



Recommendation of Action for the College of Education, Michigan State University¹

Ted Ward

Priorities for programmatic development should be considered alongside and in basically the same ways that other priorities are considered. The issue is that they *should* be considered as part of the whole task of the College of Education. It will help to disentangle the development priorities from the research priorities where they tend now to get lost. It may also be useful to define college service priorities in terms of development. In other words, the College of Education ought to be engaged in development efforts within the College and also in partnership with other educational organizations (including the public schools).

Especially in establishing priorities at the practical level input and evidence should be sought on two functional matters: Is there an adequate or currently expanding research base which can undergird the development project or program in a responsible manner? Is there strong evidence of awareness and interest in the field? These two questions will substantially aid in the matter of establishing and implementing priorities, the first in terms of a responsible commitment to action based on knowledge and the latter in terms of a commitment to engaging in activities that will meet real needs rather than merely indulging exotic curiosity.

Although no substantial study has been made, it is reasonable to assume that there have been three major considerations brought into account in making decisions about development priorities:

- a) Worth of the activity
- b) Availability of funds
- c) Availability of appropriate faculty

There is nothing wrong with taking these matters into account. What we have not done very well is to decide in advance on the basis of *worth* of various possible emphases which of what sorts and how much of this and that we *should* be doing. In other words our vulnerability does not arise from irresponsible decision-making but from two other matters which we should now try to resolve:

- a) Commitment, at the level of policy, to matters deemed to be of major importance (rather than to respond ad hoc and post hoc, on essentially pragmatic ground, to opportunities as they arise.
- b) Deployment of resources to take initiative in the opening up of appropriate frontier territories.

Having stated these two needs, I must now back off and assert that a development program built purely on initiative and rigid commitment to specific priorities will not survive. Today's patterns of support for scholarly activity are not so free as they once were. Everyone is getting into the priority-setting act! It is not enough to have one's own view of needs; one must be to some extent, responsive to needs determined by others. Given the history of research and development within higher education, and its occasional tendency to become overly abstract and irrelevant, we should be humbly cautious about sailing exclusively by our own views of the stars, anyway.

¹ Ted Ward. Proposal for educational development, College of Education, Michigan State University, September 15, 1977

We should have three categories in our scheme of priorities, not just two. The first and third are the typical categories. The second category is also valuable:

- a) What we think is most promising.
- b) What we are willing to engage in if and when responsible others think it is promising.
- c) What we don't see much if any value in doing.

In order to set our priorities into these three categories and thus to provide an orderly basis for reviewing faculty initiatives and institutional opportunities, a continuing study group is needed. The study group (six people, with rotating membership) is described in the accompanying document as the Development Council.

At least half of the College's allocation of FTE's for research should go into development activity. Well over half of the College's successful "research proposals" for outside funds in the last fifteen years have been for development activity. Some portion of this development support should be deliberately committed to seeking out the potential matches between our own sense of needs for development activities and the various potentialities for funding. In other words, we should establish our categories of priority and then seek out ways of supporting appropriate activities. So what is new? Only two matters: 1) that we fix the responsibility for clarifying and enunciating College-wide priorities; and 2) that we support some exploratory investigation.

It is hardly wise for one person to recommend a specific set of development topics that should be given high priority by the whole College. Instead, three sources of criteria are suggested:

1. *Analyses of social need.* The issue here is, or should be, what sorts of continuing or emerging needs in the society should have particular attention from the educational development sector. There is potentiality in reference to this source for the most scholarly and philosophical thinking we can bring to bear.
2. *Practical applications of the College's research activities.* The research program to which we are committed (if and when we adopt and implement a coherent program) has implications for the development priorities. We should be setting aside some of our development effort for seeking out the practical applications of the outcomes of our own research.
3. *Strengths of our faculty.* Priorities must take into account the realities of our own competencies. This factor is both a limitation and a strength. There are certain things that we should not undertake, regardless of their social worth. There are other things that we ought to be specially promoting and seeking to develop in larger ways because we have substantial faculty strength.

One tangible and immediate step we could take would be to create a College-level review process for the various discretionary and internal research funds (e.g., all-university and seed money from contingency funds). The Development Council and a counter-part council for the review of research proposals can work together to encourage the sorts of activities that are high in priority. Specifically, the College needs a means to selectively encourage certain proposed activities and, especially, to see that the vital commodity, faculty time, is allocated where it will do the most to further the research and development priorities of the College.

