draws no sharp line of distinction between the making of a plan, the adoption of a plan, and its implementation; (c) it lays stress on the political realities, on the balance of forces affecting the adoption of a plan; (d) it mentions the needs both of the country and of the children; (e) it gives special consideration to an educational system's capacity for growth.

The special point of view of the administrator—or, since we are a mixed lot, it might be safer in this context to say *an* administrator—can conveniently be discussed under five headings:

New dimension to planning

There has been educational planning of a sort ever since education came to be regarded as a national responsibility. No administrator worth his salt could control an educational system without exercising some degree of foresight and struggling for some measure of consistency. At its worst such 'planning' was pretty feeble and might consist of little more than an annual scramble to put together a budget. At its best it produced some vigorous and far-seeing reports that influenced national education systems for decades. Government commissions, consultative committees, national conferences, universities, and independent research organiza-

1. In some countries, education and the planning of education are not regarded as primarily the responsibility of the central government, and local or regional administrators have more real power than might appear from the brief references to them here. There is, however, a growing tendency for central governments to include education in their national planning. For the sake of simplicity, I am assuming that this practice is more widespread than in fact it is.

tions have all, in their time and place, produced sweeping schemes for the reform of education, and overworked administrators in dusty offices have not infrequently turned out plans that were down-to-earth and yet not without vision. To be sure, many of these schemes and plans have slipped untimely into some quiet pigeon-hole, but this scarcely distinguishes them as a class from sophisticated, modern educational plans.

What then is the new dimension in educational planning that marks it off from the classical type of planning carried out by consultative committees and others over the past hundred years? The most obvious difference lies in the modern planner's intense interest in economic growth, in human resource development, and in what the economist calls 'macro-planning', the simultaneous consideration of all a country's interlocking development plans. The old-fashioned educational planners can hardly be blamed for not having been interested in these, for, with rare exceptions, nobody else was either. They could not gear their planning to national economic plans that did not exist, and as for the country's manpower resources, these were supposed to be looked after by the play of the free market. In theory—in so far as there was a theory—the educator met the demand as it arose, or, because of the time-lag in the provision of educational facilities, some time after it arose. This is not a completely fair picture, as the educators did, on occasion, blaze the trail. In my own country, for example, in the years immediately following the war, the department of education and the technical schools, without the benefit of a national economic or manpower plan, did as much to create the demand for technicians as they did to satisfy it when industry belatedly took it up.

Nor can it be justly said that the educational administrator is not interested in finance. No one who has tussled with treasury for the annual budget for education or, in a decentralized system, has wheedled the taxpayer into a new bond issue for schools can ever forget that the funds for education are not unlimited. Every scheme he puts up to the government for approval has to be costed, and its acceptance or rejection may hinge on the economies he can make in it. Yet somehow there is a subtle difference between the attitude toward finance of the average educational administrator and that of the economist working on the economic plans for the country as a whole.

The contrast shows most clearly between an economic planning commission and the classic type of education commission, a combination of administrators, theorists, teachers, and laymen, to which many countries have been in the habit of referring major problems of policy. A

common procedure has been for an education commission to draw up sweeping recommendations for reform within its terms of reference, and then either to present them to the government uncosted or to sketch out a generalized estimate of costs *after* the recommendations on policy have been decided. This is not to say that all education commissions have blissfully ignored economic realities—though some have. The administratively sophisticated members of most commissions have had an idea of at least the order of magnitude of expenditure to which their recommendations would commit the government, but the commissions have not commonly regarded it as part of their function to make rigorous costing of alternative solutions to a problem *before* deciding on the policy they will recommend. I have myself asked of a commission during its deliberations, 'But how much will this proposed measure cost?' only to receive the reply, 'Let us decide the policy first, and we can give you the costs later'. The costing of schemes before coming to a decision on recommendations of policy seems to me to be of the essence of modern planning, for, without it, a rational consideration of priorities becomes difficult, if not impossible.

Here again it is easy to be unfair to the educator. (In this still hazy realm it is hard to make any generalization without being unfair to someone.) The idea of carefully costing alternative proposals before putting one up to the government for approval is nothing new to the good educational administrator. He has normally done this with specific proposals he has submitted on the policy for such varied things as buildings, pupil transport, free textbooks, and new schemes for child guidance or teacher training, and his usual method of handling the global recommendations of an education commission has been to break them down into their components and to present these over a period as a series of separate costed proposals. What he has rarely done—and this is the crux of the argument—is to cost a global scheme in advance with a constant eye on the country's economic plans and potential and on its manpower needs. This is the new dimension which the educational administrator will ignore in the future only at the risk of losing his rightful place in the process of planning.

The administrator may continue to be sceptical of some of the techniques of long-range economic and manpower planning and of the results that they achieve, and he will suspect that, however global the planning of education may appear on paper, a great deal of it will, in fact, continue to be done piecemeal in response to political pressures and half-expected crises. He knows too that, however enthusiastic treasury may be for

macro-planning, in other moods it will drag its feet on certain sectors of the educational plan in order to spread the rise in expenditure over a number of years.¹ But, whatever his doubts, the administrator must accept the fact that, after the discovery of education by the economists, the business of planning, however it may be defined, will never be quite the same again even in advanced countries, while, in developing countries, it may begin to look very different indeed from what was acceptable in the past. It is natural that the economists, breaking into an established field with new techniques, should exaggerate the novelty of what they have brought, and it is equally understandable that the educator should respond by stressing the planning he has always done. A fertile marriage of the two sets of skills will come only when each side recognizes the value of what the other has to offer and the limitations of what either can do alone.

