

Dale C. Thomson

The State of Planning at McGill

mcgill then and now

McGill University was created two years before the birth of Queen Victoria and, thus, came into a very different world from that in which it must function today. For most of its history, it was patterned on its senior sister institutions in Great Britain and an Oxbridge training was considered a highly desirable qualification for academic posts. The Montreal business community played a major role in maintaining it as an independent institution and took a direct interest in its operations, particularly through the Board of Governors. In close co-operation with its private benefactors, a series of long-tenured Principals ran the University with a minimum of administrative staff and often in a highly autocratic manner. In general, the academic staff and students accepted this form of governance, which provided adequate freedom and opportunity for a rewarding intellectual life. And they developed for McGill a first-class international reputation.

A century and a half after its founding, McGill's situation is very different. Its British academic tradition has faded before North American and world-wide influences. Its sources of financing have altered dramatically; it now receives over 80 per cent of its funds from the Government of Quebec (albeit nearly half indirectly from the Government of Canada) and only after detailed scrutiny of budget submissions by the Provincial authorities. Private benefactions are relatively small, but still very precious, since they ensure a certain search grants of over 100,000 dollars from any source have to be freedom of action, a chance to rise above government norms. Re-

approved by Quebec. For the purposes of Bill 22, the Official Language Act, McGill and other universities in Quebec are part of the Provincial "public administration." This concept of the place of the universities is re-appearing in other legislation and regulations, with serious implications for academic autonomy. With the inevitability of an approaching glacier, the Ministry of Education and the Council of Universities, a government-appointed body, are integrating the universities into a cohesive network of complementary institutions and reducing their freedom — for instance, curtailing their initiative in developing new programs.

Within McGill, broader participation in governance by staff and students, and the general trend in modern society towards more complex infra-structures, have contributed to a proliferation of administrative structures and committees. In addition to the growing bureaucracy, academic staff spend an impressive number of hours at meetings of bodies ranging from the Board of Governors and Senate to a host of departmental committees. These activities cannot but detract from the efforts spent on the fundamental task of a university: the development and transmission of knowledge. In this situation, the Principal remains the chief executive but has much less power than his predecessors and often finds himself with little choice but to endorse the advice he receives from consultative bodies. Partly by personal preference but also in recognition of the new situation, Principal Robert Bell, in marked contrast to his predecessors like William Dawson, or more recently Cyril James, occupies himself largely with co-ordinating, mediating and representational functions, while most of the actual decision-making occurs elsewhere. The formal prerogatives of the office remain largely unaltered, but the reality has changed considerably.

the challenge of change

Change is often painful for individuals, and puts severe strains on institutions; it is also a constant of the present age. The planner's challenge is to assist people and institutions to adapt to new conditions, even to anticipate them. In the case of a prestigious institution like McGill, this task implies building on, rather than breaking with, the achievements of the past. A university's reputation, and the myths surrounding it, are among its most valuable assets. The term "myth" is not used in a pejorative sense, but rather as Burton Clark of Yale University uses the term "saga" to refer to self-validating belief systems which contribute to inner strength as well as external

support. Because of the importance of this phenomenon to McGill, Clark's concept is worth specifying:

An organizational saga is a powerful means of unity... It makes links across internal divisions and organizational boundaries as internal and external groups share their common belief. With deep emotional commitment, believers define themselves by their organizational affiliation... [and] share an intense sense of the unique... Such an emotional bond turns the membership into a community, even a cult... As participants become ideologues, their common definition becomes a foundation for extreme trust and loyalty. Such bonds give the organization a competitive edge in recruiting and maintaining personnel..."¹

In planning for McGill, it is important to respect and even nurture this asset of loyalty and sense of community, while at the same time minimizing its negative consequences in terms of archaic attitudes, procedures, structures and performance.