As I see it, *development* is a sector of activity comparable to *teaching* and *research*. The classical definitions of the public university's responsibilities for research, teaching, and service are in need of updating. Research and teaching make sense, but service is too vague. Service is an outreach of *any* sector: Teaching by extension in response to particular requests of outside agencies is a service. Research undertaken to serve the needs of a donor or sponsor is a service. Development to meet the practical educational needs of an institution or organization is a service. Thus service cuts across all three sectors.

Evaluation is one example of a service. Evaluation competencies and resources need to be available similarly to all three sectors: teaching, research, and development. Indeed, the relationships

and the kinds of uses made by each sector would be expected to differ, but the same service organization could serve all three.

Differences between sectors and services

1. The best way to assure compatibility and complementarity in the organization and management of the College is to carefully differentiate ends and means and organize accordingly.
2. Organizing the major functions of the College according to the three major sectors of activity expected of the faculty illustrates the preferred organization giving predominance to ends: teaching, research, and development.
3. Services should be conceived as supportive rather than as dominant. The services most needed in the College are of comparable importance to all three sectors, and thus they should be organized so as to be equally accessible to each sector. This is the major argument against having a service unit "belong to" or be part of a given sector. (Evaluation services should not "belong to" the research sector. "Service," in the sense of outreach services of the College, should not belong to the development sector, etc.)

Toward a Rigorous Concept of Development

The analysis, summary, and propositions following are related to a set of problems with which the College of Education is attempting to deal more effectively. The need, widely felt in the professional field of education, is to make research more practical. To put it more precisely, the need is to build a stronger linkage between research and practice and in the process to make education more careful in its use of scientific evidence about human learning and development processes. The practical problems now confronting the College in relation to this need are the following: 1) to recognize and support the development work of faculty, wherein it is seen as a part of the responsible academic community's roles to undertake the applications of knowledge to practice; and 2) to educate the professional community, especially through graduate studies, to a higher level of skills and concepts in the orderly pursuit of development activity.

Three basic assumptions underlie the viewpoints expressed in this paper. First, development activity is not seen simply as a logical extension of research activity; the nature of the undertakings are essentially different. Second, the argument for specialized training in development activities is as reasonable as the argument for specialized research training, albeit much less well defined. Third, the destiny of a college of education (or any academic establishment of applied social science) is best fulfilled through a composite of activities which build communicative bridges among the various sectors of knowledge sources and human needs.

The linguistic partner of *research* is development. Talking of research in reference to practical or applied problems, one generally says, "research and development." As the two terms become more commonly used together, they tend to blur as if unable to stand separately.

As the scholarly study of education progresses, the importance of research becomes more widely recognized. But because of a lingering suspicion that research tends to be esoteric and impractical, its value the field of education is assumed to be somehow substantiated when coupled to development.

Both of the terms are large and indistinct. Much effort has been given to defining *research* and specifying the conditions of its responsible pursuit. Nevertheless we find the word research applied to such widely contrasting activities as sitting in a library, writing an expository article, asking questions through a questionnaire, and observing participants in an experimentally-controlled situation.

The term *development* suffers from even more confusion. Few efforts have been made to define and specify the conditions of development activities, partly because few scholars have moved in close

enough to identify the problem. Within higher education, *development* can refer to raising money to augment the budget or to build a new building, adding a new department or major, engaging in a course improvement project, applying in the field a finding from the laboratory, or to what happens in the darkroom of the campus photographer. To make matters worse, everyone takes for granted that the context communicates what sort of development is being suggested, and that beyond this rudimentary specification no further elaboration is needed.

Indeed, in many fields of human pursuit, especially in fields closely related to the natural sciences, development work is carried out with rigor and dispatch. Where science has been made most practical, for example in the practice of medicine and in the several fields of engineering, several factors can be seen in common: researchers and development people are trained as specialists; the researchers and development people are trained somewhat differently, the former more as analysts, the latter more as synthesists; tasks assigned to research people are essentially different from those assigned to development people; each set of people recognizes the value of the other set; a back-and-forth pattern of communication links the two sets; and, finally, the social worth and academic respectability of both the researcher and the developer are established and assumed to be beyond challenge.

