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ABSTRACT: This paper documents the process and the results of restructuring the College of Education at the University of New Mexico. The goal is to inform other colleges and universities of these experiences to assist them to manage change and to anticipate the issues that will arise during the process. Results of the restructuring process are presented with a brief description of the actual implementation plan. Also included is a discussion of the major questions posed by the college as it experienced the restructuring process.

Introduction

Colleges of education have a unique opportunity to respond to the challenges facing national and state educators in the 1990s. Schools traditionally constitute a community and social foundation through which children and youth are prepared for productive lives and responsible citizenship. In recent years, the educational enterprise has expanded beyond the boundaries of the school to address the continuing education of adults, as well as other influences that affect children, youth and adults throughout a lifetime of learning. Educational institutions must, and are, changing to meet the needs of a larger education sector. Colleges of education have the opportunity and the challenge to be in the forefront of that change through systematic and thoughtful planning rather than random and unrelated actions.

The College of Education at the University of New Mexico (UNM) has spent more than a year in planning for its future. This was not a change the College sought or even wanted. Instead, it was precipitated by the decision of the University's Board of Regents to gain more budget flexibility through a systematic process, which they termed 'reallocation'. The Regents called for 'blood on the floor' and downsizing and termination of unspecified programs and/or colleges. The reallocation plan, released in September 1991, targeted the College of Education for a 'thorough review' by a panel of experts to be selected by the provost, who would report to him by 1 December 1991. This panel would advise the provost what to do to or with the College. The College administration decided to respond proactively by offering to restructure the entire College. The paper describes the process the College used to plan and to begin the restructuring process. This paper will inform other colleges
and universities of these experiences to assist them to manage change and to anticipate the issues that will arise during the process.

This paper examines the change process, and the effects of the change itself. Specific problems to be addressed include the following: the determination of the context in which the change occurred; the introduction of the proposed change within the organization along with its initial purpose; and the outcomes of the change upon the structure of the organization.

Fundamental to the study of change is the concept of a time-related process—where what comes next is affected by what came before. Understanding preceding events helps to clarify the reactions and interactions that occur as a result of the change.

Context of College of Education and Reasons for Change

The College experienced an enormous growth pattern during the late 1960s and 1970s, with a faculty remaining fairly constant at about 115 full-time employees since that time. The growth spurt, however, resulted in about one-half of the faculty nearing retirement by 1989. In 1990, 15 new faculty were hired, and six new faculty were hired in 1991. The college currently has approximately 20 vacancies.

The College, as well as the University, has experienced unstable leadership. In 1973, the dean of the College was fired by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, himself an ex-dean of the College. The subsequent search failed, and a faculty member was appointed dean. Eight years later he resigned, and the next search also failed. A new dean was appointed following the subsequent search, and he resigned 8 years later. The next two searches failed, and the College had a 1 year interim dean, followed by a second interim appointment that began in July 1991. During the 10 years from 1982–92, the University has had six presidents and six provosts/academic vice-presidents and is yet again searching for a new provost.

In contrast, the College has an exemplary and stable history of collaborative work with the Albuquerque Public Schools, which is the twenty-sixth largest district in the USA. The College has also taken advantage of its geographic location, through a focus on multicultural education and through co-operation with other school districts in the state and collaboration with Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories and government agencies on issues of math, science and technology, early childhood education, bilingual/multicultural education, health education, and family and education policy.

Fundamental Issues

Early in the process, the College administration, working with the Faculty Policy Committee and the Administrative Council, determined to address several fundamental issues during the restructuring.
Organizational Structure

Over time, colleges of education have organized themselves into departments, which often have become increasingly independent from one another. The organizational structure of the College of Education at UNM was a basic issue in the University’s reallocation plan, which asked whether the College should have eight departments and six centers. Faculty in the College were devoted to the department structure, although some changes had occurred in the mid-1980s, when programs and/or faculty moved from department to department and two departments collapsed into one. Faculty in the College are tenured in the College, not departments or programs, which permitted this reorganization.

The independence of the departments, amounting to almost total autonomy in some instances, had caused a variety of problems and difficulties in the College. It was almost, as Dean Richard Wisniewski of the University of Tennessee states, as if there were eight colleges within the College, not dissimilar to the situation in traditional arts and sciences colleges. Yet, the field of education is not analogous to arts and science colleges; it is, or should be, a cohesive, but diverse, field of study, with all parts relating to one another, even if that relationship is not strong. Adopting that view of the College led to a systems approach to the management of change in the College, with the premise all parts relate, and change in one part will affect change in another. The ability to manage as a system may be one hallmark of a professional school with the organizing feature being the cohesive nature of the field.