A related factor that must be taken into account in planning for change is the existing form of university government. Such forms range from highly centralized and authoritarian, through hierarchical and bureaucratic, to collegial. Quebec's French-language universities tend to be hierarchical or structured in character, with specified channels of communication between the upper echelons of the Administration and the operational level, the professors and students. The rigidities in such a model inhibit both vertical and horizontal exchanges of information and personal contacts, and encourage an adversary situation which has contributed to the unionization of academic personnel. McGill University enjoys at present a collegial model, or probably about as close as it is possible to come to a collegial model in the circumstances. Most of the University's senior administrators have been drawn from the academic ranks; practising academic staff members (and students) are represented on all important deliberative bodies including the Board of Governors but excluding the Budget Planning Group, a serious omission. Notwithstanding the efforts of his entourage to "protect" him, the Principal is quite accessible to individual staff and students. And relations between the Administration and the McGill Association of University Teachers are generally relaxed and open. The collegial principle is even extended to non-academic staff, who are represented on the Board of Governors and other bodies and, at the senior level of the Administration at least, are considered as true colleagues.

The reverse side of this precious coin of collegiality is the cumbersome nature of the decision-making process. Proposals have to run the gamut of committees, and often get caught in the cross-fire of

opposing interests, as well as encountering the roadblocks of academic conservatism. Since a consensus is considered advisable if not absolutely necessary at every level before proceeding to the next one, many proposals are lost or reduced to innocuousness underway. The more innovative the proposal, the less chance it has of staying the course. As planning is essentially a matter of bringing about change to keep pace with the rapidly evolving society, it is often an exercise in frustration.

planning defined

What is, in fact, university planning? The literature on the subject has proliferated in the past two decades and ranges from simple “how-to-do-it” techniques to futurological speculation. It draws on human knowledge developed in such varied fields as Engineering, Mathematics, various Natural Sciences, Social Science, and Business Administration. He is a rare human being who can become what Buckminster Fuller calls a “comprehensivist” and encompass it all. Unable to grasp planning’s various dimensions, many administrators and professors regard it with misgivings, and prefer to make decisions based on the immediate, albeit rapidly becoming outdated, world as they know it.

Planning is foreseeing the future and preparing for it, either by affecting its nature or adapting to it. Francisco Sagasti has defined it in less simplistic terms:

Planning is anticipatory decision making. It is a process whereby a system selects outcomes and courses of action in a series of inter-related choice situations which have not yet occurred, but which are envisioned to occur in the future.²

For those who prefer a still more sophisticated definition, Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber describe it as:

An on-going cybernetic process of governance, incorporating systematic procedures for continuously searching out goals; identifying problems; forecasting uncontrollable contextual changes; inventing alternative strategies, tactics and time-sequenced action; stimulating alternative and plausible action sets and their consequences; evaluating alternatively forecasted outcomes; statistically monitoring those conditions of the public and of systems that are judged to be germane; feeding back information to the simulation and decision channels so that errors can be corrected — all in a simultaneously functioning governing process.³

Clearly, one of the problems facing universities today is to recon-

cile the exigencies of planning with the ideal of a self-governing community of scholars, or in Paul Goodman's terms, an "anarchically self-regulating" collectivity.⁴ Effective planning requires not only that someone have an overview of the university and its place in evolving society, but also a knowledge of the ways of moving it forward in appropriate directions. Above all, the planner must have the power to effect that movement. Full-time professors running the university through occasional committee meetings, or even professors who accept full-time administrative posts for a fixed term, are unlikely to meet these requirements alone. In other words, university planning requires specialized competence and strengthens centralist trends. If as much academic freedom as possible is to be maintained, it is vital, in these circumstances, to appoint senior university officials who have a genuine appreciation of academic matters and planning-directed management. Such persons are rare.