Planning, adoption, execution

It is understandable that a specialist interested in the theory of planning should draw a sharp distinction between the preparation, the adoption, and the execution of a plan, and should insist that they be kept 'analytically separate'.² The intellectual analysis of each process is made easier if the untidy interactions between them are temporarily ignored. But one wonders if theory is not bound eventually to concern itself with these very interactions. The practitioner certainly must, for a plan becomes workable only when the sharp edges of theory have been ground down by the play between the technical experts who make the first draft of the plan, the politicians who amend and approve it, and the administrators who carry out its parts and in so doing inevitably alter them. Too great insistence, even in theory, on the purity of the planning process could result in the setting-up of a planning mechanism that made it unduly difficult for the mutually abrasive action between the ideas of these three groups to take place.

The danger of this purer-than-life concept of planning is that it might lead some people to assume that the approval of a plan is a single, cli-

1. For that matter, when national development planning does not come directly under the minister of finance, there is sometimes tension between treasury and whatever *ad hoc* body has been set up to handle over-all planning.
2. Y. Dror, 'The Planning Process', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Brussels, Vol. 29 no. 1, 1963, p. 51: 'Planning is substantially—and, in most cases, also formally and legally—a process of *preparing* a set of decisions to be approved and executed by some other organs. Even if the same unit combines planning functions with authority to approve and execute, these are distinct, though inter-dependent, processes which must be kept analytically separate.'

mactic event rather than the culmination of a long series of adjustments and compromises, in which those who have to give the final stamp of approval and those who have to carry out the plan must be involved. There are few who would contest the right of a government to be regularly consulted during the preparation of a country's over-all economic plan. Such consultation is usually inherent in the structure of the planning organs that it sets up; even if the chief executive or one of his cabinet colleagues is not the nominal chairman of the planning commission¹ an official or adviser very close to him will normally be its working head.² Whether the minister of education is included in these consultations will depend upon his standing in the government and on the weight given to education in the planning process.

Curiously enough, the traditional consultative commission on education, although it will almost always have official members, is often less directly influenced in its deliberations by the government than is the average planning commission. This is not necessarily a sign of strength; a government is most likely to try to influence the decisions of those bodies that it regards as of prime importance. It may expect the education commission to express its recommendations in such general and qualitative terms that they can either be side-stepped with ease or adopted with a flexible time-table. As educational plans begin to mesh more closely with general economic and manpower planning and to be costed and phased before they are presented for adoption, it will become more than ever important that ministries of education be somehow involved in the whole planning process from the start.

Countries vary greatly in the extent to which the educational administrator is called into consultation before approval is given to the government's over-all economic plan. In some cases there is an educational sub-committee officially linked with the planning commission, in others a member or officer of the commission acts as the liaison with education and a related group of departments, and sometimes the relations, though real, are quite informal. In what seem to me to be the best systems, there is also a planning unit within the department of education which, either directly or through the permanent head of the department, is in regular contact with the central planning commission. There are some countries, however, where the educational administrator's only function is

1. A planning commission is not set up in all countries that do planning; the term is used here as a convenient expression for whatever planning mechanism is established on a national scale.
2. In India, for example, the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet is also Chief of Staff of the Planning Commission.

to provide the figures for which he is asked, and to carry out his part of the plan when it is presented to him. It is amongst this group of countries that one finds the least effective examples of over-all educational planning, where the alleged plan for education is so vague as to be virtually useless or so out of touch with reality as to be dangerous.

No one would suggest that the top officials of government departments should sit in when the sums to be allocated to each under the plan is being decided,¹ although the planning authority would be very unwise not to have heard them fully beforehand on the problems likely to be created by the various possible levels of expenditure. (In all honesty it must be admitted that the authority would be equally unwise not to discount the estimates of each administrator by a percentage determined by a knowledge of his judgement, his temperament, and his past record.) If the central plan proceeds to allot, within the total sum proposed for education, the amounts to be made available within each major division, for example, to primary, secondary, technical, or higher education, it becomes essential that the educational administrator play an active part in the process. Only he is in a position to know the delicate balance between the parts of a school system, and the effects that the sudden expansion or the starving of one part may have upon the rest. This knowledge is only in part the result of a study of the statistics that anyone could undertake; it flows in some measure from his 'feel' of the living and complex system he controls, and his understanding of what the human beings who compose it can do and will stand. This is all so obvious as not to need mentioning were it not for the fact that it is sometimes forgotten both in theory and in practice.

Even those who admit that the preparation of an educational plan and its adoption are, in practice, inseparable, and that the collaboration of the administrator is essential in its formulation might still maintain that the business of putting the plan into operation is no part of the process of planning. This view seems to me to rest upon an oversimplified concept of the formation of policy. In theory, the government determines the policy and adopts the plan, and the administrator's job is to carry it out. But anyone who has worked at a high level within a national system knows that the true picture is often very different from this. It is true that any good educational plan will be firmly based on certain broad political and social principles that have either been formally propounded

1. The minister of education, however, will obviously take part in any cabinet discussion on the allocation under the plan of funds to the various departments, and of certain resources to private industry.

by the government or are taken for granted in that particular society, but at a more immediately practical level, the educational sections of many long-range national plans contain more than their share of the pious hopes that spring up so readily when education is mentioned, and the administrator often finds himself given a general indication as to direction rather than a programme laid down in terms of speed and cost.

This is particularly likely to be the case when the point at issue is an improvement in the quality of the work in the schools rather than a mere quantitative extension of existing institutions and services, where reasonable projections can be made on the basis of current practice. No one knows enough about the problems of raising the standards of a whole school system to be able to predict with accuracy the date at which a particular level of excellence will be reached or how much it will cost to get there—even if we knew with certainty how to define the level in the first place. Educational plans, for example, sometimes lay down goals for reducing the number of 'drop-outs' or 'repeaters' who are the bane of many under-developed school systems, but we know so little about the causes of drop-outs or about the effects upon quality of speeding up the flow of pupils without improving the training of the teachers that a statement of a fixed goal within a given time is rarely better than an inspired guess and may be simply misleading. The situation is made even more difficult when the goals that are set are dictated in part by election promises, hasty decisions made on political grounds, or idealistic commitments entered into in the first exhilarating days of a country's independence. The educational plans of some countries are complicated, for instance, by their governments having committed themselves publicly to the achievement of universal primary schooling by a date that they now know to be unrealistic but which they cannot openly renounce.