Development as Emergence

Development is a very broad word. It is used in reference to many different situations. Many of its uses have a high degree of allegorical value. Development can refer to the whole complex of emergence and enhancement of the living organism, especially human development. It can refer to some particular aspect of the larger complex, for example, physical development, development of the nervous system, and so forth. It can refer to the enhancement of particular skills and traits, as in social development and artistic development. Development also can be used in reference to institutions, organizations, and even nations, as in financial development, personnel development, policy development and, in general, community development and national development. In all these uses one common factor prevails: they connote the substantive and qualitative nature of normal and desirable emergence. Development refers less to acquisition than to fulfillment. When it stands alone, the word development has a positive connotation. The adjective *abnormal* must be added to turn it negative. In many of its common meanings, development is one of the praise-worthy aspects of social and individual life.

In some of its more limited technological uses, the word carries over this same positive tone and, in several instances, further establishes the allegory of emergence. For example, in the photographic laboratory the film is submitted to a chemical development process. What emerges was there all along in a latent form. Through the development process light-induced changes in the sensitized surface become visible and the image takes on its fulfilled form.

Product development and market development are also processes of unfolding and emergence. The product, in its potential form, is already known; its potentialities must be revealed and brought into relationships with existing needs to which it can relate. The market for the product also is developed by peeling away the layers of darkness that separate the product or service from its potential relationship to the needs of buyers or clients. Development is less a matter of creation than of discovery.

In educational development the allegory of discovery and emergence also applies. The developer asks questions, in turn, of the practitioner and of the researcher. The developer facilitates the discovery of points of contact, wherein the research can be seen as having meaning for what might be applied in the field. The tasks of the developer include a pair of continuing responsibilities: to know educational and social science research and to know the realm of educational practice. These tasks constitute an unrealistic expectation unless ameliorated (as elsewhere in our complex world) by

the devices of specialization. The developer's concern is to “put it all together”; not just to understand, in the analytic sense, but to provide for a knowledge-based and knowledge-generating praxis. Thus, the developer's role is to systematically facilitate discovery and emergence of improved practice.

Practitioners and Researchers: Different Sorts of People

All sorts of people teach. All sorts of experiences lead to learning. As one listens to the endless debates over whether teachers are made or born, as one grasps the massive responsibility placed upon the educational sector of society, and as one comes to grips with his own idiosyncrasies and those of others, the idea of any sort of standard approach to teaching seems elusive indeed.

Teaching can be understood in many ways. At one extreme it can be explained as a series of decision-making processes, acted out in such a way as to optimize environmental conditions and inter-personal relations in order to develop mental and physical behavior. At another extreme it can be argued that it is purely an art form which is played out in human contexts, never quite submitting itself to objective analysis. Thus the world of the practitioner in education is whatever the practitioner sees it to be. Standard definitions and operational formulae are still a long way off!

Research, at least among researchers, is not nearly so broadly defined. Indeed, there are minor skirmishes about the degrees and kinds of evidences that can be called scientific and about the place of empiricism. But at the heart of it all there is general agreement that research is scientific inquiry and that it should be carried out in an analytic way. Those who can't see things analytically tend not to last long in research.

Almost as surely, those who must see everything in the cold, hard light of analysis, tend not to last long as teachers. If the world of the researcher is analytic, the world of the classroom teacher is synthetic. No teacher ever controls all the variables. (Few teachers would claim even to know what all the variables are!) Classroom teaching is a matter of making the best of whatever is at hand; rigorous planning helps so long as it does not lead to *rigid* plans. The successful teacher copes. Like a highly trained boxer he takes the exchange with alert, flexible finesse. Can the gestalt of it be ultimately analyzed? Pieces and parts, yes; the whole, no.

It is reasonable to assume that there are substantial differences between the world of the educational researcher and the world of the educational practitioner. It would follow, then, that people who choose to become researchers have one sort of outlook, by genetic predisposition and/or by training and experience, and those who become practitioners (at least those who are happy as teachers) have a different sort of outlook. It may be such a basic matter as aptitude for analytic reasoning versus aptitude for divergent thinking and/or creativity. Again here we must guard against overgeneralization. Certainly no single descriptor would account for all cases. But until the contrary is established it may be best to assume that teachers are teachers and researchers are researchers. Further it may be assumed (with apologies to Kipling) that if the twain are to meet, they will need an interpreter or go-between. Are these assumptions so strange? Within education, yes; but within many other fields where the foundational knowledge is derived from scientific disciplines, these assumptions about the differences between practitioners and researchers have been long accepted.

