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ABSTRACT

All institutions of higher education must respond – and respond now – to a new and powerful challenge to “business as usual”: the call for accountability. It will not be enough to tinker at the edges. The kind of institutional change required will entail a re-examination of how we teach, how we grade our students, how we relate to our students, how we market ourselves and how we give an accounting of ourselves to policy makers and those who fund us. Those institutions that can adapt and meet the new accountability challenge are the ones that will survive and be in a position to thrive. As Charles Darwin noted: “It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change.”

The purpose of this study is to describe how organizational change was accomplished at an urban, commuter, masters-level liberal arts institution. Specifically, the study analyzes the changes in assessment, faculty accountability and campus culture, begun by the catalyst for change in an initial NCATE accreditation as well as other college-wide factors like a strategic planning process and a general education review.

This study will use the four aspects of change that affect the depth and meaningfulness of change in an organization: the why, what, how and target of the change, and put the findings from the exploratory case study in the theoretical framework of Bolman and Deal’s Reframing
Organizations. Using the four frames, structural, human resources, political and symbolic, the many factors around the change initiative will be analyzed to determine the role played in the change.

This study will help institutional leaders better understand how change occurs in a public, commuter institution as well as the effect of internal and external forces. It will help leaders look at a change process from multiple lens, and analyze it from the perspectives of the various individuals in the process. This study provides some insight into aspects that help, and those that might hinder effective transformational change for leaders in similar institutions.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

All institutions of higher education must respond – and respond now – to a new and powerful challenge to “business as usual”: the call for accountability. It will not be enough to tinker at the edges. The kind of institutional change required will entail a re-examination of how we teach, how we grade our students, how we relate to our students, how we market ourselves and how we give an accounting of ourselves to policymakers and those who fund us. Those institutions that can adapt and meet the new accountability challenge are the ones that will survive and be in a position to thrive.

Institutions of higher education are under increased scrutiny from the students who fill their classes and the employers who hire their students. The student as customer has changed how students are recruited and retained, how student services are delivered and how college facilities are retrofitted or constructed. Employers, aware of the skills college graduates need to be successful today, are demanding relevant degree programs and proof that students have mastered basic skills.

Recently, the federal government weighed in on accountability. Duly recognizing the many successes of higher education in the United States, the Spellings Commission noted that:

Higher education has long been one of the undeniable strengths of our nation. In quality, diversity and character it’s the envy of the world. American Universities have been incubators of great ideas, birthplaces of great inventions and testing grounds of great individuals.
But then the commission went on to ask:

…but in our changing and ever-flattening world, has higher education kept pace? Is it accessible to students of all backgrounds, including minorities, low-income students and adults? Is it affordable? Is it accountable to the students, parents and taxpayers who foot the bill?

In response to these and a number of other concerns raised by policymakers and legislators, the Spellings Commission produced a report that outlined various steps to improve higher education. One such finding stressed the need for accountability:

To meet the challenges of the 21st century, higher education must change from a system primarily based on reputation to one based on performance. We urge the creation of a robust culture of accountability and transparency throughout higher education. Every one of our goals, from improving access and affordability to enhancing quality and innovation, will be more easily achieved if higher education institutions embrace and implement serious accountability measures.

According to the Spellings Commission, “no current ranking system of colleges and universities directly measures the most critical point – student performance and learning.” Two commission proposals include:

- Explore incentives for states and institutions that collect and report student learning outcome data.
- Convene members of the accreditation community to recommend changes to the standards for recognition that will place a greater emphasis on results.

The Spellings Commission’s emphasis on accountability and assessment arises from a widespread recognition that institutions of higher education must be accountable. In response to the growing concern for accountability, various accrediting agencies have made a strong
commitment to assessment in their review and reaccrediting processes. One agency that is doing this is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Through the process of professional accreditation of schools, colleges and departments of education, NCATE works to establish high-quality teacher, specialist and administrator preparation. It believes every student deserves a caring, competent and highly qualified teacher. NCATE has an elaborate process for assessing student learning and measuring the effectiveness of assessment instruments. Currently, the review process allows faculty to decide what constitutes success in a program and how best to measure, on their own terms, their effectiveness in the classroom. However, there is growing pressure to establish standards that all faculty must meet. How faculty perceive and are engaged in the process of change, and what processes are set in motion by administrators to facilitate or hinder change, will determine the degree of success in changing. We do not yet know how sweeping the change will be or its effect on the professoriate. The very nature of higher education institutions, where the free exchange of ideas is highly valued, prevents swift and transformational change (transformational change being defined as a fundamental shift in how things are done or perceived). However, governing bodies and society itself are calling on higher education to change more swiftly and completely than in the past.

Purpose

This study will describe how organizational change was accomplished at a master’s-level, public liberal arts institution that serves commuter students in an urban area. The five-year period of 2003 – 2007 was a time of rapid change in this institution. Not only was the institution undergoing NCATE accreditation, which has specific assessment processes, the college was experiencing a general education review, a strategic planning process, a middle states accrediting
process and a faculty hiring spree. The extent to which NCATE specifically and the other processes generally affected the degree of change in assessment practices, accountability and the campus culture for faculty and staff is the focus of this study. Specifically, the research asks the following questions:

- What forces and sources were the cause of the change in assessment processes, faculty accountability and campus culture during the time of the NCATE accreditation process (2003 – 2007)?
- What was the role of the NCATE process in bringing about these organizational changes?
- What other alterations in the organization during the time of the NCATE accreditation could account for the incremental and transformational change at the college?
- Were the four frames of organizational change (e.g. structural, human resources, political and symbolic) as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003) observed in the analyses of the institutional changes? If so, in what ways were these frames enacted?
- What are the implications for other liberal arts institutions looking to make similar changes? If the changes were positive for the institution in the context of its culture, structure and mission, could this process be replicated in other initiatives?

The rationale for this study is based on the premise that organizational change is a fundamental part of growth in any institution and that the methodologies used affect the depth and meaningfulness of the change. For an institution without a history of assessment, pursuing and attaining initial NCATE accreditation can be transformational if it establishes a culture of assessment across various disciplines in a sustainable and meaningful way.
Kezar (2001) in *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*, suggests that organizational change may be analyzed by answering four questions: the *why*, *what*, *how* and *target* of the change. The depth and meaningfulness of changes are identified in two ways: changes that are incremental and adjustments to the status quo (first-order change) and changes that transform an organization (second-order change).

According to Kezar (2001), the structure and organizational culture of higher education make transformational change particularly difficult. The multiple power and authority structures – typically including decentralized administrations and elaborate faculty governance processes – seem designed to thwart change. Often, the structure is loosely coupled, as faculty operate independently from the administration. Goals are often ambiguous, and the idea and definition of success vary depending on the perspective: the community, the faculty, the staff, the system or the students.

The history, prevailing campus culture, student, faculty and staff population, mission of the college, campus leadership and system organizational structure are among the factors that influence current practices and new behaviors or attitudes. The effectiveness and permanence of any change can also be influenced by external mandated forces.

**Study Site**

This study is situated within an increasingly centralized system governance structure; a faculty and staff union environment; new leadership (president and vice presidents); a strong faculty culture of teaching and research; a general education review (the first in 30 years); the emergence of new instructional technologies; the replacement of over a third of the faculty during a five-year period and long-standing budgetary constraints.
The seventy year-old commuter college, one of seventeen institutions in a large public urban system, has a mission to provide a liberal arts education to the citizens of the surrounding community. The diverse student body, many of whom are immigrants, hail from over one-hundred and sixty countries and pursue degrees in one-hundred and ninety undergraduate and graduate majors (students who pursue a doctorate do so at a system center). The 18,000+ student population is taught by faculty who are required to pursue research, teaching and service as part of their workload. Over 70% of the faculty have the terminal degree in their field. Faculty have appointments at the system center or primary appointments at one of the seventeen system institutions. Therefore, a faculty member may have the opportunity to teach undergraduate, graduate and doctoral students.

The college has a strong faculty governance system. The personnel and budget committee (P&B), comprised of all chairs, the provost and the president, is responsible for approving all academic personnel and budget decisions. The strength of the union, coupled with the long-standing presence of the P&B, the faculty senate and the centralized system, influence the process of change.

The Division of Education, one of four divisions at the college, was required by the system office to seek initial accreditation from NCATE. NCATE’s assessment procedures cross disciplines; therefore, any academic program with an associated education minor is affected.

The way the college reacted to the middle state accreditation process, new faculty hires, a strategic planning process and a general education review led to changes in assessment procedures, faculty accountability and campus culture. The questions remaining include: What forces and sources influenced the changes in assessment, faculty accountability and campus
culture? How was change accomplished, and was the observed change transformational or incremental?