Comprehensive Nature

When the process of restructuring was first started, some faculty argued that the College should retrench to a focus on pre-school through grade 12 (P-12). The College, over the years, had become an amorphous collection of programs, ranging from the traditional teacher and administrator education programs to nutrition and dietetics to corporate training. A pivotal question was how all the talent and resources of the College could be brought to bear on issues facing education, wherever the training occurred and at whatever age the education was delivered. Preliminary documents made clear that the College was to be comprehensive; however, when the national education goals were also discussed, some faculty took that as evidence of a P-12 focus. Although the issue of a comprehensive College continued to be debated and is still under discussion, the College administration stated in the fall that the College would remain comprehensive, but that all programs must relate to education and must have some connection to P-12 education, no matter how small.

The Climate

Colleges of education in New Mexico are not highly popular places, often under attack within their university and frequently under siege from state agencies. An obvious, but unsupported conclusion, was that the College at UNM was targeted in the reallocation plan because no one would care what happened to it, except the
faculty and perhaps the students in the College. It was essential to shape the climate to be more positive toward the College. This led to systematic and constant public statements about the opportunities created by reallocation and the enormous work being done in the College. There has been some indication of a more positive attitude both in the University and in the state toward the College, but with a ‘final judgment pending’.

Faculty Confidence

Suspicion was high among faculty, who did not trust the administration, regardless of what was done within the College; nor did they have much faith in a new, interim dean and a new College administration. As a consequence, the majority of the faculty either resisted doing anything, or they proceeded to take actions independent of any co-ordinated activity from the College leadership. The Faculty Policy Committee worked with the dean to orchestrate a co-ordinated response by the entire College to the University’s reallocation plan. Committees were consulted and reactions and suggestions solicited; individual faculty were asked to contribute their responses; and departments were asked to provide formal department responses. All responses were sent to the Policy Committee, who drafted the initial College response to the plan. With minor editorial changes, the dean forwarded the document to the provost. This activity occupied the month of October and resulted in a higher level of confidence that the dean could be trusted to listen to the faculty and that the Policy Committee would be instrumental as the liaison to the College administration.

How to Get the Provost to Change His Mind

Once the College leadership had decided to be proactive about reallocation (‘this is great; it permits us to think about doing things we never had the chance to before’), the problem of the provost’s plan for an external committee remained. The provost remained adamant about the need to examine the College, to the extent that many faculty decided any effort would be a lost cause (‘it’s all been decided anyway; why should we bother?’). However, in a regular meeting with the provost to discuss the outside review team, the dean mentioned that the College would collaborate with the Albuquerque Academy for Educational Leadership to have Michael Fullan of the University of Toronto as a speaker. Also, the dean presented the rationale to the provost that a review committee would, once again, study the College’s past and that the point of any exercise, even if it were reallocation, should be to plan for the future. The provost and dean then agreed upon an alternative strategy to focus on planning and change that would include a series of speakers such as Fullan.
Change Process

The process developed by the dean, in collaboration with the Faculty Policy Committee and the Administrative Council, and approved by the provost consisted of the following steps:

I. Phase One
A. Environmental scan (conducted by an independent firm)
   1. Surveys
   2. Market analysis
   3. Focus groups
   4. Interviews of past dean candidates
   5. Review of current status of College programs and departments

B. Speaker’s series
C. Self-study
   1. Task forces on admissions/advisement; teacher education programs; year-round schooling; and non-licensure programs
   2. College standing committees

D. Lunch series for discussion of specific issues
E. Assessment of the national and state trends

II. Phase Two
A. Development of a preliminary plan
B. Review team to be recommended by the dean to the provost
C. Final plan

III. Phase Three—implementation

Phase One—the motivation to change/data gathering

This occurred in the period between 1 November 1991 and 1 February 1992.

Surveys. Surveys were distributed to current undergraduate (n = 630) and graduate (n = 1200) degree students, as well as to 6300 alumni and 1316 superintendents, principals, state and local Board of Education members and education agency personnel. The surveys were similar, asking individuals to assess current programs and practices in the College and to react to possible new directions for programs and the focus of the College.