What we believe about the interfaces of science and practice and of scientists and practitioners is vital. It will determine what sorts of schemes and approaches we will invent to bridge the gap.

Practitioners as Researchers: The Mirage of Action Research

Closing the gap between research and practice is a recurrent theme in educational development. Researchers are asked to become more focused on educational practice, and practitioners are asked to

become more research-oriented. Although these matters of orientation, focus, and style may indeed be related to the gap between research and practice, little long-term positive change in the field of education has resulted from efforts to close the gap by changing these orientations. Making teachers into researchers and making researchers into teachers seems to work for “some of the people some of the time,” but certainly the hopes and claims for the promised reform of education seem doomed to frustration. Since few things are so persistent as a good idea that won't work, the close-the-gap-by-changing-the-people schemes are reborn almost annually.

The key assumptions must be challenged. First, is it reasonable to assume that research activity and teaching activity are so similar that a person who is competent in one should be expected to be competent in the other? Second, is it reasonable to assume that the processes and activities of teaching are altogether reducible to propositions which may be tested scientifically? Third, is it reasonable to assume that teaching will be improved (more particularly, that a teacher's behavior will be more effective) if the teacher functions analytically, weighing each action and decision against a reasoned scientific base? And fourth, underlying the others, is the very dubious assumption that there are only two sorts of human activity to be considered: teaching and research.

It is this fourth and most basic assumption that is easiest to refute. The historical development and present state of the art in the natural sciences serve as an indication of what we should be assuming instead. Builders turn to a consulting engineer, not to a physicist, when they want a reliable solution to an immediate and specific problem. The physician calls in the expertise of pharmacology, not biology and chemistry. The steel manufacturer consults with the metallurgical engineer, not the physicist.

In most cases, at least within the natural sciences, the effective application of basic science to practical human problems depends on a three-tier system. At one end are the basic sciences and their appropriate specialized scientists. At the other end are the fields of practice and their practitioners, who must contend with particular human needs. Between these two sets is a gap; but it is an accepted and not a lamented gap. No one cries over the fact that physicists aren't building airplanes or that biochemists aren't prescribing drugs. What makes the gap tolerable is the assumption that intermediaries are appropriate—that a three-tier system is needed. The emergence of the concepts of engineering in the late nineteenth century is both a consequence and a cause of the scientific era. “Better living through chemistry,” as Monsanto says, is less a matter of highly developed chemistry than of effectively relating chemistry to human needs through chemical engineering.

In few applied areas of social science have we entered a scientific era. It is popular to decry the low quality of scientific research in social science and to complain that teachers, social workers, psychotherapists, and other human-services practitioners “fly by the seat of their pants.” It would be more constructive to point out the missing link: in social and human development fields we lack engineers.

The action research movement (Stephen Corey, et al. Teachers College, Columbia University) was influential in educational thinking and planning in the decade of the 1950's. Its contributions were a mixture of the useful and the useless. It raised the level of concern for research as a foundation of educational practice and it demonstrated that concern for the research-to-practice gap could lead to innovative teacher education. But on the whole the outcomes of the movement satisfied very few. The research-oriented approach to classroom teaching was a selective phenomenon. It worked for some, not for others; more important, it tended to bring into teaching and encourage certain sorts of people who were also in demand in other fields. Thus it made education more competitive in the short run, but in the long run it was self-defeating. Teacher preparation was being seen as more a quantitative than a qualitative problem.

During the large expansion of the teaching field and the general manpower shortage of the early 1960's, the action-research idea (along with other innovative approaches) were perhaps not given

a fair chance to be tested. On the other hand, the contemporary increase of funds for educational research brought about a higher level of sophistication within the previously small (and weak) educational research community. The lack of congruence between the new models of research and the do-it-yourself classroom experiments of the action research movement led to a fatal clash; no longer was it reasonable to argue that action research was in the best interests of building a more research-oriented educational practice. Instead, the new sophisticates who spoke for the educational research community decried the potentially misleading outcomes and over-simplified answers that action research tended to produce.