Research Design

This exploratory case study will investigate the changes in assessment practices, in faculty accountability and in campus culture for faculty and staff by using research questions and case study research methodology to create a protocol for data collection, data analysis and conclusions.

Certain measures are needed to ensure that a case study has quality, which is defined in terms of reliability and validity. Kidder and Judd (1986) identified four criteria for quality research, three of which are important to exploratory case studies:

- **Construct validity**, in which correct operational measures are taken for the concepts studied. This is accomplished by using multiple sources of data and having key informants review the case study as drafts are prepared (Yin, 2003).

- **External validity**, which can be achieved by tying the results of the data gathering to a theoretical framework so that the results are generalized.

- **Reliability**, which is achieved if the study can be replicated. This can be done if the protocol includes a logical progression from the case study questions to the data collected to the analysis conducted and the conclusions drawn (this will be found in chapters three, four and five).

Data Collection

This study used multiple sources of data, including memos, letters, reports, meeting minutes, working papers and interviews with fourteen people who were at the college from 2003 – 2007. Documents came from the following categories for the same timeframe: minutes from
faculty senate meetings, P&B committee meetings, NCATE task forces and committees, divisional caucuses and departmental meetings, working papers for the NCATE review, report from NCATE and rejoinders and special program accreditation reports. These cover the breadth of the NCATE accreditation process and include the process of the initiative as well as the outcome of the accreditation.

The individuals chosen for interviews fit into one of several categories. They were either the policymaker or vision setter for the college, an implementer of policies and initiatives, a participant in the initiative or a colleague not involved in the initiative or change. Human subject’s approval was requested and granted at both the University of Georgia and at the case study institution. Those interviewed were asked to sign consent forms were indicating a willingness to participate. Those unwilling to participate were not included in the study and their identities will be kept private.

The purpose of the interviews, which were conversational, was to allow individuals to explain their understanding of the NCATE process, as well as their understanding of or involvement in the general education review, the strategic planning process, the hiring of new faculty and the middle states accreditating process. The interviews lasted approximately one hour. Their information – which includes a written transcript of the interview and the tapes – along with all documents are kept in a secure place, accessible only by the researcher. These will be kept confidential and maintained for three years, according to the IRB agreement.

Data Analysis

After the data were collected, the activities, processes, decisions and outcomes were triangulated to identify themes and prevailing trends. Individual differences were noted as they provided a context for multiple views of the same outcomes. This is an exploratory case study
that investigated findings and looked for connections, themes and trends. These were then tied to a context or theoretical framework to better understand the findings.

This study used Kezar’s (2001) four questions – the *why*, *what*, *how* and *target* of the change – in a first stage of analysis. The findings from these questions suggested the depth and meaningfulness of change in the institution.

To interpret the findings, Bolman and Deal’s *Reframing Organizations* (2003) four models of organizational change were used as a lens for further data analysis. Based on extensive analysis of institutional change, Bolman and Deal propose four frames for understanding and enacting organizational change: structural, human resources, political and symbolic. The findings and themes from this case study – processes, activities, attitudes, decisions and outcomes – were placed into one of the four frames and then analyzed to determine which factors affected what type of change and how.

To better understand the generalizations about the findings and to tie these findings to a theoretical framework such as the four frames, a review of the appropriate literature is included in chapter two. It identifies the key findings in the area of organizational change as well as the particular aspects of organizational change in higher education. An overview is included here.

**Literature Review**

Much research has been done in the past fifty years in the field of organizational change, beginning with the early work that recognized some key questions that should be answered: the *why* of change, the *what* of change, the *how* of change and the *target* of change (Burnes, 1996; Goodman, 1982; Levy and Merry, 1986; Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1996). The *why* of change can occur due to an external or internal force or source or a combination of the two. The *what* of
change is the significance of the change. Transformational change occurs when the basic values, structure, culture, processes or mission of an organization is changed; incremental changes are minor adjustments to the status quo (Kezar, 2001). The how of change is the manner in which the change occurs. As an example, a change can be reactive or proactive depending on how it is implemented. The outcome of the change describes the target of the change.

To answer these questions, theorists developed models that helped frame the change and explain the four aspects of organizational change. Most early studies looked at industries, such as manufacturing. With time, corporate entities and the service industry were also included. As the field grew, investigations began to include higher education. Since the mission and goals of institutions of higher education – as well as their governance structure – were quite different from industry, such studies noted these differences as well as their similarities to other industries.

Kezar (2001) brought together the work of the major theorists on organizational change and noted the differences in those theories as they applied to higher education. She provided an overview of six major typologies of change in higher education: evolutionary (where change is adaptive and slow), teleological (where change is rational, linear), life-cycle (where change is a natural progression), political (where change occurs around power and negotiation), social cognition (where paradigms are altered) and cultural (where change is long-term and symbolic). A brief description of each follows with particular emphasis on evolutionary theory and social cognition. Given the mission and goals of higher education, these are a natural fit.

The evolutionary model has social and biological origins. Its major assumptions focus on change as a slow stream of mutations, gradually shaped by environmental influences (Morgan, 1997). Sociology and political science developed theories of change around a premise that change depends on the environment, situational variables and conditions within and around an
organization (Morgan, 1997). In this model change is described as the reaction to new stimuli, in which change is more organic and the result is a new structure.

Teleological change models can best be characterized as a rational change process or strategic planning. Here, leaders take a key role in implementing the change and are often seen as change-masters (Kanter, 1983). Change occurs around organizational development. This model has not been extensively used for higher education, mostly because it relies on rational processes that often do not apply to change in higher education.

The life-cycle models see change as a cycle of growth and development, particularly individual growth and development. The role of the leader is to assist in the systematic development of individuals, which results in the growth and development of the organization. Bolman and Deal (1991) used this model as one of their four frames as they developed the larger mixed model. They recognized that change was difficult, but that by providing opportunities to learn and grow, individuals became more productive.

Dialectical models, generated from the Hegelian-Marxian idea that patterns, values, ideals or norms each has its polar opposite (Kezar, p. 40), assert that change is the result of the push and pull of each force. Change occurs after a conflict arises that challenges identities and the status quo. Not all individuals are involved, but coalitions are formed that share ideas and information, which is often as important as power.

Bolman and Deal (1991) draw on this model for one of their four frames, noting that negotiation, bargaining and consciousness-raising are important aspects of the change process. Higher education’s organizational structure is frequently defined as loosely coupled within the various units in the organization. It has many power bases, including units like the faculty senate and the administration, which tends to diffuse power. These characteristics make the dialectical
model an effective descriptive model for examining change in higher education, as well as an idealized model for leaders who desire to implement a change initiative.

Social cognition models, newer to this field, depend upon ideas like cognition and sense-making. The models assume that each individual perceives his/her own reality and that new learning occurs as a result of cognitive dissonance, in which two conflicting pieces of information are brought together (Argyris, 1994). The change or learning does not occur necessarily due to the actions of a leader but through a sense-making by the individual. The change does not have to be good or linear in its development. The environment is not as important to the change process, and leaders who wish to implement the change must reframe the process (Harris, 1996).

By combining the irrational nature of the dialectical model with the sense-making aspects of social cognition models, researchers identified the cultural model of change. This model analyzes altered values, beliefs, rituals and myths (Smirich, 1983) as the product of change. According to Schein (1985), culture can be shared, and those who wish to implement change must create both new events and rituals that symbolize the new culture and new metaphors to interpret the change. This model, which identifies a new aspect of change not found in the other models, has been criticized as being simplistic.

These six typologies have been used alone or in combination to provide a model to describe change, or as an idealized model to guide leaders in implementing change. Bolman and Deal (2003) took four models and combined their features, relying on the social-constructivist perspective that recognized the complexity of the change process. Specifically, they claim that leaders who can see the organization and its issues from multiple perspectives will be able to implement change more effectively. Structural issues can be seen through the bureaucratic lens,
training issues can be seen through the human resources lens, power issues through a political lens and identity and meaning through a symbolic lens.

Bolman and Deal’s four frames are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMES</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>HUMAN RESOURCE</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
<th>SYMBOLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor for organization</td>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central concepts</td>
<td>Rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, environment</td>
<td>Needs, skills, relationships</td>
<td>Power, conflict, competition, organizational politics</td>
<td>Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of leadership</td>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic leadership challenge</td>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align organizational and human needs</td>
<td>Develop agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1. Overview of the four frames model (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 16)

This study will rely the evolutionary model, informed by social cognition. The reason is that change in higher education frequently occurs incrementally and slowly. The individuals involved in the change, in this case faculty, are active participants in creating the change and as such, experience cognitive dissonance and reframing. Social cognition provides a framework for this. The study will then use as a theoretical basis the evolutionary model informed by social cognition. Bolman and Deal’s four frames will be used to help provide explanations for the events and actions that defined the changes in assessment practices, faculty accountability and campus culture. The frames will provide a context in which to place the data and analyze the effects and influences of various activities, decisions, discussions and events to the changes being studied. These models and the four frames will offer a framework around which to determine where transformational and incremental changes happened. The actions of individual leaders can be put into a context and framed to determine their effect on the change initiative.
This is particularly helpful as institutions of higher education respond to increasing scrutiny from society, accrediting agencies and their own faculty and staff.