Whatever the reason, long-term educational plans are notoriously difficult to express in terms definite enough for their implementation to be no more than the carrying out of fixed instructions; and where they are as definite as this, experience frequently shows that major adjustments have to be made, and the administrator either has to make them himself or to go back to cabinet for fresh guidelines. Even if he is not free to act on his own authority, he is expected to make recommendations for amendments and so comes back again into the main planning stream. Governments have frequently only an emergent purpose that becomes altered in the very process of moving towards the goal, and policy not only determines ways and means but is, in some measure, itself determined by the ways and means chosen to put it into operation. This is

not always a conscious process. An administrative decision may be made on an apparently minor point and a precedent created without anyone realizing that this is a significant new departure in policy. Public pressure and the irresistible logic of individuals and organizations applying the new precedent to their own slightly different cases may, within the period of a plan, produce unforeseen results no less significant than those brought about by conscious purpose.

There are, needless to say, instances where policy decisions can be given from above in a form that leaves no room for doubt or gloss, and the administrator is certainly not free to exceed the total sum allotted to him in the budget. But it is just at the point where his annual budget is being prepared that the administrator can exercise a great effect on policy. Even in those cases where the plan for education has been phased and costed for the full five-year period, there are a myriad factors that can alter the annual allocations foreseen by the most determined planning expert. Changes in the volume of foreign exchange, a drop in revenue, or a rise in expenditure due to unexpected demands in some other sector may reduce the education vote in any year (an unexpected rise is, unhappily, less frequent), and anything from a bottle-neck in the building industry to sheer political expediency before an election can advance or retard the rate of expenditure under sections of the budget.

This means that the administrator, in preparing his annual budget for presentation to the government, must make a partial review of the long-term educational plan. If the plan has been loosely drawn he may have considerable room for manoeuvre, and if it is too tight and restrictive, he may have no small influence in determining where the cuts and substitutions shall be made. A shrewd administrator who knows how to point up the unfortunate social or political implications of certain cuts in expenditure may, on occasion, secure from a reluctant minister of finance an increase in his total vote.

All of which adds up to the view that educational planning is a continuous process and that the educational administrator must be in it somehow from the beginning to the end if he is to help make it realistic in the first place, and help mould it to changing conditions as it unrolls.

Political realities

Political judgement is at the heart of planning in the sense in which the term has been used here. Even the theorist who sees planning primarily as a technical exercise leading to the presentation to the government of

a logical and statistically satisfying plan would not deny the right of the politician to make the final decision. He might, however, be shocked at a suggestion that some 'political' element enters into almost every phase of the planning process in the sense that a choice of priorities at any level normally involves vested interests, material or intellectual, and some degree of tension between their proponents; and that in the resolution of this tension, compromise, personalities, and pure logic are liable to be inextricably intertwined.

It is commonly admitted that this tension between divergent views operates when choices are being made between priorities at the highest level. For example, when a government is deciding what aid it shall give to private schools, or whether it shall check the expansion of primary schools in order to improve the quality of the existing ones, men of good will, starting from the same set of facts and apparently using the same rules of logic, will arrive at very different conclusions. The process by which the government comes to its decision may conform much less to the pattern of the syllogism than it does to the 'parallelogram of forces' by which (if I remember aright my physics of half a century ago) the movement of a body is determined when it is subject to external tensions in different directions at the same time. As an administrator, I have come to believe that the same mechanism, involving the resolution of contending forces that are not necessarily entirely rational, frequently plays a part in official deliberations well below what is normally considered the political level. Even the most objective of planning experts are not completely isolated in practice from the tensions within the parallelogram of forces.

Political forces, in the broadest sense of that term, may be considered as operating in three different modes. In the first, some of the forces may be so widely diffused as to escape identification. No government is completely free to decide on any list of priorities that it likes. Its choices are circumscribed not only by the political and social philosophies for which it openly stands but also, more subtly and powerfully, by the 'Weltanschauung'. For example, in this decade, when the right to education has been so universally acclaimed and demanded, a government would have to be very powerful or very rash to announce a policy of steadily reducing the number of schools. In the phrase so often heard in political circles, 'the country wouldn't stand for it'; the official, no less than the politician, is influenced by the prevailing mood of the country and by the values it takes for granted, and, unless he is enormously insensitive, he is unlikely to make a major recommendation that runs counter to them. Because

of the relative unanimity, real or apparent, between those involved in decisions at this level of generality, the resolution of tensions may not be very obvious.

It is in their second mode of operation that political influences tally most closely with the forces to which the term is commonly applied, and where opposing tensions demonstrably result in compromises. Pressure groups and the tenets of party programmes compete, in the minds of a government, with one another and with the cooler advice cabinet receives from officials. The official, in turn, knows that his views will have scant hope of being accepted if they run head-on against some massive or cherished political force, and he seeks some way of impinging on it more obliquely. This does not mean that the career administrator or the planning technician should become involved in issues of party politics. In most developed countries they are forbidden to do so, and they may often feel impelled to throw their weight on the side of principle and reason against political expediency of any kind. One thinks, for example, of the cases where, for the planning expert, the development of technical education or the improvement of the quality of existing schools is clearly preferable to the rapid expansion of low-quality primary schools to which the government is being pressed by parents or party. The point I wish to make is that it is the *weight* of reasoned argument they are throwing against the weight of other demands, and that the result is likely to be a compromise more or less attuned to the competing forces.¹