Focus groups. Business, community, and education leaders from across New Mexico participated in six focus groups to establish the viewpoints of the clients of the College as input for planning. Four scenarios/questions were posed: (1) Imagine that the College of Education as you know it at UNM does not exist and you are providing input that will be used to form a totally new college. What should be its central focus? (2) What are the most important personal and professional characteristics educators will need to meet the challenges of education between now and the
year 2002? (3) Imagine that the College of Education is developing a vision statement which all faculty will support and which will serve as a framework for producing the kinds of graduates who will be excellent educators for the New Mexico of the future. Our task is to create a list of concepts which should be included in the vision statement. What should we include? (4) Restructuring is a current buzzword in educational circles and on the public’s education agenda. What relevance, if any, does restructuring have for the College of Education? If your task were to restructure the College to meet future educational needs in New Mexico over the next few years, what would be your top three priorities?

 Speakers’ series. A series of 10 nationally known speakers were invited to the College to meet with faculty and to make a presentation of their choice about change in colleges of education. Speakers included Michael Fullan, Vito Perrone, Steve Lilly, James Horgan, Jeff Bingaman, Arturo Madrid, Richard Pesqueira, Michael Kirst, Willard Daggett and Virginia Richardson. Ideas presented by all speakers ultimately became pivotal in the final plan of the College. For example: permeable clusters (Fullan); cannot plan forever (Fullan, Lilly, Perrone); cohorts (Lilly); risk-taking (all speakers); differentiating between reorganizing and restructuring (Lilly); streamlined administrative profile (Horgan); center of inquiry (Perrone, Richardson); multicultural education (Perrone, Madrid); paradigm shift (Lilly, Perrone, Pesqueira); non-linear planning (Fullan); ‘Complacency will be the death knell for those who buy into it’ (Horgan); ecology of the schools as integrated service centers (Perrone).

 State and national trends. Information obtained from the environmental scan, the speakers’ series, self-study, task force reports, and an extensive review of documents was synthesized into the critical issues to be considered in the development of a strategic plan for the College. The issues were broadly categorized as (1) changing demographics; (2) school change; (3) diversity and multicultural education; (4) the information age; (5) collaboration and articulation; and (6) curriculum, research and assessment.

 Organizational sensing. To facilitate the unfreezing and to gain a sense of where individual faculty members were in their understanding of the changes needed, an organizational sensing was undertaken. This involved asking all departments and committees of the College of Education to discuss in depth and prepare written reports on (1) the need for change, (2) the process of change and (3) plans for restructuring. Along with gathering information from these groups, all individual faculty members were encouraged to submit individual responses to the need and plan for change. In September, due to the high level of rumor, misinformation, and confusion, the dean began a series of ‘updates’ that addressed the factual issues of what was occurring. These updates have continued periodically. The updates took a sense of pulse from the College and gave up-to-date information about critical questions. They also incorporated perspectives from the speakers after each visit,
informed faculty who were not actively participating, and served to confirm for those who did participate.

Phase Two—development of a plan of action

This phase involved the analysis and planning for change through the development of a preliminary plan for the College, based on the data gathered in phase one. A team approach was used to facilitate the development of the plan and to assimilate the information gathered from the various sources. Two volunteer work teams of faculty, one larger than the other, formed to review, discuss and analyze the information and to develop plans. The larger team consisted of 32 members whose task was to do a preliminary analysis of the information and develop areas of priority. Their work was forwarded to the second, smaller team, which consisted of 15 faculty members, the dean, and the associate dean. During a 2 day retreat with a professional facilitator, this small team addressed the issues and priority areas. By the end of the retreat, the team had developed a focus statement for the College, five goals, and a variety of strategies that could be used to attain the goals. The team spent almost the entire second day discussing options for reorganization, but was unable to come to agreement. The team continued its work, and during the annual American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) meeting in San Antonio, options for reorganization were developed, and the plan was put into a form that could be distributed to the faculty. This work was disseminated to the larger team, discussed, and returned to the smaller team for further work. The decision was made to share the body of the plan with the faculty without an implementation strategy. The dean and the provost agreed to forego the planned outside review team until the fall 1992.

Phase Three—adoption of plan

Phase three was characterized by the feedback of information to and from the entire faculty of education. The Faculty Policy Committee decided to hold a series of "town hall" meetings to accomplish this purpose. A facilitator, experienced in large group feedback sessions, moderated the town hall meetings. They were scheduled during March 1992, and were open to all faculty, staff and students in the College of Education. In addition to town hall meetings, each department and committee was asked to review the proposed plan and prepare written comments, including strengths and weaknesses. Further, to include all members in small group conversations, weekly lunch discussion groups met so that faculty could voice their opinions in a variety of ways. As with the original organizational sensing, each faculty member had the opportunity to provide written comments to the dean's office about the proposed plan.