**Significance of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand how institutional change occurred in a specific context, the factors affecting the changes, and the lessons that could be learned for future change initiatives in this and similar institutions. This study will help institutional leaders better understand how change occurs in a public, commuter institution. It will help inform decision-makers about the external and internal forces that can be harnessed to implement an initiative and the interplay between those forces in the process. It will help leaders look at a change process and analyze it from the perspectives of faculty, staff, other administrators, chairs and deans. Each plays a role in the institution and sees his/her work through a certain lens. Implementing transformational change without upheavals in productivity or extensive negative fallout is difficult at best. This study provides some insight into which aspects help or hinder effective transformational change for leaders in similar institutions.

**Organization of the Study**

The following chapters outline the theoretical framework and rationale for the study, develop a research design and reporting methodology, describe and analyze the results and provide conclusions and implications for additional studies.

Chapter two begins with an overview of change in organizations based on Kezar’s *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*. The four aspects of change are defined and put into a higher education context. The review then goes through six major typologies or models of change, describes each and provides insights into their application in higher education. From this, the review looks at
the work of Bolman and Deal, who bring together four change models to create a new, more comprehensive model in *Reframing Organizations*. These are further described and tools are outlined on their use in describing change as an idealized model for leaders wanting to implement change.

Chapter three develops the research design of an explanatory case study, defining the characteristics of a quality case study design. Using Yin (2003), effective data-collection procedures are defined, relying on multiple data sources, multiple views of data from one source and appropriate permissions and controls as outlined by the Human Subjects Review Board. These are needed to effectively triangulate the data and ensure the reliability and validity of the study. The remaining portion of chapter three looks at the method of analyzing the data, triangulating the results to find themes, trends and conclusions as well as individual responses that provide multiple perspectives on a single outcome.

Chapter four reports the findings from the study, analyzing the data using the methodology outlined in chapter three and putting the results into the theoretical context outlined in chapter two. From this, conclusions can be drawn about the effectiveness of the change in assessment practices, faculty accountability and campus culture.

Further conclusions can be drawn in chapter five from the data brought together and put into context in chapter four. Implications for other studies and other institutions can be drawn that might help inform additional studies on change in higher education.
Growth and change are part of any organization. The ability to make needed changes to respond to market demands and growing opportunities as well as external threats is a factor that will determine an organization’s success or failure. At this time, higher education is being called upon to accelerate its change and to be more accountable.

The structure and organizational culture of higher education make transformational change particularly difficult. The multiple power and authority structures, typically including decentralized administrations and elaborate faculty governance processes, seem designed to thwart change. Often, the structure is loosely coupled, as faculty operate very independently from the administrative structure. The goals are frequently ambiguous and the image and definition of success are varied depending upon the perspective – that of the community, the faculty, the staff, the system or the students.

The effectiveness and permanence of the change depend on a number of factors including the nature of the institution, the institutional culture and the leadership. The external forces that mandate a change can also affect it. Regardless of the origin of the change, educational leaders need to figure out how to effect change to solve a particular problem in a manner that facilitates the maximum lasting change with the least upheaval.

In the past century, social scientists and organizational studies have examined organizational change initiatives – those that were successful and those that failed. Beginning with work-flow studies, they developed theories and models that help describe the change as
well as idealized models designed to assist leaders in implementing effective change. Many of the frameworks or models were first developed for private sector industries and have now been analyzed or used in the higher education sector. These theories are explored below.

Many theories on change use similar concepts to define the attributes and frame the analysis of change for organizations in general. Authors such as Burnes, 1996; Goodman, 1982; Levy and Merry, 1986; Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1996, identified models named evolutionary, teleological, life cycle, political, social cognition and cultural. Evolutionary change is defined as change that occurs over time in small increments as adjustments to the system. Gersick (1991) built upon the evolutionary model by defining evolutionary change along a continuum that allowed for rapid, revolutionary change occurring large spurts as well as slower adaptive change. These ideas are described in more detail below and include some new terminology. Both have been applied to higher education. The work of Gersick (1991) analyzes the depth and significance of change, characterized by the terms evolutionary and revolutionary. These correlate closely with incremental and transformational change used by other theorists.

The activities of change may be analyzed using one or a combination of theoretical models of organizational change. Kezar (2001) in a review of the organizational change literature identified six models of change: evolutionary, teleological, life cycle, political, social cognition and cultural. Bolman and Deal (2003) combined theoretical models to create a comprehensive methodology to better explain organizational change. Their work builds upon that of earlier theorists and provides a framework to describe how either incremental or transformational change is accomplished. The four frames are the structural frame, the human resources frame, the political frame and the symbolic frame.
The frameworks described in this chapter come from the idea of analyzing change by answering four key questions. These questions help define change and capture its characteristics. The questions include: the why of change, the what of change, the how of change and the target of change (Burnes, 1996; Goodman, 1982; Levy and Merry, 1986; Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1996).

The forces and sources of the change are usually internal or external or a combination of both and are the why of change. The what of change is examined through terms like first- and second-order, scale, foci, timing and degree. The how of change is characterized by terms such as adaptive/generative, proactive/reactive, active/static and planned/unplanned. The outcomes reveal the target of the change.

Why change occurs initiates the analysis and discussion of any given change. Whether the change force or source is external or internal can affect the level and effectiveness of the change. When the change comes from external sources, the resulting organizational interactions are different from the interface that occurs when the change comes from an internal source. Often, external forces provide strong impetus for transformational change, while internal forces result in more evolutionary changes. Further, the source should be scrutinized for its validity or significance to the organization; this is what will affect the amount and effectiveness of the change.

The degree of change differs depending on a number of factors and is usually defined as first-order or second-order. First-order change is associated with ‘minor adjustments and improvements in one or a few dimensions of the organization; it does not change the organization’s core’ (Kezar, 2001, p. 16). Evolutionary change also typifies first-order change.
In contrast, second-order change is ‘transformational change; the underlying values or mission, culture, functioning processes and structure of the organization change’ (Kezar, 2001, p. 16).

Transformational change is often seen as revolutionary change. An example of first-order change or incremental change might be creating more weekend classes to expand the college’s programming. This development does not fundamentally change a department’s mission or goals. It can be accomplished while the institution carries on its present policies and procedures. This is known as single-loop learning. It is linear in its approach and evolutionary, often slow and methodical.

In contrast, an example of second-order change or transformational change would be the development of a residence hall on a commuter campus. This would fundamentally change how student life was perceived by the students, faculty and staff. Second-order change is more transformational and will affect the culture, mission, process and structure of an organization. The changes will occur at various levels and on a number of dimensions. Because the change is fundamentally new, it will often be seen as irrational and will result in a paradigm shift. The learning is described as being double-looped, where the mismatches in governing variables are examined and altered. If the change is too radical and threatens the environment, then strong resistance can result. This kind of change is studied in the framework of organizational transformation rather than organizational development, which is associated with first-order change.

Change is not always either-or, but can be seen along a continuum of first-order change to second-order change. Gersick (1991) argues that organizations change along a continuum of long periods of stable, evolutionary, continuous change interrupted by short periods of revolutionary change. This cycle of change may happen individually as well as in organizations.
(Tushman, Newman, and Romanelli, 1986), and is called the “punctuated equilibrium” paradigm. Three main components make up this paradigm: deep structure, equilibrium periods and revolutionary periods. Deep structure is built into an organization as it makes choices over time about how it organizes and manages itself. It could be said to be the design of a playing field and the rules of the game (Gersick, 1991, p. 16).

The equilibrium periods are like the playing of the game, the maintenance and execution of these choices. In these times, changes are only incremental, because by sticking to a course a system can become good at what it does. Revolutionary periods are described as dramatically changing the rules of the game. Organizations do not change from one type of “game” to another incrementally. The switch occurs through comprehensive upheaval.

Gersick asserts that revolutionary change occurs after disruption of the two key features of deep-structured systems that generate inertia. Those features are the “mutual interdependence of their parts and action patterns and the fact that deep structures determine how systems obtain resources from the environment. These features expose two basic sources of disruption: (1) internal changes that pull parts and actions out of alignment with each other or the environment and (2) environmental changes that threaten the system’s ability to obtain resources” (Gersick, 1991, p. 21).