Planning is usually divided into two types: operational research on hard data and leading to statistically based conclusions; and more abstract analysis based on less quantifiable information, concepts and objectives, and leading to more general conclusions. As in most universities, the first type of planning presents few difficulties for the McGill Administration. ORPAD (the Office of Research for Planning and Development), the Computer Centre, and the Comptroller's Office have a high level of competence in making linear projections. Even when they have had to incorporate in their evaluations relative imponderables such as student preferences of universities and programs, their record is good. For the present Principal and Vice Principals, five out of seven of whom were trained in the physical sciences, the statistics from those sources constitute reassuringly solid grounds for decision-making. Understandably, however, senior administrators feel much less at ease when asked to project decisions for the longer-term future where so many unquantified (and perhaps unquantifiable) variables should be taken into account.

And yet, the challenge of planning is to develop the capacity within an organization to prepare for — even to have some control over — the future that is still over the horizon of those who have to be able to measure if they are to believe. With the present rapid rate of change in human society, that future often becomes the present before we realize it exists, and we find ourselves trying to cope with it on the basis of data and approaches that belong to the past. "Planning Two," as Principal Bell has called this type of forward planning to distinguish it from the operational type based on quantifiable data, "Planning One," requires administrators to live with un-

certainty, and to take decisions that may well be proven wrong and have to be modified on the basis of additional information. "The best planning framework to-day," states Donald W. Fowke of Hickling-Johnston Limited, "is one which stresses keeping options open, and keeping the organization on the balls of its feet to respond."⁵

The requirements of organizational and personal flexibility, of operating in a fluid situation where often no more than tentative decisions can be made and even they may be proven wrong, are alien to traditional administrators and administrative processes. Decision-makers rise in the hierarchy on the basis of their record of "right" decisions, and are not forgiven easily for their errors. Other organizations to which they must answer, for instance, the Ministry of Education in the case of McGill, will not tolerate planning errors. And the clientèle being served, the professors, students and public, will soon withdraw their confidence.

That is the dilemma of the university planner. In an age of flux which leads many people to resist change and to cling to the familiar and the proven, he has to help administrators to learn to function in a situation of uncertainty, and those affected by administrative decisions to appreciate the necessity for flexibility and even what often appears to them to be indecisiveness. In a remarkably mind-expanding study entitled *Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn: The Social Psychology of Changing Toward Future-Responsive Societal Learning*, Donald M. Michael has stressed the need for the development of a new kind of adaptive capacity which he calls "future responsive societal learning." He argues people must learn to:

- live with and acknowledge great uncertainty
- embrace error
- seek and accept the ethical responsibility and the conflict-laden interpersonal circumstances that attend goal-setting
- evaluate the present in the light of anticipated futures and commit themselves to actions in the present intended to respond to such long-range anticipations
- live with role stress and forego the satisfactions of stable, on-the-job, social group relationships
- be open to changes in commitments and direction, as suggested by changes in the conjectured pictures of the future and by evaluations of on-going activities.⁶

Other futurist writers, ranging from the popular Alvin Toffler to authors of the series published recently by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, have argued along similar lines and have tried to identify the kinds of educational organizations most likely to be able to cope with future conditions. In an article pub-

lished in the volume, *Foundations of Futurology in Education*, Toffler advises university presidents to adopt a highly decentralized, "ad-hocratic" form of organization, relax admissions criteria, stimulate debate with students and staff on the institution's goals, and relate as closely as possible to the surrounding community. He attacks the natural conservatism at the Faculty level, and sees the concepts of "tenure" and "professor" as stultifying feudalistic remnants of another age.⁷

planning mcgill tomorrow

What are the assets and liabilities of McGill University in this planning context? Her one-hundred-fifty-odd year history is a decided asset inasmuch as it has produced an enviable "myth" or "saga" with which people are happy to identify. It contributes to loyalty and cohesion within, and support from outside, the institution and can be valuable in mobilizing the necessary forces for change. On the other hand, it can have a conservative, stagnating effect, to the degree that it perpetuates outdated values and modes of conduct. For instance, influential members of the staff and members of the Board of Governors sometimes hark back to the McGill of their youth in attempts to resist necessary change. More tangibly, the McGill "myth" has been useful in attracting good students, in obtaining research funds, in getting a hearing on current issues, and in fending off governmental attempts to intervene in the University's affairs.