The first town hall meeting was structured so that faculty were limited to 2 minutes at a time for comment prior to distribution of the plan. However, the majority of the faculty appeared disconcerted by the structure of the meeting and spent most of the time expressing frustration that 2 minutes was insufficient time. The second town hall meeting was held in a smaller room in the Student Union.
Building. A member of the ‘retreat team’ presented the plan’s goals and strategies, which had been distributed to faculty about 1 week before the meeting. The tone of the meeting was favorable to the plan, with general discussion about change and future direction of the College. Concern was expressed about how the plan would be implemented, particularly with regard to reorganization. After this meeting, five options for reorganization and key issues for implementation were distributed to the faculty prior to the third town hall meeting, which was the most acrimonious and dealt solely with implementation and reorganization. Faculty formed into ‘camps’ of those who wanted to reorganize and those who did not. Much of the concern about reorganization was centered on how the bureaucracy would work, for example, who would control the overhead return.

**Questionnaire.** After the third town hall meeting the dean distributed the reorganization options along with a questionnaire to the faculty. Faculty were asked to rank their preferences of the various options and to rate their agreement with each element of the plan. The results indicated a strong preference for two of the five reorganization options and strong approval of the focus, goals and strategies for the college.

**Faculty meetings.** A week after the town hall meeting, about 15 faculty presented a petition to the dean for a formal faculty meeting and a request for a vote on the plan. The dean called the meeting, set for 5 working days from the date the petition was received. However, under the College standing rules, decision items must appear on the agenda to be distributed to faculty no later than 1 week prior to the meeting. The dean put the issue to the faculty at the meeting, since no decision items had been proposed in the petition. They decided not to vote to suspend the standing rule, but to take a straw vote instead. The discussion at the meeting centered on reasons for reorganization. The faculty decided to vote on the plan, without the implementation section. The plan was adopted by a large margin.

The regular faculty meeting was held 2 weeks later (last week of April). The point of discussion, as had been agreed upon at the prior meeting, was reorganization. In the interim period, however, the College had received its budget allocation for 1992–93; and the vacant posts and dollars in those posts in the College were removed from the budget. This information was shared with the faculty at the meeting. When they realized the provost was removing all of the vacant faculty posts from the college, the faculty voted by about a two-thirds majority to reorganize into three divisions, to be called divisions A, B and C, partly to diminish the likelihood of future rigidity in structure.

The dean reported this vote to the provost, who in turn, reversed his decision and returned the vacant faculty posts and dollars to the College.

**Stabilization of Change**

**The plan of action.** The plan of action adopted by the faculty is intended to be the primary avenue by which change will be realized by establishing a college that is dynamic, self-renewing, and changing. The plan will be reviewed annually to
determine the progress of the College over the past year and to make any changes in goals, strategies, or outcomes that are deemed necessary to enable the College to meet the needs of its constituent groups.

Each year the College will establish areas of priority for restructuring and improvement of programs. This will enable the faculty, students and staff of the College to address specific issues, such as strength of teaching, research, collaboration, and supporting practices. We anticipate that the goals of the plan will occupy the faculty for many years; however, the strategies, priorities and objectives within each goal will change as needs and opportunities change. The plan, consequently, is deliberately designed to be flexible and evolutionary, permitting faculty and programs to respond to students and the University, as well as to state and national trends.

Structure of the College. During this time it became obvious to some faculty that some kind of change would occur. As a result, various faculty alliances began to be formed and approximately 30 faculty asked to be moved away from existing departments. These faculty members expressed interest in forming a new group to deal with the issues of restructuring. This group of faculty came from all areas of the College and from all ranks, thus impacting every department within the College. This new alliance of faculty was pivotal to accomplishing the change because it opened the possibility for faculty to think about doing something different and it released them from the strictures of their old departments.

Schein (1980) emphasizes the importance key members have on change in an organization. It was these key faculty members who were able to step beyond the traditional bounds and create a new division, ‘Division C’. This new structure was conceived as being permeable, where faculty have the opportunity to cross divisions to work collaboratively, to be housed in one division while teaching in another, and to design new programs. This new division is intended to foster new ideas and permit mistakes and encourage innovation.