Punctuated equilibrium models assert that revolutionary change often occurs following periods of failure. When things take place within the context of the current deep structure, revolutionary change will not occur as the system’s inertia is preserved and only incremental change will occur. As Gersick points out,
The handwriting on the wall cannot be read; events do not indicate to system members what they ought to be doing differently. It may be more useful to think of certain kinds of failures – those engendered by misalignments within a system’s deep structure or between its deep structure and its environment – not as sufficient causes, but as major sources of energy for revolutionary change. Revolutions themselves seem to require decisive breaks in systems’ inertia (Gersick, 1991, p. 22).

The *what* of organizational change, whether it is the long periods of evolutionary change or the punctuated equilibrium paradigm of revolutionary change, can occur to an individual, a group of individuals, a unit in an organization, an organization or across an industry. This aspect of the ‘what’ of change is described by examining the scale of change.

The scale of change can be inspected by looking at three frameworks that make up the organization – the individual, interpersonal and organizational (firm-level) (Goodman, 1982). Terms like individual, interpersonal and organizational can be used for studies of change in higher education. An example of individual might be a faculty member while interpersonal might be the interactions within a department. Firm level examples include particular institutions. In addition, another level has been introduced that also maps change, the industry level.

In higher education, an example of industry level change might be the assessment of programs like NCATE accreditation, since it affects all institutions of higher education with divisions or schools of education. Meyer, Brooks and Goes identify four types of schema that help define change: adaptation, metamorphosis, evolution and revolution (Meyer, Brooks, Goes, 1990, p. 1). Two institutions that become one, changing the mission of each is an example of a metamorphosis on the institutional level.

Figure 2.1 on the following page maps the framework of the two types of change (first-order/incremental and second-order/transformational) across the firm level and the industry level.
(Meyer, Brooks and Goes, 1990). As the framework shows, incremental changes on the firm level occur through small changes in the status quo while transformational changes happen as a firm ages and finds the need to change in order to grow.

![Figure 2.1. Framework of change (Meyer, Brooks, Goes, 1990)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Level</th>
<th>First-Order Change</th>
<th>Second-Order Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Metamorphosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong></td>
<td>Incremental Change</td>
<td>Focus: Frame-breaking change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within organizations</td>
<td>within organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td>Incrementalism</td>
<td><strong>Mechanisms:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource dependence</td>
<td>Life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Configuration transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors:</strong></td>
<td>Lindblom (1959)</td>
<td><strong>Authors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles &amp; Snow (1978)</td>
<td>Ginsberg (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pfeffer &amp; Salancik (1978)</td>
<td>Greiner (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miller &amp; Friesen (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tushman &amp; Momanelli (1985)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Level</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
<th>Revolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong></td>
<td>Incremental changes</td>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within established industries</td>
<td>Emergence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transformation, and decline of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms:</strong></td>
<td>Natural Selection</td>
<td><strong>Mechanisms:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional isomorphism</td>
<td>Punctuated equilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantum speciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors:</strong></td>
<td>Hannan &amp; Freeman (1977)</td>
<td><strong>Authors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zucker (1987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On an industry level, first-order/incremental change occurs through natural selection or the industry’s evolution. Industry level transformational change often occurs as some revolutionary event forces change or as industries become specialized.

As Meyer, Brooks and Goes (1990) point out, revolutionary changes in an industry can influence the metamorphic change within an organization or firm. Similarly, adaptations in an industry can affect the level of evolutionary change within a given firm. An example of a revolutionary change that might influence a metamorphic change in a college occurs when the accreditation process in higher education can effect change on a college’s assessment and accountability process. Likewise, an increased emphasis on effective teaching practices as an adaptation to a university system can influence the evolution of the promotion and tenure system as well as the development of a teaching and learning center at a specific college.

The interactions and influence exerted between revolutionary industry level changes and revolutionary and evolutionary changes on the firm level might affect the level and timing of the change, as well as its permanence. If the industry level change is revolutionary, then new structures will appear and others will be eliminated on an industry level. Transformations will occur that affect the firm level. Firm level changes that occur from industry level change can be metamorphic or evolutionary, depending on the impact of the industry level change and the ability and the willingness of the firm (organization) to change. If the change is metamorphic, it is frame breaking and might result in new assessment procedures, new governance structures and altered faculty roles. Evolutionary change might result in new governance only after the retirement of key faculty, the influx of a new administration or the timing of the accreditation process. The permanence of the change differs in degree since metamorphic change is more transformational and evolutionary change is more incremental.
While the scale of change examines the level of change within and external to the organization, the *focus of change* looks at which parts of the organization are affected by the change and is another aspect of the *what* of change. Berquist (1992) identifies three areas of focus: structure, process and attitude. Structural changes are accomplished by re-creating the organizational chart, while process changes look at the way business is accomplished. An example of process change might be instituting shared governance at a college. Finally, a stronger focus on teaching may bring about attitudinal change and influence how people feel about their work. Each of these is frequently tied to the other, as a structural change which changes the lens through which the organization sees itself might also affect people’s attitudes and their processes which can become their habits. However, in a given change there is generally one dominant focus.

Another aspect of the *what* of change is the intentionality of change – *planned change* or *unplanned change*. Planned change can be seen as the conscious decision to change where there is intentionality and deliberateness of process. It involves expertise from within and outside the organization (Carr, Hard and Trahant, 1996). Evolutionary change like an increased emphasis on teaching that affects the development of a teaching and learning center may not be seen as a planned change, but, according to Weick (1979), may increase adaptability and, as such, might qualify as a type of planned change.

Response time, typified as *proactive* or *reactive*, may also affect the effectiveness of the *what* of change. Proactive change occurs before an emergency, while reactive change happens after one. A number of researchers have found that proactive change aided by an environment where change is ongoing and is part of the organization is beneficial to an organization (Argyris, 1982; Senge, 1990; Steeples, 1990).
Finally, the target of change is described in all change models, focusing on the process of change and the outcome of the change. Process, known as the way in which change occurs, can be described as adaptive, generative, proactive, reactive, planned and unplanned. The outcome of change is a more debatable topic, as this can be quantitative or qualitative or both. Further, it is important that the process of change be connected or analyzed with the outcome of the change. The outcome of change could be a culture change, a process change or a structure change. Another measure might be to look at the benefit to the organization of a given change. Outcomes might be intended or unintended. Each of these should be analyzed when a particular change is studied. The target of change is one of four areas describing organizational change.

To assess the effectiveness and quality of a change in an institution, analysis should include investigating the why, what, how and target of the change as described above. These can be captured in part by looking at the roles of the leader, the faculty involved in the change, the rest of the campus and the administration in implementing an initiative. How this is done is outlined further in this chapter and in chapter four. Campus culture, faculty governance, system organizational structure and external pressures from accrediting agencies are some of the forces that affect the change.

Models of Organizational Change

Many models describe organizational change by relying on one of six typologies: evolutionary, teleological, life cycle, political, social cognition and cultural. Early on, the evolutionary and teleological models for understanding change were dominant. Kezar (2001) developed a framework to compare the typologies that included 1) major assumptions (why change occurs, the process, the outcomes, and key metaphors), 2) some examples of each model, 3) key activities or individuals and 4) benefits and criticisms of the model. She found several
models that were more useful for explaining change in higher education and some that best
described change in other areas. Some of the models came from work done in the manufacturing
industry and others from industries like electronics firms. Her work provided an overview of the
work of theorists, bringing them together into six models that are described below.

Each of these models has been applied to higher education in order to develop research-
based principles on change in this area. These models fit within two categories – models that
describe how change is occurring and models that promote effective approaches to change in an
idealized sense. Below are descriptions of each model and its application to higher education.
Special emphasis is placed on the evolutionary model and social cognition for those seem to be
most useful in this research.

Evolutionary Model

The evolutionary model came from two sources: social and biological. The major
assumptions from the biological evolutionary model focused on change as a slow stream of
mutations, gradually shaped by environmental influences. Sociology and political science
developed theories of change around a premise that it depends on the environment, situational
variables and conditions within and around an organization (Morgan, 1986). More recently
Morgan (1997) defined evolutionary change as the following:

The capacity of a system to evolve depends on an ability to move to more complex forms
of differentiation and integration, and greater variety in the system facilitating its ability
to deal with challenges and opportunities posed by the environment. This involved a
cyclical process of variation, selection, and retention of the selected characteristics
(Morgan, 1997, p. 41).