Even when the career administrators and planning experts are closeted in their committee room they are still not insulated from the clash of opinions and the play of personalities. Unless some are the narrowest of technicians, there is at the back of every mind a feeling for what 'the country will stand' and some understanding of the political pressures to which the government will be subjected while it is considering their recommendations. These factors will carry different weights with the various people around the table, and this in itself will introduce, though in a weakened form, some of the tensions of the outside world into the official meeting. No less important are the personalities and attitudes of the officials themselves. In the making of any major plan, economic or educational, men with no obvious party bias can advocate so many divergent paths that the judgement and social philosophies of the members of a planning commission or committee can be as important as their

1. The whole of this argument applies only to nationals of the country and not to foreign experts, who may be aiding them, and whose position demands that they be most circumspect where the exercise of pressure of any kind is involved.

technique, and the skill and weight of advocacy may determine whether marginal funds are spent on capital works or consumption, on education or roads, on universities or primary schools. In an expert group one has a right to expect that the cruder political pressures, though they cannot be completely ignored, will not be the major factors determining its recommendations, but it would be naïve to assume that another group of experts, with the same facts before them, would necessarily come to the same conclusions.

If it be admitted that planning is not a purely logical process, that, when all the facts are known, much still depends upon the balance struck between competing views and interests, and upon the tenacity and skill of the men who defend each of them, the implications for the educational administrator become tolerably clear. He must be something more than a pawn in the planning game. It is not enough that he merely hand over the facts and figures as they are demanded of him. It is his duty, within the bounds of official propriety and good taste, to see that their full implications are understood by those who are to make the next decision, and that the claims of education for funds and facilities are pressed no less assiduously than those of competing services. I shall deal later with the points at which the administrator can properly exercise such influence as he has.

Whether all this is a part of planning depends on the definition of the term that one accepts. It is certainly a part of administration, and the administrator who holds himself aloof from any attempt to influence the nature of the plan is likely to find his department at a disadvantage compared with those of his peers who take a less detached view of their function. Conversely, the administrator who, in his enthusiasm, overreaches himself will, in the long run, also lose out. In this, as in most of his activities, the administrator walks a knife-edge.

Needs of the country and of the children

There is no need to labour further the obligations of the educational administrator to seek to adapt the school system to the economic and manpower needs of the country; this aspect of planning is covered by other booklets in the series, as well as in the general literature. Nor should it be necessary to stress that economic criteria are not the sole measures of the schools' contribution to society, that a plan for education must take account of other social values than those of the market-place. The educational administrator has no right to assume that, of all the people

involved in planning, he is the sole guardian of these wider values, although he may, with others, have to recall them to mind in a group of specialists if educational planning in any place shows signs of being too tightly dominated by narrower goals and techniques.

There is one respect, however, in which the educational administrator is set apart from other specialists in a committee on planning: he is the only one there whose professional duty it is to think first of all of the interests of the child. The others, the politicians, economists, statisticians, in their capacity as parents and citizens, may be as interested as he is in the welfare of the children, and even in their professional roles they are unlikely to treat the growing generation simply as a means to an end. But each has his dominant professional interest, and, struggle as they may to be objective, it is inevitable that, when they sit around a table to hammer out a plan, every man will tend to lay special stress on the sets of values and the principles with which he finds himself most at home. It would be arrogant of the educational administrator to regard himself as the only guardian of the rights of the child, but, within the official planning establishment, he may quite properly be expected to be their chief expositor.

What is at issue here is something less than the formidable question whether there can indeed be a conflict between the needs of the country and the needs of a generation of its citizens. The question, as it usually arises, is whether some measure that is proposed to help satisfy an economic or social demand will result in undue hardship to a group of children. It might, for example, be a proposal to introduce fees for secondary schooling or to insist on very early specialization for one type of child to meet the need for a particular kind of worker. (I have myself heard a secretary of treasury suggest to a planning committee in a developing country that the Bachelor of Arts degree be abolished and that the first degree for every student be in science.) In each of these cases society as a whole might, in the long-run, suffer as much as the individual, but it would be certain classes of pupil who would bear the brunt of the change in the first place. In many instances the politician will be quick to sense the political effects of such innovations, but in others it will take a professional educationist to see all the implications for categories of pupils, and he will be doing less than his duty if he refrains from making his views known as early as possible in the proceedings. The new techniques in planning have, if anything, intensified the need for the educational watchdog.

Capacity for growth

There has been no dearth of plans that have proved in some major respect unworkable, but no competent planning expert would put forward a plan unless he had taken some steps to see that it was feasible. This does not absolve the educational administrator from his special responsibility to study every plan affecting education to see if it can in fact be carried out in the time proposed and at the estimated cost. The difference here between the national development planning expert and the educational administrator is partly a matter of inside knowledge and partly one of emphasis. The essence of the expert's job is to look into the future, to balance the claim of education against those of other services, to propose targets, and to suggest the disposition of resources that will best enable the country to reach those targets in a given time. He may himself have first-hand knowledge of some of these resources, probably in the realm of finance, in which case he may make a shrewd assessment of the capacity of these portions of the system to achieve the target. In the case of education he will rarely have enough personal experience to do this adequately and must either rely on the advice of the educational administrator or make a guess based on such figures as he has been given. In any event, the general planning expert will have determined the target for education on the basis of a complex set of factors going far beyond the school system,¹ and he of all people must not lose sight of the target.