During the summer and fall of 1992 the implementation began. The provost dropped his request for a formal outside review team. In July approximately 130 faculty and staff were moved among the nine buildings occupied by the College to create a better proximity for faculty in the various divisions.

In the fall, vacant positions were determined through a ‘request for proposal’, that resulted in the reallocation of 20 faculty posts. Approximately 10 posts were tenure-stream, while the remainder were either clinical or visiting appointments, to ensure maximum flexibility for change in the College by not locking in prematurely via decision about areas of expertise.

This phase and the divisional organizational structure are estimated to span 2-5 years while the process of change continues. However, the plan that was adopted included continual review, with the intent to design a new organizational structure in the future. Understanding the process and the time-related sequence of steps undertaken is necessary to understand fully how this College of Education was able to restructure in such a brief span of time into a new configuration better able to meet the needs of the future.
Results of the Restructuring Process

Organizational change results in several benefits to the organization. One benefit is that of double loop learning. Because of involvement at all stages of the process, faculty were able to examine and learn through the process and now have a systematic way of processing future problems. The autocratic methods of imposed change do little to help members of organizations learn how to solve their own problems. Actively involving the faculty promotes learning to work collaboratively on problem-solving. In addition, the opportunity to play an active role increases the motivation of the members to work toward achieving the goals of the organization. Because faculty are able to become involved, their commitment to the new plan is conceivably greater than a forced plan from the administration, although there still are small numbers of faculty who insist that the plan was predetermined in the fall 1992, via a secret process. Lastly, by using various feedback methods, greater amounts of information can be disseminated and synthesized by more members of the organization. Traditionally, faculty are isolated employees and often insulate themselves from administrative and organizational issues. By using several modes of data gathering, analysis and dissemination, more faculty have the opportunity to be involved in a process that is central to their own work.

Fullan & Miles (1992) have presented several propositions for success in educational reform. This plan and the change process exemplify some of these propositions. They propose that change is a journey, not a blueprint. The College of Education has begun the journey, developed a road map, and is continuing on the trip. This is a journey that is seen as long term, with many bridges and curves ahead. Fullan & Miles assert that change is learning and is loaded with uncertainty. The plan this College of Education has developed emphasizes the learning that is necessary for it to become successful, and has built into its structure the flexibility to accommodate the uncertainty of change. They also assert that change is systemic. By experiencing a thorough self-study, a comprehensive reorganization, and formulating new goals, purposes and programs, the plan is based on system-wide change. Finally, Fullan & Miles contend that all large-scale change be locally implemented. Through the time-related feedback activities faculty have endeavored to work on the problem of restructuring at all levels of implementation.

Questions Concerning Restructuring

As the change process began, a number of questions arose. This section will examine some of these questions and various issues surrounding them.

Is it necessary to have all the answers 'up front'? Trying to accomplish large organizational change is difficult at best. The complexities of the system dictate that one change affects many, if not all, other parts of the system. What evolves is a continually changing entity. The intricacies of the effects and the results are nearly impossible to calculate fully; however, it was understood that standing still would create a certain demise. Both Michael Fullan and Steve Lilly counseled against
taking too long. In particular, Fullan was adamant that planning could evolve, that only the general framework had to be determined, and that the particulars could be decided as planning progressed. Thus Fullan's (1991) suggestion of 'Ready, Fire, Aim' became a guide-post for planning.

Can an organisational structure assist reform? We felt that some organizational change was necessary, in large part to send a signal to the University administration of serious intent; however, creating just another stagnant structure was undesirable. Moving 'boxes' around on a piece of paper would not accomplish the goal. A structure was needed that was permeable and flexible—one that allowed for dramatic change and at the same time maintained current programs and offerings, giving as much stability as possible to students, faculty and staff. The result probably was as close as an organization can get to having no structure, or a destructuring of a college. There is no organizational chart; lines of reporting and authorities barely exist; and faculty, staff and students are housed in a somewhat unique configuration of divisions, due to the cross-division membership of about one-half of the faculty.

Can teacher preparation reform lead to college reform? This question was answered with a sound 'yes'. Although the College of Education had toyed with the idea of reform, it was not until the internal necessity combined with the national impetus to reconsider teacher reform that the College became serious about the issue. The public schools in New Mexico were leading the way in educational change, and the College was being soundly criticized for programs that did not consider or address the issues that teachers must work with in the school and classroom. It became very important to determine the linkages needed with the schools and to incorporate them into the strategy of reform.