The influence of managers in the change process runs the gamut from proactive to
reactive to none at all (March, 1994a), and a number of key concepts describe the process: open
systems, homeostasis and steady state, entropy, structure, function, differentiation, integration
and equifinality (Morgan, 1997). Systems theory describes how organizations are built as interrelated entities that are dependant on each other, while the interactivity determines the activities within and between the entities. The concept of an ‘open system’ relies on the idea that any organism or populations of organisms subsist in relationship to the environment. The openness of an organization is its ability to relate internal and external aspects and homeostasis reflects the ability to maintain equilibrium and a steady state between the organization and the environment (Sporn, 1999).

Change in the evolutionary model is described as a reaction to new stimuli and often results in a new structure. A popular analogy is a colony of termites, which constantly rebuild and restructure their nests in reaction to new stimuli and environmental changes (Morgan, 1986). One aspect of change in the evolutionary model is contingency theory, where organisms adapt to the environment. The idea is that organizations must be carefully managed to balance the internal need and the external forces. Sometimes this means finding new ‘species’ as the environment changes. The main goal is to find the best fit for the organisms and the environment, and that may require different management techniques at different times in the process (Morgan, 1997).

Different types of management approaches and organizational structures are needed depending on the type of organization and the change envisioned. Some organizations are more mechanistic, like a rayon mill, while others are more organic, like a technology firm (e.g., Google). The environment, the nature of the task facing the firm, the organization of the work, the nature of the authority, the communications system, and the nature of the employee commitment vary from organization to organization (Morgan, 1997).
Higher education is a more organic organization, although the nature of the environment in higher education is quite stable, as in mechanistic organizations. When the goals are stated broadly and in an ambiguous manner, there is consensus in the college community. As soon as they begin to be implemented, disagreements occur (Baldridge, 1983). The nature of the task facing higher education sits between a mechanistic model and an organic model, depending on the type of institution and the culture of the college. According to Baldridge, administration and academic needs are different, with administration emphasizing management and leadership that need hierarchy, control and accountability as prime roles while academics who must manage teaching, research and service must be creative problem solvers with good interpersonal skills for teaching (Baldridge, 1983). The faculty work is organized in a more organic fashion. Although faculty have clearly defined roles, new initiatives and projects might engage them in work beyond their day to day activities. As an example, a faculty asked to serve on a strategic planning committee that was looking at diversifying new revenue streams might be performing tasks outside their clearly defined roles. Authority is informal and constantly changing in higher education, given the faculty governance system and the various coalitions and groups that form. Communications are both formal and informal in higher education, although most institutions work towards transparency. Finally, the commitment of faculty is to their department and discipline and less so to the institution.

Several modified versions of evolutionary theory developed in response to the study of business organizations, including resource-dependence theory which posits that organizations cannot exist in a vacuum but are dependent on other organizations and external resources to survive and grow (Sporn, 1999). Resources include raw materials, finances, personnel and services and engage political decision-making between organizations. Organizations that can
connect with the environment will gain more resources and will gain power. Thus, decision-making is tied to external possibilities. According to Sporn, “Organizations are viewed as active. Organizational participants scan the relevant environment, searching for threats and opportunities with the goal to find the most favorable and profitable solution” (Sporn, 1999, p. 46). There are two ways that organizations can adapt to reduce the dependence on resources. Either organizations can adapt and change to fit the environment or organizations can try to alter the environment so that its needs are met. In this framework, management has three roles – symbolic, where success or failure is connected to management; responsive, where management’s actions help to work with external constraints and discretionary, where external constraints and dependencies are dealt with by management (Sporn, 1999). Often the role of management is reduced to reaction when environmental forces are strong. The population economy model posits that some organizations adapt by selecting out (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1985).

Population ecology grew from the notion that the decision making of organizations is vital to their growth and survival. This approach happens through a natural selection by environmental demands. Changes in individual organizations are not as important as a population of organizations with a common form. Organizational structure is the outcome of a collective adaptive process. Two kinds of changes are important to this theory: changes in the amount of resources available for organizations and changes in the kinds of supported activities of organizations. The key component for selection is the degree of fit between the organization and the environment. The major force that drives the natural selection is organizational mortality (Hannan and Freeman, 1977). According to Sporn, “The population ecology aggregates organizations into populations, downplays the importance of managerial choices, and views the
sources of adaptation as selecting out unfitted organizations. As a combination of different approaches, institutional theory uses population ecology to explain adaptation processes in organizational fields and strategic choice to understand how organizations adapt to certain external forces” (Sporn, 1999, p. 51). An outcome of this theory was diversification, where organizations broadened their focus and customer base so that the impact of environmental change was not so severe. One criticism of the population ecology model was that it had a one-sided view of the evolutionary process by emphasizing resource scarcity and competition. It did not consider that resources might be plentiful and that organizations could collaborate to create value and niches that had previously not existed. An example might be two institutions who joined together to create a new degree – an engineering school joined with a medical school to create a biomedical engineering degree. This theory is known as organizational ecology and relies on shared futures (Morgan, 1997).

Organizational ecology views organizations as living in tension with the environment, which exists as a separate entity. Also, organizations exist as part of a larger eco-system and change in this arena is seen as the survival of those that fit in the best. For this reason, organizations themselves shape the environment that is shared with other organizations, co-creating the environment. As an example, schools and divisions of education themselves create accrediting agencies that manage the quality of the work of individual schools of education. The accrediting requirements and process evolves as institutions are evaluated and the system looks at the effectiveness of the process. Eric Trist (1951) found that change in inter-organizational relations can help reshape the environment and the future in a positive way, built on the idea that these relationships evolve as a response to the complexity and instability in the environment.
One danger to this model is the highly individualistic nature of some groups whose actions tend to make the environment so complex that it becomes unmanageable.

Morgan (1997) sees several strengths of the organismic models for describing change. One strength is that it looks at the influence of and the relationship between the environment and the organization, relying on the process of change as much as the result of change. Another strength is that the models allow managers to look at the needs that should be satisfied in order for the organization to flourish. Further, there are various ‘species’ in organizations that give managers options for decision making, whether assimilating into the environmental change or in creating new structures that meet organizational needs thus changing the environment. Another strength is that the organic aspect of organizations helps the innovation process by allowing new structures and ways of thinking. Finally, the model recognizes the importance of inter-organizational relations and the effect that each has on the other (Morgan, 1997).

As a framework for describing change, the organismic models bring a fuller view of the organization and its environment. However, it is limited in that it sees only the concrete things about organizations, its products, its populations, its physical well-being. It overlooks the values, beliefs, and visions of organizations and individuals in organizations that drive and enrich the organization. The creative activity in an organization can fundamentally alter its course and culture. Thus, change is not just the result of a reaction to external forces. Further, organizations do not necessarily operate in the same connected fashion as living organisms. That is, the human body is dependent on the close relationship and functioning of the parts of the body – the heart, lungs, digestive system, etc. In contrast, organizations can often exist and even grow if one part is not functioning. In fact, the human body relies on the harmonious working of all its parts where organizations often flourish with political conflict, internal and external, that strengthens
and allows for growth. In spite of these weaknesses, the population ecology model and the organizational ecology model both provide powerful frameworks for describing evolutionary change. Other theories also fit into the evolutionary model of change.

Chaos theory was incorporated into change by Margaret Wheatley in her book, *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (1999). Organizations change in response to chaotic forces by self-organizing and through feedback loops which then result in new structures that are formed mostly organically. All the theories described above fit within the evolutionary model of change for organizations. However, change in higher education has some unique characteristics, as shown by the discussion below.

In higher education, the evolutionary model of change has come to the forefront as accrediting agencies and legislative bodies demand institutional accountability for student learning and the use of tax dollars and as state funding sources shrivel in concert with rising public concern regarding the mission of higher education in educating the workforce. No longer are institutions immune from environmental demands and accountability. Consequently, these new demands and requirements affect the governance of institutions. According to Gumport and Sporn the accountability movement can drive a change in management as it gains power and as management exercises more control over the growing cadre of part-time, visiting and adjunct faculty members (Gumport and Sporn, 1999).

External forces do not exert as much pressure for change in higher education as in other organizations that are more reliant on the bottom line and profit margins to survive. Rather, the loosely coupled systems structure of higher education usually mean ongoing, methodical change, i.e., the organization sought homeostasis and a steady state system as environmental changes
occur. This is what often results in conflict in the process of change as experienced by the academic faculty and administrators.

The differences in the academic culture and the administrative culture make change difficult to occur. Administrators work in hierarchical structures with rational decision making that engages bureaucratic rules and rank. In contrast, professionals in organizations, including faculty, demand autonomy in their work, have divided loyalties (their field, discipline and institution), and value peer evaluation of their work rather than feedback from groups like students or government indicators. Because the administration exists to ‘support’ the professional group, differences in implementing change occur. In higher education, administrators can be highly fragmented as they provide support services for the expert professionals and as such, have loyalty to the success of the unit sometimes at the cost of efficiency and institutional effectiveness (Sporn, 1999). In this arena, leaders need a variety of skills to manage change.