The educational administrator may perhaps take account of the same set of factors, but his emphasis is different. He is acutely aware that, once the plan is approved, his is the main responsibility for seeing that it works. He will bear most of the blame if the target is not reached by the end of the plan, but equally will he be criticized if the educational system is disrupted this year in order to meet a deadline five years hence. Plan or no plan, the system must work today and tomorrow, and the endless committee meetings and the flow of letters from anxious parents and angry politicians do not cease just because an exciting new five-year plan has landed on the administrator's desk. So he is acutely conscious, perhaps too conscious, of the demands of the present and of the limits imposed on the growth of his school system by its existing de-

1. In countries where sections of even formal education (for example, medical, agricultural, technical) fall outside the province of the ministry of education, the experts in the national planning agency may be the persons who suggest how the plans of the various ministries involved in education should be co-ordinated and balanced.

iciencies—of teachers, buildings, books, ideas, special skills, and administrative personnel. He knows better than anyone else the ways in which a plan can drop behind schedule; experience has taught him that financial approvals get lost for months in the maze of governmental procedures, that buildings take longer to plan and erect than even the pessimist had feared, that the gestation period for a set of good new textbooks is more protracted than any layman can understand, and that an increase in the number of primary teachers is dependent upon providing more secondary schools and teachers, and this again on additional universities and better salaries for professors.

It is essential then that the opinion of the administrator be sought, early in the planning operation, on the capacity of the educational system to meet the demands made on it by any proposed plan. This is not to say that his judgement will necessarily be accepted by the government without question. A vigorous and imaginative administrator is no less likely than the national planning expert to pick on a target that will stretch the system to the limit, but not all administrators are in this class, and many will operate more effectively if someone sets for them a goal that is a little ahead of the best they think they can achieve. If it is too far ahead, the result will be disappointment and confusion.

Balance of influences in planning

This conception of educational planning as involving, from the beginning to the end, a complex interplay between the politician, the national development planner, and the administrator¹ is not without its dangers for the administrator. It deliberately blurs lines of distinction that are kept beautifully clear in the 'purer' concept of planning advocated by Dror, 'the process of preparing a set of decisions to be approved and executed by some other organs'. If he is to play a part in the evolution of plans and policies as well as in their implementation, it is important that the educational administrator understand just what his role is at each point and the limits beyond which it would be unwise or improper

1. In this section the term 'administrator' is used in rather a narrower sense than in the earlier part of the booklet where it included the political administrator (minister). Only the career administrator is referred to here. Since the purpose is, in part, to show the relation between the administrator and the government, it would only complicate matters to include the minister, who combines administrative with overt policy-making functions. The administrator is still thought of, however, as a composite figure rather than as an individual.

for him to seek to extend his influence. Conditions will vary from country to country and even for the same individual as the result of a change of minister or of government, and so it is impossible to lay down fixed rules for the administrator as he picks his way delicately over very uncertain ground. What he can do, however, is to extend his normal code of professional ethics to cover the relatively new function of medium and long-range planning. Even this is not a 'code' in the sense of a universally accepted set of rules whose application is immediately obvious in every situation, but there are certain broad principles that the majority of good career administrators in most countries would try to observe in their relations with their ministers and their governments. I see nothing in the new educational planning that makes those principles less applicable there than in more routine operations, although, as in all administration, the less routine the activity the more burden it throws on the judgement and professional conscience of the administrator. These principles are so much a part of the experienced administrator's daily life as to make it unnecessary to recall them to his attention, but unless some of the more important are specifically stated, the definition of educational planning adopted in this booklet will lie wide open to misinterpretation, particularly by those not versed in administration.

The basic principle is obvious: the final overt decisions on plans and major policies lie with the government. No responsible administrator would doubt that it is his duty to carry out the decisions of the government, whether or not he agrees with them. If his disagreement is profound enough to make this impossible, his only alternative is to resign. Were this the whole story the administrator's life would be easy, though dull, but it has already been said that the government's policy on education may have been expressed in terms so vague and general as to leave to the administrator a decision between alternatives that itself makes policy. He can, in case of serious doubt, go back to the chief executive or cabinet for a ruling, but he will not necessarily be thanked if he constantly pesters them, or even his minister, for rulings on problems that they feel he could be expected to solve himself.¹ On other occasions, as was suggested earlier, not even the administrator himself may realize that new policy has been made until he sees the consequences that

1. This, it must be said, assumes that both the minister and the official are fairly mature and experienced persons working within a tolerably stable system. Some of the statements on this and succeeding pages would need to be modified in cases where the minister jealously guarded the power of making all but the most routine decisions and where the official was so insecure as to be afraid to speak his mind.

follow from his having set some apparently innocuous precedent.

In making an important decision within the tenuous limits of a loosely worded plan, the administrator is not free to come to the conclusion that he personally would find most satisfying. He is under an obligation to choose the alternative that he feels the government would have made if it had been faced with the decision and had known all the facts. This may appear to contradict what I said earlier about the capacity of an administrator to make modifications to a plan in the very act of implementing it, but there is no contradiction if one is aware of the real relations between a competent and trusted senior administrator and the government he serves. No government that is doing its proper job of laying down general policy covering all national affairs can have the time or the knowledge to determine the application of its policies in every set of circumstances, and, even when it is making crucial decisions itself, it must often lean heavily on the advice of its top officials. So the administrator, in deciding what the government would have done in any particular instance, is, in nine cases out of ten, estimating what its decision would have been *after listening to his advice*. There may sometimes be only a hair-line between this and making the decision on the basis of his own beliefs, but it is a line no administrator should cross. Much depends on the peculiarly subtle relationship between the senior administrator and his minister. The minister often has quite a wide discretion even on matters of policy, and, if the relationship is one of mutual trust, the administrator can exercise, under him or through him, a considerable influence on the formation of the plan for education and also on the modifications that become necessary in the course of its execution. But what he exercises here is still influence and not power, which continues to reside in the government. So the heading of this section is the 'balance of influences in planning', and not the 'balance of power'.