Will the University commit to teacher education and reform? The University's strategic planning document, UNM 2000, does not consider the issues of teacher education. Instead, it emphasizes science, engineering and management as priorities of the University. The University did become a charter member of the Holmes Group and established a Council on Teacher Education, but the participation and interest has been largely limited to a group of faculty in the College. A year of publicity about change, about intent to review and redesign, about restructuring has begun to change the negative image. The Faculty Senate has also been co-operative and facilitating. During 1991–92, the dean routinely informed the President of the Senate about the change process. The new 1992–93 Senate President asked the dean to report periodically to the Senate Reallocation Committee about the progress in the College, rather than seeking bureaucratic approval of organizational changes that would themselves be modified in the next 2–5 years.

How do faculty create new programs while maintaining old ones? What is the responsibility of the faculty to a College that is changing? What is the responsibility of the College to faculty whose areas of interest shift during the change? What is the responsibility of the College to programs if faculty ask to leave a program to work in another? We view these
as the most critical series of questions if change is to become permanent. To
determine the viability of programs, a system of zero-based curriculum is being used
during the restructuring period. Faculty are being asked to evaluate each program,
both old and new, and its offerings. Only those courses seen as important to
program integrity are being offered. This will result in a streamlined curriculum and
assist in determining redundant, under-utilized, and extraneous course offerings.

As the division structure is implemented, faculty who had been in various
departments 'broke-up'. Conflict between faculty responsibility to programs for
which they were originally hired versus their right to change career direction has
emerged. Questions about the priority of a program and the responsibility of the
College if several faculty choose to work with another program have been posed.
How these issues are ultimately resolved will determine the degree of change and its
direction in this College.

As faculty chose to pursue a different direction, even if they still taught in the
program in which they had been hired, inevitable dissension occurred. These faculty
were viewed as 'traitors', who abandoned their obligation to the 'traditional' pro-
gram. Turf and control issues have emerged, causing faculty to feel torn between
their desire to redesign programs and their desire to retain friendships and col-
leagues. This has been especially difficult for non-tenured faculty, many of whom
now reside in Division C, requiring changes in procedure of the promotion and
tenure process. Faculty, working with the division dean and with the approval of the
dean, now have the option to form a cohort of faculty who will serve as their peer
reviewers.

Should the College of Education have a specific research agenda? This is a hotly
debated topic, one that has not been resolved. It seems clear that faculty should
contribute to the mission and focus of the college, yet some faculty view this as a
restriction of their academic freedom. This is especially evident in programs that
have little, if anything, to do with the field of education.

Can faculty be given the time to debate the issues of reform when they have teaching,
research and service loads? Change takes much time for debate, thinking and
planning. This problem is impacted by difficult economic conditions. As regular
faculty are released from teaching to work on program redesign or development,
more required courses are taught by part-time faculty, straining the budget and
angering students. Counseling of students has become a particular area of con-
tention, as unmonitored admissions policies at the graduate level have resulted in
extraordinary counseling overloads. It is especially important to recognize the time
involved and to protect untenured faculty from overload.

Can the future be planned rather than reviewing the past? Planning is often simply a
review of the past and a tinkering with a few variables; however, the colleges of
education cannot survive with this kind of tinkering. A distinction must be made
between research and invention, between planning and visioning; strategic reform
must occur.
Can change occur this quickly? We respond yes. Arturo Madrid, the president of the Tomas Rivera Foundation, warned the faculty that given the opportunity, 'academics will talk anything to death' (1991). The speed with which the College was forced to move (6 months) precluded endless discussion, the creation of more committees, second-guessing, more options, more questions. The College had a severe deadline that it met, forcing the faculty to come to decisions, even if unhappily. The 6 months were dreadful, but in retrospect, we believe we engaged in a better and more productive process than one that is more drawn-out over years.

These questions represent a sample that the change process has prompted in the College. There are many more questions and too few answers. In essence, we are creating the process daily. The ability to pose the questions, seek answers and reflect is the most important part, and the most difficult, of the change process. An organization cannot proceed through the reform process without this questioning.

Beginning the effort of forging the future of the College of Education brings the knowledge that the tasks and the years ahead will be both challenging and exciting. This is a time of great promise for the College and the University. Superficial change is not the goal; neither is change for the sake of change. Systemic change that responds to the changes in the educational system is the goal. We believe that this College, through its rapid and inclusive process, has set the stage for that systematic change.
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