Action research tended to overload the teacher and undermine research at the same time. Thus the hope of better relation between research and practice was frustrated. Action research led toward a mirage. Rather than linkage, the outcome was merely a blurring of the lines, to no particular advantage either to research or to the practice of education.

Proposal for Programmatic Development in the College of Education

The appropriate tasks of a college of education should include development of educational practice. In the College of Education at Michigan State University, development activities are and have been supported under the general fund allocation to faculty time for research. Further, a substantial portion of the externally supported research activity of the College has been, in fact, development more than research. For example, the research budget of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center (1966-1974), the "I Can" project for physical and mental development of handicapped children (1972-1977), the Behavioral Sciences in Teacher Education Program (BSTEP, 1965-1969), the Training of Teachers of Teachers (T²T, 1969-1973), the Teacher Corps Project (1971-1977), the Protocol Materials Project (1970-1975) the International Rehabilitation Special Education Network (IRSEN, 1976-), and the Nonformal Education Research in Developing Nations (1971-1977), are some of the larger examples during the past decade. Each of these projects has had a substantial research budget; the activity performed in each has been more a matter of *development* than research. The focus has been upon putting into practice improved procedures and materials based upon evidences from research.

What follows in this proposal is innovative, not in the idea of support for development, but in the processes it suggests for expansion, organization, and accountability. It is intended that these innovations contribute substantially to the quality and worth of the outcomes of recognized development activities within the College. If they serve only to restrict and inhibit through bureaucratic misunderstanding of these intentions, the value of these efforts will be lost.

Kinds Of Development Projects Appropriate For Support

As a matter of definition and in order to establish the scope of the proposal, three kinds of development projects are identified. In the sense listed here, these are categories of projects, not distinct sets of activities. One might engage in very similar operations in each of these kinds of projects.

1. *Improvement of educational practice.* This first category is meant to be the broadest. It includes development of any significant aspect of educational services as well as administrative and support services as needed for effective educational practice. Further, it is not restricted to educational practice within schools.
2. *Instructional materials development.* The materials development project is the most specific kind, but it, too, usually is broadly defined to include field trial of materials, teacher training, as needed to implement the materials, and evaluation.
3. *Instructional improvement within the College.* Commonly called program improvement, the emphasis

here is on small-scale or large-scale innovations or improvements within the College of Education. This sort of activity is justified in terms of its ultimate and general contributions to higher standards within the field of education; further, it is necessary for responsible self-renewal of the College as an institution of social worth.

Criteria: Intended Effects of Development Activity

The sort of development activity in which College resources are invested takes on value as it fulfills four purposes. These purposes, stated as intended effects, follow:

1. Contributing to human competency in coping with social needs. The issue of social worth of professional activities is of prime importance. Especially because it is a public-funds-supported institution, all allocations of resources must be examined in terms of the social worth of the potential and probable consequences of the activities they support.
2. Making the outcomes of research useful. As an applied field of social science, education is concerned with the uses of knowledge. Research within education and from appropriate specialties in social science has potential value for educational practice if translated and tested through appropriate development activities.
3. Training development specialists. Especially because a primary task is preparation of professional workers, all activities within the College of Education should have a training facet. Development is especially appropriate and needed, in this regard.
4. Improving the quality of educational practice in measurable ways.

In addition to the consideration of the social worth (#1, above), there is need to ascertain that each development activity or project does, indeed, make tangible contributions to the quality of educational practice. Appropriate evaluation procedures should be a part of every development project.

The four intended effects listed here, examined in terms of prospect and accomplishment, are the four criteria for major consideration in decision-making at the faculty group, departmental, and college levels.

Responsibility for Allocation of Time and Resources to Development

The decisions to which the four criteria relate can be reduced to three clusters:

1. Determining whether or not to support a given development activity.
2. Determining the extent of support.
3. Determining whether or not to continue (renew) the support.

The responsibility for making these decisions rests with the Dean of the College, in counsel with appropriate advisory groups and persons, acting upon the recommendation of the Department Chairman (or Chairmen). In as much as resources are rarely adequate to support all possible and needed activities, it is wise and necessary to involve the departments in the deliberative processes which lead to resource allocations.

Procedures for faculty involvement.

Because of the nature of creativity and the difficulty of collective inventiveness, development is as often an individual as a group process. Procedures for support of development, especially as they relate to initiation of ideas and decision-making about procedures, must be designed so as to tap collective wisdom without thwarting individual creativity. The procedures recommended following are intended to foster both individual creativity and broad-based participation.