McGill's collegial style of governance is also an asset. Easy vertical and lateral communications, whether through committees or other bodies, facilitate exchanges of information, mutual respect and consensus-building. As part of the same model, a high degree of decentralization enables many innovative steps to be taken at the Department or Faculty level without precipitating conflicts with colleagues in other units. Many of the significant innovations such as the development of brain surgery, nuclear fission research, and business management training have been generated at the base rather than at the administrative apex of the University. But, once again, we have a characteristic that can be, and indeed has been, used to block change. Other assets which come readily to mind are McGill's good research facilities, access to both public and private funds, an urban location (and urban centres are loci of change), and centres of excellence in particular fields.

Among the liabilities is the decreasing independence of action

of the McGill community as the Provincial Government asserts its authority in the field of education and non-Provincial sources of funding continue to decline. At a time when innovative capacity is more important than ever before, McGill is being reduced progressively to the status of a Provincial institution with concomitant purposes and scope. An associated factor is the *minorisation* of the English-speaking population in Quebec; that is, its reduction, for educational purposes at least, to the status of a Provincial minority rather than an integral part of the English-speaking population of all Canada, and indeed the English-speaking world. The probable absolute decline in numbers of anglophones, and their increasing preoccupation with survival rather than development, must inevitably discourage a confident, forward-looking approach within McGill University.

who plans at and for mcgill?

According to the consensual, decentralized model of university Administration in favor at McGill, planning should occur primarily at the operating level, that is within Departments, Institutes, Centres or other core units, and should be carried out by the academic staff. The Administration should play a facilitating and supporting role. Unfortunately, that is no longer completely possible in an age of interdependence, accountability and rapid change. Nevertheless, most suggestions for innovation continue to "bubble up" from the operating level, rather than "trickling down" from some other echelon of the University.* Most Departments and Faculties have planning committees or other structures that fulfill that function in fact if not explicitly, although few do so in a systematic way with the benefit of knowledge of the planning process. It is not mere coincidence that those units which do plan systematically (for instance the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Management) and which are able to present an image of cohesion and dynamism, enjoy a high level of autonomy and even prestige.

At the university-wide level, planning was imposed within McGill in the late 1960's by the pressures of outside events which led to a financial crisis and student unrest. An operational research office was created, which grew into the present-day Office of Research for

*Note: I find the hierarchical connotations of the words "up" and "down" as applied to university governance invidious since they connote "superiority" and "inferiority" in some minds. Unfortunately, they are so widely accepted that to use other words would create confusion.

Planning and Development, and the first Vice Principal (Planning) was appointed. Emphasis was placed at the outset on the immediate and specific aspects of planning such as analysis of enrolments, preparation of budgets and physical development. In the same period, a Tripartite Commission on the Nature of the University was created with representation from the Senate, academic personnel (McGill Association of University Professors) and the Students' Society. The Principal and the Presidents of the M.A.U.T. and the Students' Society became *ex officio* members. The Tripartite Commission provided the vehicle for extensive debate on McGill and resulted in the production of a number of papers and reports. However, several years later it is hard to identify specific results of this dialogue.

In October 1970, the Planning Commission of the University was created, and given the mandate "to explore and develop alternative models for the operation of the University within the constraints foreseen within the next five years." In part, this step was taken to avoid a repetition of the kind of crash decision-making that had occurred a few months earlier, when a very small group of administrators adopted drastic measures almost overnight to meet a serious budgetary situation. The Planning Commission was to be an advisory body to the Principal, and indeed to be chaired by him. To ensure it of adequate freedom of action, it was not to be responsible to the Senate or the Board of Governors. Simultaneously the Budget Planning Group appeared. It, too, was to act as an advisory body to the Principal, who was also its chairman.