Leaders in higher education can either be transactional or transformational. Transactional leaders respond to institutional needs and rely on process to accomplish goals. In contrast, transformational leaders are more engaged in focusing on outcomes and the consequential benefit to the organization and thus look to change expectations (Cameron and Ulrich, 1986). In particular, presidents serve a more symbolic role and must manage the organizational culture. “But the professional nature of colleges and universities may make the management of culture difficult if not impossible, and the role of leaders may therefore be more symbolic than real. Presidents may have relatively little influence over outcomes when compared with other forces that affect organizational functioning” (Birnbaum, 1989, p. 24).
However, leaders can make a difference if they have a high level of technical competence and an understanding of higher education. They must also understand the particular institutional culture and have the skills to work with external populations (Birnbaum, 1989). This is particularly true when there is a lot of environmental instability (internal and external) and the institution needs to adapt and change. Whether transactional or transformational, leaders who manage change may use a variety of processes. A number of aspects of the evolutionary change progression are useful in describing in more detail how change occurs in higher education.

For example, as new demands have emerged from society and the environment, higher education has assumed additional responsibilities and created new structures (Clark, 1983a). This differentiation often weakens a system as structures are added without meaningful cohesion. An important study of all types of organizations led by two Harvard researchers, Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch (1986), affirmed two key ideas: 1) different kinds of organizations are best suited for diverse technical and market conditions and 2) in uncertain and unstable times, organizations should achieve a higher level of internal differentiation. An example of internal differentiation in higher education might be the creation of a center designed to bring profit to the organization and connect with the business community. The loosely coupled nature of the higher education organization allows for the evolution of structures, but often appears unorganized in the process. Thus, in turbulent times, the differentiation needed might not be implemented in the most efficient manner or result in a lasting change.

Other studies have found that homeostasis is an important characteristic of evolutionary change. Radical change does not appear as an aspect of change. Instead, a measured approach is considered more effective. Gersick’s (1991) work on punctuated equilibrium ties evolutionary change to more revolutionary change, which is often the result of strong external forces that
serve as a catalyst for the change. Organizations live in homeostasis, changing incrementally (first-order) in response to external and internal forces. Occasionally, a strong force causes a ‘revolution’ in the system, and a new frame of reference is needed for the organization to survive, causing second order or transformational change. As such, transformational change is not typical for higher education where more methodical and incremental change most often occurs.

Research shows that unlike business organizations that employ SWAT analyses, institutions of higher education find that these methods are ineffective (Birnbaum, 2000; Chaffee, 1983; Keller, 1997). Instead, reinterpreting external norms to internal standards has been found to be more effective in the context of collegial decision-making. As a result, strategic planning is more organic and evolutionary and less deterministic and rational in its approach. This approach has been attributed to the conflicting value system between the administrative members of the organization and the autonomous academic faculty who rely on consensus for decision making. Yet, in regard to external forces that affect higher education, market-driven forces have been found to influence change in higher education (Rhoades and Slaughter, 1997). In particular, it has been found that different institutional types and different departments and programs are influenced in dissimilar ways by market forces and external changes and these differences may affect new structures in the organization (Gumport, 1993). In the extreme, large changes in financial resources can cause rapid transformational change, including retrenchment and higher tuition costs (Cameron, 1983a, 1983b; Davies, 1997; St. John, 1991).

Recently, organizational change research in higher education has focused on adaptive colleges and universities (Sporn, 1999). These entrepreneurial or responsive universities are
externally oriented in their mission and exhibit flexible administrative units, entrepreneurial activities and diversified income streams. To foster such an organization, Peterson (1997) indicates that processes and structures must be reorganized, the nature of the organization must be redefined as well as its culture, and the mission and external relationships must be realigned.

Whether change occurs by internal forces or external forces that are internalized and acted upon, the evolutionary model has been used to describe change in higher education as well as provide an idealized framework for institutions looking for best practices for change initiatives.

**Teleological Model**

Teleological change models are often known as rational models or planned change models, and strategic planning fits well within this framework. This type of change is assumed to be purposeful and generally caused by leaders and internal rather than external forces. The leader is seen as the key instigator and implementer of change. A common metaphor would be the change-master (Kanter, 1983) and the result of the change would be a new structure or organizational principles. Often the strategy is concerned with organizational development (Golembiewski, 1989; Goodman, 1982) and the change is incremental or first-order. The change process is methodical and linear, and the assumption is that individuals are pliable and able to change as the leader sets the standards and goals. TQM (total quality management) and reengineering are two examples of teleological change. TQM assumes that institutions cannot improve quality due to cultural or mission barriers. To alter this situation the institution must focus on its mission and values and under the guidance of supportive leadership, with delegated decision making to implement planned change.
This type of change model focuses on the individuals’ work in the change process through retraining and collaborative decision-making. It also looks at the individual’s role in resisting change and ways to eliminate this resistance. Often, teleological change is described as overly rational and linear (Dufty, 1980) and usually only looks at first-order change. This model does not capture the chaotic nature of some second-order or transformational change nor the irrational aspect of some organizational structures. It also fails to recognize the political nature of change (Pettigrew, 1985).

In higher education, teleological models are generally not a good fit as methods to implement change or to describe change initiatives. Partly, this stems from the nature of the organization. TQM is generally not effective when applied to changes in the mission of the college or changes in the teaching and learning processes (Birnbaum, 2000). This is due to a host of reasons. Decision-making is decentralized in colleges, while teleological change is short-term, linear and rational. Colleges have environments that are more ambiguous and processes that are less clear (Birnbaum, 2000; Bess, 1999).

In higher education studies, teleological models describe mission, vision, strategic planning, focus on leadership, incentives and cost incentives (Kezar, p. 87). Studies have found that tying mission to specific goals shared by the college community is a complex process (Birnbaum, 2000). Although identifying a vision and subsequent plan of action is effective in other organizations (Kaiser and Kaiser, 1994; Kerr, 1984; Mathews, 1990; St. John, 1991), it proves less useful for higher education due to the loose structure and ambiguous goals and values within the organization (Chaffee, 1983). Strategic planning as a tool for change in higher education is often perceived as too linear and rational, although some campuses have been successful (Taylor and Karr, 1999). Leadership is a key component for change in the
teleological model since leaders can provide resources and focus priorities (Cowan, 1993; Farmer, 1990; Kerr and Gade, 1986; Lindquist, 1978; Lovett, 1993). Leadership, combined with collaboration with stakeholders in a shared governance setting, has proven effective in implementing strategic, planned change on some campuses (Clark, 1996a; Cowan, 1993; Curry, 1992; Bensimon and Neumann, 1993; Lindquist, 1978, London, 1995). However, incentives like additional training or release time for faculty have had mixed results for change initiatives. Faculty are generally not motivated by external rewards (Bess, 1999). Decreasing financial resources have caused campuses to reengineer business processes so that they are more efficient and streamlined, and these changes may eventually affect the autonomy of the professionals in of institutions as short-term business decisions affect long-term goals (Bess, 1999; Birnbaum, 2000).

Teleological methods of change have not been found to be as effective as other models of change in higher education. As an example, TQM does not incorporate academic values and as such is not effective as a change tool (Birnbaum, 2000; Freed, Klugman, and Fife, 1997). In summary, the distributed nature of institutional decision-making is opposite to the linear decision-making chain of command process in teleological models that uses data to drive decisions (Benjamin and Carroll, 1996; MacTaggart, 1996).

Life-Cycle Model

The life-cycle models describe the cycles of change of individuals as well as organizations. The model focuses on the systematic change of individuals as part of the organization and its growth, maturity and decline (Levy and Merry, 1986). Change in individuals occurs as they are trained and motivated under the guidance of management.
Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1996). The result is a new organizational identity as individuals who personalize their work grow and develop.

An example of a life-cycle model is the human resource tradition (Bolman and Deal, 1991). Change is difficult for individuals who rely on their identity and strengths. Leaders must help individuals overcome their fears by helping them to understand the change and train them to work differently. Change occurs in the life-cycle model when all the members of the organization are provided training and opportunities for individual development, thus allaying their fears.

This model emphasizes the idea of stages of organizational development, and different tools are needed for organizations at various phases in their development. New organizations need entrepreneurial activities that help create an ideology while more mature organizations should work on internal processes and factors. Growth and expansion occurs as the organization examines the environment and responds to opportunities.