One of the greatest needs is to bring development work more into the open. Perhaps because of the faculty's many and varied preoccupations, the College's many activities are hard to know about.

This problem is especially detrimental to graduate students, whose needs for awareness and exposure are often greater than those of the faculty.

Another need is to provide a shift in the norms and expectations of the faculty in the direction of a more openly sharing community of scholars. Likely because of the history of over-commitment and overwork which has been fairly common in the College during the last fifteen years, anything that takes time gets cut unless it fights for itself. There is no general enthusiasm among faculty for taking the time it requires; and the College as a whole will be stronger if a shift toward openness should result in broader participation and, to some extent, a willingness to work together on closely related development projects.

The Development Group

Visibility, clarity, continuing professional interaction, help from graduate students, and periodic harvests of advice—these are the intended advantages of organizing a development activity around a Development Group.

The Development Group would come into being when two or more faculty have identified a particular development need in which they wish to invest time and effort. The Development Group may or may not seek institutional support, but if it does so, it would come about through the following general pattern of steps:

Phase I

- A. A development potentiality is recognized by one or more professors. The research base is becoming adequate and the need in the field is becoming recognized.
- B. The professors share their observations with other faculty they think may be interested. This step may take months and would usually be informal.
- C. Professor Y is identified as a person with similar or complementary interests. The appropriate chairpersons are involved in discussions.
- D. Several faculty prepare to hold a Development Forum. They prepare a brief document that can be circulated to the entire faculty in advance of the forum. The document is to indicate their view of the potentialities and values of the development activity as well to provide a cursory review of the key research upon which the development is to build.
- E. Faculty and graduate students are invited to the Development Forum. At least two of the College's Development Group members are expected to attend and thus guarantee at least some verbal interactions about the ideas.
- F. As other people with similar interests are identified, they are added to the Development Group. The group is expected to have periodic meetings, and, depending on the level of interest of its members, to share in the work of preparation for specific project work.
- G. The affected department chairpersons, the lead faculty and the Development Group enter into discussions of the time and resource allocations needed to further the project. It is at this point the recommendations go forward to the Dean. Among other considerations is the matter of potentialities of outside funding at some future point in the project.

Phase II

If the College allocates resources for continuation of the development activity, the Development Group takes on a degree of permanence and becomes obligated for the following:

- A. Joint and individual progress reports, term by term.
- B. Submission of proposals for funding.
- C. Offering a scheduled section of a Development Seminar at least once a year for the duration of the project.
- D. Holding a Development Forum at least twice a year.

- E. Arrangement for appropriate practitioner participation in the project, and preliminary arrangement for field sites as needed.

Phase III

If the necessary funding is obtained (whether from outside or inside sources), the project is activated.

- A. The Development Forum is sponsored at least semi-annually.
- B. The Development Seminar is offered at least once a year.
- C. Independent studies are encouraged within the tasks of the project and field experiences are provided if feasible.
- D. The project is carried out according to conditions of the grant or contract and in such a way as to fulfill the College's purposes in educational development.

General conditions underlying this pattern of steps:

The assignment of faculty load to development would, except in unusual cases, carry the obligation of this pattern.

The student credit hours produced by the seminars, independent studies, and field experiences are seen as part of the assignment to development and, as such, would be credited to the departments on a *pro rata* basis.

The principle investigators, or more properly, the development project coordinator (or coordinators) are not to lose autonomy to an amorphous decision-making body. Even if several faculty are given assigned time for the development activity, responsibility for the project as a whole is to be clearly fixed.

Each project participant is to negotiate with his or her own department chair about the share of time needed. Inter-departmental relations in regard to needed time will be the responsibility of the administrator assigned to work with the Development Council.

Graduate students, whether or not financially supported by the project, should be welcome as Forum participants, and if their professional experience and/or graduate studies programs are appropriate, they should be eligible for membership in the Development Group.

The Development Forum

The purposes of the Development Forum are related to communication about the development project or activity:

1. To provide a periodic updating for faculty and graduate students who are interested in the project. The level of interest will be highly variable: some who attend will be barely interested, only enough to bother to attend; others will be vitally concerned, whether or not their schedules allow more extensive participation in the project.
2. To provide an occasion for the sharpening of the project and, especially, the effective sharing of information, ideas, and problems. The fact that the Development Forum can be a dialogue and can allow for interaction of project and non-project people is seen as an asset.