With time, the Planning Commission has become integrated into a web of commissions and committees including Senate bodies such as the Academic Policy Committee, the Senate Committee on Educational Development, the Senate Committee on Physical Development, and the Senate Committee on Continuing Education. In 1975, the terms of reference of these four and the Planning Commission were revised to ensure greater coordination and complementarity and, in the process, the Planning Commission lost some of its independence. The Vice Principal (Planning) has assumed the chairmanship of the Planning Commission and the Principal rarely attends its meetings. The Budget Planning Group is also now chaired by a Vice Principal, the Vice Principal (Finance), but unlike the Planning Commission it has resisted integration and has become the most powerful in the constellation of committees and commissions.

Why the different evolution in the situation of the two bodies? The answer lies largely in their respective mandates. The Planning Commission is supposed to take the longer view and make its

recommendations on the various matters submitted to it within the broadest context of McGill's character, role and place in society. The Budget Planning Group deals essentially, as its title indicates, with the preparation of the annual budget and with disbursements. Its numerous specific and detailed decisions are largely short-run and based on specific facts and figures. In a *milieu* where facts usually take precedence over intangible considerations and where power is directly related to control over funds, the diverging evolution of the two bodies was inevitable. Deans appear before BPG each year after painstaking preparation, but still with trepidation, and argue valiantly for a fair share of the financial pie. They appear before the Planning Commission, if at all, confident of their relative power.

the record

The six-year history of the Planning Commission reveals that its efficacy is directly related to the specificity of the subjects with which it deals. One of the matters it considered was the future location of the Faculty of Agriculture. It took a firm decision that the Faculty should be moved to the downtown campus and subsequently confirmed that decision. But without the power to implement its decisions, it could go no farther than state its position, which was ultimately ignored. Another part of Macdonald College, the Faculty of Education, had already been moved downtown and the Planning Commission went through a very long and painstaking exercise to determine the Faculty's future. The recommendations in its final report were resisted by the Faculty with relative ease and PC members had to find solace in the possibility that their Education colleagues were taking some innovative steps themselves.

A third major project tackled by the Planning Commission was to react on behalf of the University to three *Cahiers* published by the Quebec Council of Universities with a view to setting out a *plan de développement des universités québécoises*.⁸ The *Cahiers* contained two parts, one dealing with the *objectifs et orientations de l'éducation supérieure au Québec*, the other with the *grandes orientations* of the Quebec university network and of the individual universities. Two major difficulties were encountered by the Planning Commission. First, McGill's staff reacted strongly against the notion of integrating the university into a network of Provincial institutions, each with a prescribed set of activities, even if the University itself participated fully in defining those activities. And second, the Planning Commission, composed of amateur planners and with negligible staff

support, was not able to deal with a subject of such scope. The responses it formulated were designed, on the one hand, to forestall wrathful reactions on campus, and on the other, to make as few concessions as possible to Quebec. McGill's *axes de développement* were only vaguely defined in what was a painful but important initiation into Province-wide and Government-directed planning.

A final example of the Planning Commission's activities is its examination of Bill 22, which became the Official Language Act, and recommendations for coping with it. Since the Bill was published (and rushed through the National Assembly) as the academic year 1973-74 was drawing to a close, the PC was not able to have a University position on it adopted in time to influence its contents. In the circumstances, the most that could be done was to analyse the law for the benefit of the McGill staff and to make representations concerning the various regulations drawn up for implementing it. The analysis was competent, as befitting a centre of learning. However, no real planning was involved.

In general, one can say of the Planning Commission that it has performed well when given specific tasks related to current issues that require academic judgment or factual analysis, or even a combination of them, but that it has done poorly on broader future-related questions. It has not fully assumed its fundamental role as a source of knowledge and guidance on university planning, and its prestige has suffered as a result.