If the duty of the administrator is to obey, no less basic is his duty to warn and advise, even if his advice is unpopular with those to whom it is given. Since this is a more demanding function than mere obeying, it is more likely to be neglected, especially by the timorous and the uncertain. It sometimes takes a great deal of courage on the part of the administrator and of understanding in the politician to accept the fact that the offering of unpleasant advice is no less a sign of loyalty than is the carrying out of instructions. It is a function that has special significance in long-range planning because of the lasting effects of every decision. Stated baldly, this is all very obvious, but not every country has set up the type of mechanism for planning that makes it easy for the educational

administrator to give advice and warnings at the times when they are most likely to be effective.

The issues on which the administrator's advice will most readily be taken are those of a professional nature, such as the probable effects on the quality of the work in the schools of an increase in the size of classes or a reduction in the length of training of teachers in order to meet an urgent demand for more school places. Here the educational administrator's judgement is more likely to be correct than anyone else's, though he should not be allowed to forget that it is a judgement, and so open to question by intelligent laymen; there are few situations in education comparable to the engineer's calculation of the stress under which a girder will break if its diameter is reduced. When the point at issue is one of finance, buildings, or school transport, the career administrator still has behind him the accumulated experience of the department, but the minister will begin to feel himself on surer ground, and on matters touching politics he will almost certainly assume that he is the authority. Nevertheless, the administrator, because of his daily dealings with teachers' organizations, parents' groups, and regional, local and private educational authorities,¹ is in a privileged position to gauge the probable effects of any proposal in the plan upon these powerful bodies, and is, I believe, under an obligation to pass his judgements on to the government, while realizing that the minister, with his trained politician's ear to the ground, may be even more sensitive to such group reactions. The point at which an administrator will stop concerning himself with the political implications of a proposed plan will depend upon the traditional practices in the country, his personal relations with his minister, and his own professional code of ethics.

The educational administrator's relations with the other administrators and specialists involved in devising the national plan are less subtle than this. The representative of every department or agency knows that he is in competition with the rest for monies that come from a limited pool, and the amount of pressure he brings to bear, by argument and persuasion, will depend, in part, upon the effort others are making and, in part, on a shrewd estimation of the point at which additional pressure begins to arouse irritation and resistance in planning commission, treas-

1. To simplify the argument I have, throughout this essay, made too little reference to these bodies. Whether or not they play an active part in the planning process will depend upon government policy and upon local conditions, but the administrator, be he minister or official, would do well, in any event, to consult them, to the extent that his obligations to the government permit, on all matters directly concerning them.

ury, or whatever body has the next decision to make. Since the final decision will be made in cabinet or by the chief executive, the administrator knows that he will probably exercise his greatest influence by working through his minister and he should obviously be perfectly frank about this with the officials of other departments with whom he may be negotiating. All that needs stressing at the moment is that, in practice, the administrator's part in planning is seldom a purely passive one, and that he may operate at several different levels in making the case for a given amount of expenditure on education over the planning period or for a particular distribution of funds within the service for which he is responsible.

At whatever level he is operating, the degree of authority with which the administrator can speak and the weight he may reasonably expect to carry will vary greatly from phase to phase of an extended planning operation. In another place¹ I have, with a deplorable mixture of military terms with medical, considered his participation in planning under three headings—diagnosis, strategy, and tactics. The first two are not in any chronological sense distinguishable from each other, but from the administrator's point of view they are very different activities because of the greater authority he carries in the diagnostic phase. The same headings will serve as a framework within which to summarize the varying functions of the administrator under the definition of educational planning suggested in this booklet.

Diagnosis

The administrator's function in this phase of planning is to assess the capacity of the school system to achieve the goals set for it in any draft plan, within the limits of time and cost proposed in the plan. All ministries of education do this already, however inadequately, in preparing their annual budgets, and any good ministry has a unit for co-ordinating the estimates of the numerous divisions involved. So it would appear reasonable, in any general planning operation, to place the responsibility for estimating a school system's potential for growth on the ministry of education. This becomes all the more necessary when what is in question is not only the capacity to expand the number of institutions and services but also to improve their quality. Raising the quality of the product of the school is becoming increasingly important in the plans of developing

1. C. E. Beeby, *The Quality of Education in Developing Countries*, Chapter VII. Boston, Harvard University Press, 1966.

countries, and for most purposes the educationist could claim to have more knowledge than any other specialist when this is at issue. There is no direct and obvious link between an increase in the amount of money spent on education and the quality of the products, no formula the layman can apply without an intimate knowledge of the capacity of the existing teachers to adopt new methods and achieve new standards and of the problems involved in raising the level of the teaching profession.

So there are good grounds for regarding the educational administrator, with the usual assistance he gets from statisticians and other specialists, as the leading authority during the diagnostic phase of planning. He must, however, remember two things. Like every specialist in the planning game he must be prepared to justify his conclusions to others whose range of interests may be wider than his own. Secondly, his status as the leading authority lasts only so long as he is dealing with the feasibility of a particular proposal; he takes his place with other specialists when its desirability is under discussion, for this will be determined as the result of a balance between educational, manpower, political, and financial factors that go well beyond his field of professional competence. It is at this point that diagnosis shades over into the making of policy and the determination of strategy, though specialists may continue to shuttle between the two phases, since every new strategy tentatively suggested sets off another round of studies in feasibility.

Strategy

This is the phase in which facts and opinions bearing on each major issue are assembled and weighed one against the other, and decisions made, tentatively or finally, that will determine the general direction of all activities coming under the plan. Judged by the amount of influence the educational administrator may expect to exert on them, these decisions fall into two classes, those which fix the total allocation for education over the planning period and those concerned with priorities within the vote for education.