The frequency of meetings is at the discretion of the project staff, though two per year is recommended as a minimum.

The Development Seminar

Providing a visible and accessible means for graduate students to participate in development experiences is the major purpose of the Development Seminar. In any one term several Development Seminars might be offered; and the Development Council would encourage the scheduling of at least one each term so that access to one or more such project would be a regular and predictable opportunity.

It is not assumed that the enrollment in a Development Seminar would be large in every case. The importance of the Seminar is less related to serving many students than to serving those particular students who can see themselves becoming involved and skilled in development work. Emphasis should be on 1) how one goes about development work, 2) the particular bodies of knowledge and research evidences which underlie the project, and 3) the particular understanding of conditions in the practitioner's realm to which the development project is attempting to relate.

Staffing the Development Seminar is the responsibility of the Development Group. Ordinarily the principle investigator (group leader) will take the responsibility for planning and coordination of this important part of the development task, or will assign the responsibility to another senior member of the Development Group.

The Development Council

Effective decision-making with respect to the support of development activities depends to a great extent on prompt access to a knowledgeable source of counsel. In order to provide a readily accessible and broadly aware deliberative group, the Dean may establish a Development Council within in the College.

The six members of the Council would hold office for three years. (They should be elected/appointed at large from slates of nominees prepared by the departments.) Each year two new members would be selected, providing for continuity of two-thirds of the members.

Duties of the Development Council consist of the following:

1. To advise the Dean on decisions regarding proposals for development projects (whether or not to allocate; the extent of support; and whether or not to renew allocation).
2. To serve as the principle board of review at the all-college level for the development aspects of funding proposals (internal and external grants and contracts).
3. To participate in all Development Forums (at least two members of the Council are to attend each Forum).
4. To work with the appointed administrator on matters of policy and monitoring of development activity. On occasion it will be necessary to participate in conversations with various Department Chairs, especially in regard to decisions affecting inter-departmental projects.

The Service Program of the College

Service has been left until last. The assignment which gave impetus to this paper refers to programmatic development and service, suggesting that the two facets are, or should be, closely linked. Indeed such a position is defensible if certain linkages are defined and certain dangers avoided. If we are to see service in its potential relationships to development, we must first be clear about what is to be done in the name of development.

It is risky for an educational institution to be mainly a responsive service station. The task of pushing back the frontiers of the unknown is a responsibility which demands initiative. Further, a major university within a state rich with educational resources has a special responsibility to put its corporate service ventures into the context of one of its other major missions: research, development, and teaching.

Many faculty members engage as private professionals in service activities with various public and private organizations and institutions. The University's policies allow for orderly regulation of this privilege. This paper, therefore, refers only to the service activities which are accounted as part of the load or University-paid overload of a faculty person.

As a matter of general policy, the College of Education should seek to identify any and all service activities and requests for service as having affiliation with one of its ongoing or incipient

missions, projects, or activities. In other words, whether or not a request for service (e.g., to a local school district) would be accepted would depend, among other things, on whether or not it is related to (or potentially related to a research, development or teaching activity to which the College is already committed.

In reference to development activities of the College, service is an important adjunct. As defined in this paper, development always has a particular reference to recognized needs in the field and always is working toward implementations and products. Thus, organizations and institutions seeking related services can and should be part of the development partnership.

Though the increased emphasis on development may suggest expanded service potentialities, it will not necessarily follow. Instead, in order to effectively deploy the faculty resources it may be necessary to establish a limited number of delimited service outputs. It may be useful for these to be of a relatively long-term sort and be more intensive than has been characteristic of most service contracts in the past; but the number, kind, and extent would be subject to the needs of the development groups.

A Network of Development Centers

Establishing a network of development centers is an idea which need not be resolved now. It has much potential for the future and if an aggressive development program is fostered by the College it will become not only desirable, but likely necessary. Some development centers might arise out of particularly productive service relationships. Others may be deliberately identified and invited to participate because of needs of a particular development project. In most cases, the relationship of the College with a school district or other educational organization would be ad hoc and would assume a date of termination. It is possible, nonetheless, that one or more centers in the network might become co-signatory to particular grant requests or development contracts funded by third parties.