In addition to the Planning Commission, many other units undertake planning activities, and indeed, there is some truth in Principal Bell's remark that planning is "what we do all the time." Among the most useful planning-type exercises are the annual "retreats" at an Eastern Townships inn of the Planning Commission and the Committee of Deans. These meetings, held in a congenial atmosphere away from day-to-day administrative concerns, provide an opportunity to reflect on longer-term matters, and to examine the University in a more comprehensive manner than is possible on campus. One of the principal benefits of the "retreats" is on the level of human relations: participants get to know and appreciate each other as individuals rather than as occupants of particular administrative posts.

The weaknesses in McGill's planning operations are all the more serious because the planning of the Quebec network of universities is proceeding in other places and, to the degree that McGill does not participate in the process, plans will be imposed on it. The Council of Universities continues to pursue its objective of an integrated network of complementary institutions, described in a document issued

in the summer of 1974 as “*un système diversifié, mais complémentaire, cohérent et décentralisé.*”⁹ Those terms suggest a real desire on the part of Council members to reconcile university autonomy with Provincial responsibility for education. However, it is clear that if the planning and development of this network are carried on primarily at the Provincial level, or even by the Provincial authorities plus the other universities, the result is less likely to be congenial to members of the McGill community than if they have an effective input.

Another potentially effective instrument for participation by the universities in Province-wide planning of higher education is the *Conférence des Recteurs et Principaux des Universités du Québec* (CREPUQ). This is, in fact, the association of Quebec universities, and provides not only a forum for discussing common interests but also an instrument for making the most effective case in dealing with Provincial authorities. It has a small planning staff, but its list of committees does not even include a standing committee of Vice Rectors or Vice Principals (Planning). No attempt is made to take the initiative in system-wide planning, or even to press the common view that most facets of planning are best left to the individual institutions. Once again, the longer view and the broader framework are shunted aside in favor of short-term concerns. This short-sightedness not only reduces the effectiveness of universities in planning matters; it reduces the efficacy of CREPUQ in general in its dealings with the Quebec Government.

Typically, the McGill Administration is most successful in dealing with the Provincial authorities in the realm of hard facts. Its budgetary submissions are a source of admiration in the Ministry of Education and pleas for special cases, usually well documented, are given careful consideration. When the Ministry decided after the 1973 Provincial elections to abandon the out-dated *méthode historique* (in essence taking the previous year's budgetary figures and adjusting them to meet changed requirements) for calculating annual grants and adopting instead the PPBS or Program Planning Budgeting System, as developed by the Rand Corporation in the United States, McGill's ORPAD supplied the expertise and a great many man-hours of work. In the event, only certain elements of the PPB System were adopted, but the experience served to indicate McGill's potential usefulness in the planning sphere, and the real possibilities of fruitful co-operation between the University and the Government.

conclusion

We have seen that, over the past decade or so, McGill University has responded to the need for adaptation to changing conditions by

creating a certain number of planning posts and structures and has hired some planners. However, understanding of the significance of planning, as well as its scope and nature, has not grown apace among decision-makers. Consequently, it continues to occupy a less central place in the process of governance than the circumstances warrant. To the degree that this situation is allowed to continue, the future of the University is being left more to others than it needs to be.

The election on November 15, 1976 of a Government committed to the independence of Quebec as well as to social democracy lends even greater urgency to the need for competent and effective planning at McGill. An independent Quebec would certainly make different demands of, and impose different conditions on, it. And the political option, social democracy, implies much greater governmental planning and control. But whether or not Quebec separates from the rest of Canada, the process of integration or the degree of autonomy that will be preserved will depend on the ability of the universities themselves to make the case for autonomy. In this regard, McGill has strong and sympathetic allies among the other universities, particularly Laval and the University of Montreal. Structures such as CREPUQ and the Council of Universities can be much better utilized than in the past for this purpose. And McGill's prestige is a precious asset.