When decisions of the first type are being made the educational administrator must accept a subsidiary role. In making up its mind what proportion of the national budget to devote to education the government is not likely to regard him as its final adviser any more than it would accept without question the partially competing recommendations of the director-general of health or the engineer-in-chief concerning expenditures on hospitals or roads. It will probably seek counsel at

this stage from the treasury official, the economist, or the planning expert, who, whatever their ignorance of education, health, or public works, may be expected to base their judgements on a wider range of considerations than would the normal departmental head. And, when it has weighed the opinions of all its specialists—departmental, financial, or planning—the government may throw into the scales some political argument that will, for good or ill, do more to determine the issue than the technical calculations of any one of them.

The educational administrator comes back a little nearer to the centre of the stage when the priorities and the allocation of funds within the education vote are under discussion, although even here he must realize that, if any choice of priorities is important enough to claim the attention of the top planning authorities, the decision will depend only in part on educational considerations. The question at issue will cover such topics as: alternative target dates for achieving compulsory primary education and the effects of each on the extension or improvement of secondary education; the priority to be given to adult literacy campaigns; the relative weights of technical and humanistic studies in secondary and higher education; the language of instruction; the respective responsibilities of central and of local authorities for education at each level; and, in a backward but rapidly developing country, the perpetual problem of the balance between quantity and quality in the school system. None of these issues can be decided on purely technical grounds within the four walls of a school system. Politicians, economists, manpower specialists, employers, trade unions, teachers' organizations, parents, and press—all must have their say, and every man, at his moment, is an authority on education.

In this maelstrom of opinions and pressures, the administrator is not entirely helpless or without influence on the course of events. No plan starts with an empty page. When any planning commission begins its work there will be educational schemes half finished that must be completed, political commitments that must be honoured, vested interests that cannot be ignored, and obligations imposed by law or custom that cannot be flaunted. When he presents to the over-all planning authority his estimates for education over a five-year period, the administrator will give first priority to keeping the machine rolling and meeting the unavoidable escalation that will result from increasing population, rising costs, and the like. However, even in computing these apparently inevitable rises he will find gaps in his facts and figures and will have to rely from time to time on his own judgement, so that the final draft bud-

get he produces will bear, however faintly, some impress of his personal views and values, and the onus will be on any national planning specialist who disagrees with him to prove him wrong.

When he turns from the maintenance of the *status quo* to the costing of the new schemes to be inaugurated during the period of the plan, the educator has rather more elbow room. Some of these schemes may have originated with him or his colleagues, and for most of the others, whatever their origin, he will probably be called upon to put flesh on to the bare bones of a project suggested by a layman. Even if schemes arrive on his desk fully formed he will almost certainly have to cost them, and may well be given the opportunity to comment on them. However minor his authority in particular cases, this constant involvement with the strategy of the plan puts the administrator in a privileged position, and may even give him some slight influence on the total amount of money to be allocated to education. It might appear the logical procedure for a government to determine this total first, and then proceed to distribute it among the various broad divisions of the education service, but one of the factors to be considered in coming to this global decision is the education department's estimate of the cost of maintaining and expanding existing services and of financing the new ones which it seems likely the government will approve. However determined the effort to base the plan upon over-all economic goals, there will always be a marginal area where the quality of the schemes put forward, their political appeal, and the skill with which they are presented will affect the final allocation.

It may be unnecessary to repeat that, whatever influence he exerts in the select company of those who determine strategy, the educational administrator remains, if not the sole champion, at least the professional spokesman for a whole generation.

Tactics

'Tactics' is used here rather than 'implementation' to emphasize the point previously made that planning does not in fact cease with the adoption of a strategy. The difference between strategy and tactics is one of degree, of distance from the front line, rather than the blunt difference between making a decision and carrying it out under orders. It is a moot point, for instance, whether the making of an annual departmental budget should be classified under strategy or under tactics. It could be regarded simply as the application of a portion of a previously determined five-year plan, but, in another sense, the plan is an abstraction until it

is legally embodied in a series of annual budgets that determine the speed at which it shall be applied, the parts which shall be dropped entirely, and the amendments that must be made to adapt it to unforeseen conditions. In the making of the annual budget, where decisions concern means more frequently than ends, the opinion of the administrator normally carries more weight than in the strategic phase, though he is still far from being the government's final adviser.

It is only when attention turns to devising ways and means to carry out specific programmes or projects under the plan that the educational administrator again comes into his own as the central figure in what he regards as still a part of planning. (As one descends from the general national plan to its more specific applications, one finds that what specialists at one level consider to be tactics those at the next lower level may regard as strategy.) Most people would agree that the administrator, with his professional advisers, has more to offer than anyone else when the question at issue is the training of teachers, the inspection of schools, the reform of the curriculum, the place of examinations, the consolidation of rural schools, or the much discussed use of the new educational technology to compensate for a shortage of trained teachers. His opinions may be challenged, but they will be treated with more than average respect. He will occupy much the same position here that he did in the diagnostic phase.

Complexity of planning

This may be a somewhat idealized picture of the part played by the administrator in each phase of planning. It would certainly not be true of every country, much less of every administrator. The form and the traditions of government, the structure of the planning organization, and the play of personalities will create some conditions where the model does not, and perhaps should not, apply. The most that can be said with certainty is that, under any conditions, an experienced educational administrator has a unique contribution to make to planning, and a government would be wise to devise its planning procedures in such a way that he can give his counsel and exercise his influence at the points where he has most to offer. What this booklet has done is to suggest where those points are most likely to be found, and, in so doing, it has inevitably blurred the sharp outlines of planning presented by some other writers.