Dialectical Model

Dialectical models are generated from the Hegelian-Marxian idea that patterns, values, ideals or norms each have polar opposites (Kezar, p. 40). Change results from the push and pull of each force. It was found that change literature itself is dialectical where planned changes known as teleological and evolutionary change sit as polar opposites (Czarniawska and Sevon, 1996). Change occurs following conflict where identity is challenged or the status quo is altered. The process occurs through bargaining, influence, power, conscious-raising and social movements (Bolman and Deal, 1991). The process is not necessarily rational and leaders play a key role in implementing the change.
Unlike life-cycle models, the dialectical models do not assume that everyone is involved in the process. Interest groups form and reform as change occurs. When resources are plentiful, the process occurs with minimal conflict. Facts are as important as power and intuition in decision making, as is human motivation (Berquist, 1992; Lindquist, 1978). To accomplish dialectical change, often called political change, Kotter (1985) outlines the skills needed: 1) agenda setting, 2) networking and forming coalitions and 3) bargaining and negotiation. This differs from the structured process of goal setting which is generated from a leader. The process relies on listening to individuals and their concerns and using these to develop the agenda (Bolman and Deal, 1991). Networking and developing coalitions are needed to overcome resistance, identify key people to facilitate the change and provide the power base needed. Once these are in place, negotiations can occur for change (Bolman and Deal, 1991).

This model is like the life-cycle model in that it looks at individuals throughout the organization as part of the process. It differs in that only a few individuals might be involved and that conflict often generates the change as opposing views are put forth. This has an evolutionary characteristic also, since change eventually occurs as a result of conflict or the resolution of that conflict in a new idea. However, it is not necessarily a rational process, and many researchers have noted that dialectical change is not always good and often the result of political moves (Morgan, 1986).

In the dialectical model, persuasion and influence are important factors for change in higher education since colleges and universities do not have a centralized power structure. Interest groups, e.g. departments, are highly influential and influence change in order to protect their resources and power base. Persuasion is described in three ways: manipulation of symbols or meaning, one-on-one informal communications and appeals to expertise (Conrad, 1978;
Coalition-building is used to bring interest groups together and to involve people of influence, power or expertise without changing the organizational structure. This strategy is possible in higher education because of the organization’s ambiguous nature and diffused power base. Overall, coalition-building has been found to be an effective means to accomplish change in the higher education at all levels (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker and Riley, 1977).

Informal processes are also influential change factors in higher education. Informal discussions, deal-making and hallway negotiations have been found to be effective in implementing rapid change (Hearn, 1996). Similarly, persistence is a central component of change for institutions because of the complex and ambiguous environment and diffused power structure. “Those that are vocal, willing to attend regular committee meetings, willing to take on seemingly mundane tasks, and willing to meet with administrative leaders can achieve far greater effectiveness,” according to Hearn (1996, p. 146). Likewise, mediation is a factor that influences change, mostly for administrators who broker solutions from competing forces (Conrad, 1978).

Some researchers have noted that political processes can prevent change. Sometimes a strategic idea becomes a political problem which then is left alone so the initiative is not accomplished. An example might be the implementation of electronic voting for student elections, a viable initiative unless the ruling student party feels threatened by the possible outcome of opening up voting to a larger cohort of students through an electronic format.

Given the nature of higher education, the loose coupling of the organization, the diffused power structure and the many power bases, the dialectical model often provides a strong descriptive model for change in higher education as well as an idealized model for leaders who consider implementing change.
Social Cognition Model

Social cognition models developed in the past decade rely on concepts like cognition and sense-making. The models assume that there is not a single organizational reality, but different ones perceived by each individual. Change occurs when new knowledge structures are created by building on past experiences and information for an individual. New learning also comes about as two conflicting pieces of information are brought together in a process called cognitive dissonance (Argyris, 1994). Change in this model does not need to occur because of a leader’s vision, an environmental change or a political tension. Individuals reach a point of cognitive dissonance where their values are in conflict with their actions or something is outmoded or no longer useful. Cybernetics describes an interactive model that is circular in nature, reacting to strains and pressures from various areas (Morgan, 1986); herein, change is not linear, and the change is not always necessarily good. Because the change is individualistic, the environment plays a lesser role and leaders must define the change process through reframing, and individuals must make sense of the change (Harris, 1996).

Single- and double-looped learning are examples of the social cognition model of learning; extensions have been made to change models by defining single-looped learning, in which individuals improve on existing methods, as first-order change where individuals or organizations make modest improvements to the status quo (Argyris, 1982, 1994). Double-looped learning, in which individuals must reformulate existing structures and norms, is matched with second-order or transformational change where organizations must reframe norms and structures to develop innovative solutions. To do so, individuals and organizations must face the mismatches in their governing beliefs that channel their decision making (Hedberg, 1981).
Individuals possess theories of action, that is, views that drive their decision making with regard to change. In order for change to occur, leaders must recognize these theories of action and align them with the organizational values and the intended change. In other words, individuals must make a paradigm shift to see the organization in a different way.

By looking at change from a social-constructivist perspective, researchers like Cohen and March (1991a; 1991b); Bolman and Deal (1991); Morgan (1986); and Weick (1995) generated new theories of change based on different ways of seeing an organization. Particularly, Bolman and Deal assert that leaders who perceive the organization through multiple lenses see the issues through various perspectives. They see structural issues through the bureaucratic lens, training issues through a human resources lens, power issues through a political lens and identity and meaning through the symbolic lens.

Like dialectical models, social cognition relies on individuals to understand and to create change, although social cognition is wider in its view: It looks at the change in each individual as well as the organizational change rather than the actions of interest groups. Individuals learn and realign their identity or worldview and actions. Leaders must look at the issues through various lenses and then help reframe reality through metaphors so that individuals can understand the change (Morgan, 1997).

Social cognition models recognize the individual’s role in implementing the change and the work that each individual must do to create change by reframing their realities or worldviews. These models also recognize that change is not always good. Missing is the influence of the environment from other models and the importance of feelings and values that permeate the cultural models.
In higher education, social cognition has been a helpful tool in defining change and in assisting leaders in implementing change. Kezar (2001) identifies nine areas where social reorientation has been important to defining change in higher education and beyond: single- and double-looped learning, mental models, constructed interaction, learning organizations, metaphors and language, sensemaking, image and institutional isomorphism and imitation or emulation.

Single- and double-looped learning, described above, is tied to colleges and universities in the following way: single-looped learning occurs daily as departments and divisions adjust to changes in funding and institutional focus. Double-looped learning is quite complex since it requires a reorientation of a department’s vision and goals. This is more difficult to obtain given the loose organizational structure of higher education. Mental models help to frame behavior and can cause failure in change initiatives, especially if individuals cannot alter their frame of thinking and acting.

Like mental models, construction interactions provide venues to help individuals reorient their thinking. Some sensemaking strategies include committees, reading groups, staff development and ‘town hall’ meetings (Gioia and Thomas, 1996). The idea is to provide a vehicle for individuals to reconsider how they perceive their roles and to make new meaning.

Learning organizations are idealized models for change and little research has been done to study them within higher education. Staff development is one aspect of this model but does not encompass the entire theory. Metaphors and language are important aspects of change in higher education. Bolman and Deal (1991) describe metaphors and language as a key tool to be used by leaders to help individuals to understand the changes to be implemented. These metaphors can also be tied to institutional identity as they are related to image.
Sensemaking encompasses more than Bolman and Deal’s reframing model by not only engaging individuals in the change but also recognizing the role of many processes and individuals who collectively construct a new reality. According to Smirich (1983), sensemaking provides a place for individuals to create, comprehend and acknowledge new conceptualization of the organization. Then, their work is consistent with those new worldviews (Gioia, Thomas, Clark, and Chittipeddi, 1996; Weick, 1979). Some of the mechanisms that allow for this are cross-departmental teams, faculty and staff training, outside individuals or consultants providing ideas, public speeches, task forces and committees (Kezar and Eckel, forthcoming).

Image is a key component of the change process since the higher education industry is often measured by image. In some instances, “a compelling future image that people can associate with and commit to eases the launching and eventual institutionalization of strategic change” (Gioia and Thomas, 1996, p. 398). It has also been noted that some vital components in assisting change were reputation, status, stature and visibility (Gioia and Thomas, 1996). Finally, institutional isomorphism or emulation is a model for change and an aspect of the social cognition or reorientation framework. This model indicates that colleges and universities change to become more like other colleges and universities which they strive to copy – through homogenization (Sporn, 1999). Instead of seeking individualism, institutions look to emulate more prestigious institutions to ensure survival (Gioia and Thomas, 1996).