This new challenge confronting McGill University to determine its own future is one of the most serious it has had to meet. Two responses are called for. First, it must re-define its own character and its place in society, and Quebec society in particular. Second, it must play a much more positive role than in the past in shaping higher education in the Province. Undoubtedly, McGill continues to have an important vocation. The need persists to educate and train anglophone youth, as well as francophone youth and others who turn to it. There is a continuing role for McGill as an institution of international quality and scope in this part of North America. While maintaining its relevance within Quebec and Canada, it must not neglect its broader role of service to all mankind through its teaching, research, exchange and development aid programs.

The onus is increasingly on McGill University to demonstrate its value and ensure itself a place in the evolving firmament of higher education. Areas of weakness must be tackled forthrightly. Problems must not be allowed to fester and gaps in the spectrum of activity must be filled. The University cannot afford to allow certain Departments to operate at a low level of efficiency because of personnel problems or internal strife. Internal road blocks to innovation must

be overcome. For instance, three years ago the principle of continuing or life-long education was accepted by Senate, but no plans have been developed to implement it and the very concept has been resisted in some units. Similarly, the importance of a healthy measure of complementarity between McGill and Concordia Universities has been recognized, but only a piece-meal approach has been taken to ensuring it. In the same vein, McGill's representatives have sometimes been unduly reticent to negotiate co-operative undertakings with other universities and have missed opportunities to contribute to the common weal. Curiously, this attitude is manifest not only on the Provincial, but also on the national, level, for instance, with regard to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. As a final example, McGill's language policy — that is, the degree to which French is used — was devised hastily after Bill 22 was enacted in 1974, and primarily with a view to remaining within the law. It needs to be re-assessed with two objectives in mind: McGill's remaining a first-class English-language educational institution and communicating effectively with Quebec's French-language population and institutions.

The concepts and techniques of university planning are valuable and even indispensable tools in assuring a bright future for McGill University corresponding to its very distinguished past. But they are not well-honed instruments and their effective utilization requires a real effort of understanding and adaptation. In a collegial-type institution, this effort must be made in the upper echelons of the Administration, but also at Faculty and Departmental levels where so many decisions are taken. In earlier times, when the University was smaller, Departmental chairmen were better able to relate to the whole campus and to identify the general thrust of the institution. Since such an overview is now more difficult to achieve, chairmen must be associated with the planning process as well as the decision-making process.

The planning experience at McGill has not been a failure, but it has fallen far short of its potential. For the most part, the structures and personnel exist; they need to be made more effective. And the process has to be extended throughout the whole University. One of the best guarantees of a bright future for McGill is a clear and realistic view, by as many members as possible of the McGill community, of its true state and prospects. In that way, a better choice can be made among possible futures and the possibility of achieving the best future will be enhanced.

footnotes

1. J. V. Baldridge Jr. and T. E. Deal, *Managing Change in Educational Organizations*, Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1975, pp. 98-99.

2. Francisco R. Sagasti, "A Conceptual 'Systems' Framework for the Study of Planning Theory," *Technological Forecasting and Social Changes*, Vol. 5 (1973), p. 386.
3. Horst W. J. Rittel and Melvin M. Webber, "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning," *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 4 (1973), pp. 155-69.
4. Paul Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, New York: Vintage, 1962, p. 189.
5. Donald V. Fowke, *New Structures of Policy Coordination*, unpublished manuscript, August 1976.
6. Donald M. Michael, *On Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn: The Social Psychology of Changing Toward Future-Responsive Societal Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973, p. 18.
7. Alvin Toffler, "Learning to Live with Future Shock," in Richard W. Hostrop, ed., *Foundations of Futurology in Education*, Homewood, Ill.: ETC Publications, 1973.
8. Conseil des Universités, *Deuxième rapport annuel, 1970-71*, p. 104.
9. Questionnaire from the Council of Universities to all Universities, 1974, p. 19.