In an admirably clear article on the theory of educational planning,

Arnold Anderson and Mary Jean Bowman warn us that, although a 'continuing planning process with operational relevance will entail continuous feed-backs of experience', a failure to distinguish analytically between planning, on the one hand, and approving or implementing plans, on the other, can lead 'to endless disputes that confuse what is "really" planning with who does it, or with whether plans are accepted by the policy-making authorities'—and that we can end up in an 'area... entangled in politico-ideological controversies'.¹ I have done just that—and am unrepentant. For the purposes Dr. Anderson and Dr. Bowman had, they could take only the line they did, but for my purposes I did not wish to avoid the entanglements, because I wanted to show educational planning through the eyes of an administrator, who, unhappily, can never ignore them.

The administrator of the future

If this picture of the educational administrator's part in planning is in large measure true, and if, in most countries, planning is destined to be of increasing importance in education, it would seem that the preparation for the most senior posts in a ministry of education in the future must be rather different from what it has traditionally been. Those who come to administration through politics will, of course, continue to be especially sensitive to the political component of planning, and it is a moot point how far such political skills can be learned from books. The administrators who have risen through the ranks of the teaching profession will, for their part, always have the advantage of knowing the schools from the inside, and will, in addition, develop in the course of their work some feeling for political issues and an understanding of the year-to-year financing of a large educational system. Yet, even when administrators of both types combine their experience within a ministry of education, one component of good, modern administration may still be lacking. This is the set of skills involved in seeing the educational system as firmly embedded in the country's over-all plans for social and economic development. No educational administrator worthy of the name has ever been totally insensitive to the relation of his work to the wider interests of society, even before these were expressed in official

1. C. Arnold Anderson and Mary Jean Bowman, 'Theoretical Considerations in Educational Planning', *Educational Planning*, Don Adams (ed.), Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1964, p. 6.

plans, but his interest in economic growth has tended to be piecemeal and a trifle amateurish. He will need in the future a more rigorous and professional understanding of the part education can play in his country's economy, which will involve an equally acute perception of the limits beyond which economic criteria should not be pressed.

This does not mean that the man who aspires to be a general educational administrator must become, in the process, an economist, a demographer, or a manpower specialist, but he must know enough about their crafts, their vocabularies and their mode of thinking to understand at least their goals and their conclusions, if not the detailed techniques by which they arrive at them. In the corporate sense in which the term has been used in this essay, 'the administrator' will be the leader of a team that will include specialists who may be able to talk to over-all planners on a fully professional level, but this in itself is not quite enough. The individual administrator who is the chief adviser to the minister of education must understand enough about the techniques of modern planning to help to ensure that the conclusions of the planning experts, whether within his department or outside it, are given their proper weight—no less and no more—in the complex of competing forces from which will emerge the final plan for education. Some of this knowledge can be wrung from daily experience but some can come only from a study of disciplines that have not commonly been regarded in the past as essential to the job. If the educational administrator is to take his rightful place in national planning, he must be prepared to learn the rules of the game as other professions understand it, while still stoutly defending, whenever they be threatened, the values that seem to him proper to education.

Suggestions for further reading

- GROSS, B. M. *The administration of economic development planning: principles and fallacies*. New York, United Nations, 1966. (ST/TAO/series, M/32.)
- HANSON, A. H. *The process of planning: a study of India's five-year plans, 1950-1964*. London, Oxford University Press, 1966.
- KRIESBERG, M. (ed.) *Public administration in developing countries*. Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1965.
- RIGGS, F. W. *Administration in developing countries*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- SWERDLOW, I. (ed.) *Development administration: concepts and problems*. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1963.
- WATERSTON, A. *Development planning: lessons of experience*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1965.

Other IIEP publications

The following publications are obtainable from Unesco and its national distributors throughout the world:

Educational Planning: a Directory of Training and Research Institutions

1964. Also available in French

Educational Planning: a Bibliography

1964. Also available in French

Educational Planning: an Inventory of Major Research Needs

1965. Also available in French

Problems and Strategies of Educational Planning: Lessons from Latin America

1965. Also available in Spanish

African Research Monographs

Certain titles in the series in French only. Full current list available on request

New Educational Media in Action: Case Studies for Planners

Three volumes

The New Media: Memo to Educational Planners

W. Schramm, P. H. Coombs, F. Kahnert, J. Lyle

Also to be available in French and Spanish

Librairie de l'Unesco
Place de Fontenoy
75 Paris-7^e
France

The International Institute for Educational Planning

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) was established by Unesco to serve as an international centre for advanced training and research in the field of educational planning. Its initial basic financing was provided by Unesco, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Ford Foundation and its physical facilities by the Government of France. It has since received supplemental support from private and governmental sources.

The Institute's aim is to expand knowledge and the supply of competent experts in educational planning in order to assist all nations to accelerate their educational development as a prime requirement for general economic and social development. In this endeavour the Institute co-operates with interested training and research organizations throughout the world.

The Governing Board of the Institute (August 1966) is as follows:

Chairman

Sir Sydney Caine (United Kingdom), Director, The London School of Economics and Political Science.

Ex officio members

Dr. Gabriel Betancur-Mejía, Assistant Director-General for Education, Unesco.

Mr. David Owen, Co-Administrator, United Nations Development Programme.

Mr. Richard H. Demuth, Director, Development Services, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The representative of the Director-General, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Dr. N. Prasad, Director, Asian Institute for Economic Development and Planning.

Elected members

Professor Hellmut Becker (Federal Republic of Germany), President German Federation of Adult Education Centres; Director, Institut für Bildungsforschung, Berlin.

Dr. Carlos Cueto Fernandini (Peru), Minister of Education.

Mr. J. Ki-Zerbo (Upper Volta), President, National Commission of the Republic of Upper Volta for Unesco.

Dr. D. S. Kothari (India), Chairman, University Grants Commission.

Professor S. A. Shumovsky (U.S.S.R.), Head, Methodological Administration Department, Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, R.S.F.S.R.

Inquiries about the Institute may be addressed to:

The Director, IIEP, 7 rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75 Paris-16^e