These nine areas, single- and double-looped learning, mental models, constructed interaction, learning organizations, metaphors and language, sensemaking, image and institutional isomorphism and imitation or emulation where social reorientation are important are examples of how the social cognition framework describes change in higher education. Recognizing the individualistic and organizational nature of the social cognition framework,
studies of change in higher education have been able to use this to understand the change process.

Cultural Model

The cultural models of change blend the irrationality of the dialectical models with the complexity of organizations noted in social cognition. Change involves shifting values, beliefs, rituals and myths (Schein, 1985) and tends to be nonlinear, unpredictable and dynamic (Smirich, 1983). Legitimacy is an external force that motivates the change unlike the teleological or environmental models which rely on external motivators like profit or productivity. Like social cognition, change can be planned or unplanned and may contain intended and unintended consequences (Smirich, 1983).

A well-known theorist of cultural change, Schein (1985), identifies culture as shared by the collective as well as individuals, who exhibit it through mission and beliefs. Change occurs as managers re-create parts of the symbolism and culture of an organization. Cameron (1991) notes that change occurs when leaders interpret events and history and create ceremonies and events to alter culture. Interpretive strategy is another cultural model where individuals’ socially constructed reality combines that of other individuals in an agreement designed to benefit the greater good of the organization (Chaffee, 1983). Change comes as the result of revised interpretations, metaphors that are tied to the history and rituals of the organization and the reinterpretation of these metaphors. Change cannot be accomplished by only looking at the top management; it must be affected throughout the organization. To create change, the mission and vision must be recreated by new symbolic events and rituals, new metaphors used by leaders and individuals, the efforts of energetic individuals, enthusiasm and the communication of new values and beliefs.
In higher education, the cultural models have proved to be effective although additional work needs to be done. A number of important themes are embedded in this model: the role of history and tradition, symbolism as a strategy to create change, institutional culture affecting the change process, deep transformation and paradigm shifts as uncommon, irrationality and ambiguity as characteristic of the process, and the lack of interpretive power of the notion of a culture of change (Kezar, 2001, p. 105). Cohen and March (1974) note that academic traditions and history, combined with the organization’s ambiguous nature and diffused power structure, radically affect the change process in higher education. They also noted the importance of symbolism to change initiatives. Likewise, Bolman and Deal found that symbolic events could be used as levers to create institutional change.

It is widely regarded that deep transformation and paradigm shifts are difficult to accomplish in higher education (Sporn, 1999). Because institutions of higher education tend to combine old paradigm thinking with new paradigms, radical change is not observable. Further, the ambiguous nature of higher education and the irrational nature of the change process will slow the process down. Individuals in colleges and universities change not because of a rational decision-making process, but because of the future impact on their division or the effect it might have on friends and colleagues (Carr, 1996; Clark, 1976). The cultural model has contributed to the descriptive and idealized typologies for change, although, as stated earlier, it has been found to be weak when used alone. The model does not address the many complexities of change. Therefore, new methodologies arose to address this issue.

The chart on the following page from Kezar (2001, pp. 57-58), provides an outline of the six typologies of change and their characteristics, including why change occurs, the process of change, the outcome of change, the key metaphor, examples and criticisms and benefits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why change occurs</th>
<th>Evolutionary</th>
<th>Teleological</th>
<th>Life Cycle</th>
<th>Dialectical</th>
<th>Social Cognition</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External environment</td>
<td>Leaders; internal environment</td>
<td>Leaders guiding individual’s natural growth</td>
<td>Dialectical tension of values, norms, or patterns</td>
<td>Cognitive dissonance; appropriateness</td>
<td>Response to alterations in the human environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of change</td>
<td>Adaption; slow; gradual; non-intentional</td>
<td>Rational; linear; purposeful</td>
<td>Natural progression; result of training and motivation; altering habits and identity</td>
<td>First order followed by occasional second order; negotiation and power</td>
<td>Learning; altering paradigms or lens; interconnected and complex</td>
<td>Long-term; slow; symbolic process; nonlinear; unpredictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of change</td>
<td>New structures and processes; first order</td>
<td>New structures and organizing principles</td>
<td>New organizational identity</td>
<td>New organizational ideology</td>
<td>New frame of mind</td>
<td>New culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key metaphor</td>
<td>Self-producing organism</td>
<td>Change-master</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Social movement</td>
<td>Brain</td>
<td>Social movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Resource dependency; strategic choice; population ecology</td>
<td>Organizational development, strategic planning; reengineering; TQM</td>
<td>Developmental models; organizational decline; social psychology of change</td>
<td>Empowerment; bargaining; political change; Marxist theory</td>
<td>Single- and double-looped learning; paradigm-shifting; sensemaking</td>
<td>Interpretive strategy; paradigm shifting; processual change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticisms</td>
<td>Lack of human emphasis; deterministic quality</td>
<td>Overly rational and linear; inability to explain second order change; plasticity of people</td>
<td>Little empirical proof; deterministic character</td>
<td>Deterministic; lack of environmental concerns; little guidance for leaders</td>
<td>Deemphasizes environment; overemphasizes ease of change; ignores values and emotions</td>
<td>Impractical to guide leaders; focus on universalistic culture; mostly untested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Environmental emphasis; systems approach</td>
<td>Importance of change agents; management techniques and strategies</td>
<td>Change related to phases; temporal aspect; focus on people throughout the organization</td>
<td>Change not always progressive; irrationality; role of power</td>
<td>Emphasizes socially constructed nature; emphasis on individuals; habits and attitudes as barriers</td>
<td>Context; irrationality, values, and beliefs; complexity; multiple levels of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2. Six typologies of change and their characteristics (Kezar, 2001, pp. 57-58)

Of the six typologies of change, the evolutionary theory has been found to be an effective theory for explaining change in higher education. This theory considers external forces as well as internal forces as factors in change. Reactions to the environment, as well as pro-active initiatives that influence the environment place organizations and leaders as more passive participants as well as active drivers of change that might change the environment. Because of
the independent nature of the academic side and the more bureaucratic nature of the administrative side of higher education, social cognition also an effective tool to describe change.

This theory rests on the premise that individuals and organizations can learn or socially construct new realities and ways of working. Given the collaborative and complex governance structure of higher education, this theory can help inform evolutionary theory, which relies on an organization’s relationship with the environment. Evolutionary theory, informed by social cognition will be used in this study for a theoretical framework.

The Four Frames

Of the typologies and models presented, Bolman and Deal’s four frames model (2003) provides a strong framework for identifying the various parts of a change initiative for public, urban, liberal arts commuter college for a number of reasons. Public institutions have various bureaucratic issues that inhibit and facilitate change, and the political arena extends beyond institutional politics to system, city, state and accrediting body politics. Commuter campuses often struggle to create a sense of community and individual development is not necessarily an aspect of the value system. Finally, an institution situated in a large city with many sister institutions within a twenty-mile radius might develop an ambiguous campus culture for faculty, staff and students.

Bolman and Deal (2003) recognized that organizations can be described or analyzed from multiple views and that people in organizations have different mental maps about the organization and how activities are conducted and decisions are made. They looked at the various theories of organizational thought and put them into four perspectives (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 12). The mental maps that individuals carry are frames that define reality and help them
to negotiate their worlds. They are often limiting as they only present one view. Managers with multiple frames are better equipped to maneuver through the multifaceted environment of organizations. As Bolman and Deal point out,

Like maps, frames are both windows on a territory and tools for navigation. Every tool has distinctive strengths and limitations. The right tool makes a job easier, but the wrong tool just gets in the way. One or two tools may suffice for simple jobs, but not for more complex undertakings. Managers who master the hammer and expect all problems to behave like nails find organizational life confusing and frustrating. The wise manager, like a skilled carpenter or a professional chef, wants at hand a diverse collection of high quality implements. Experienced managers also understand the difference between possessing a tool and knowing how to use it. Only experience and practice bring the skill and wisdom to size up a situation and use tools well (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 13).

The four frames - structural, human resources, political and symbolic (Bolman and Deal, 1984) - were drawn from sociology, psychology and anthropology, and have been adapted by other scholars (Berquist, 1992; Birnbaum, 1988, 1992; and Dunford, 1992). Dunford and Palmer (1995) found that using multiple models had positive effects for participants in management courses, indicating that those perspectives were helpful or very helpful and that they provided a competitive edge.

As shown in Figure 2.3, Bolman and Deal point out the advantages that multiple frame thinking has over a single worldview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Managers Think</th>
<th>How Managers Might Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They often have a limited view of organizations (for example, attributing almost</td>
<td>They need a holistic framework that encourages inquiry into a range of significant issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all problems to individuals’ flaws and errors).</td>
<td>people, power, structure, and symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of a problem’s source, managers often choose rational and structural</td>
<td>They need a palette that offers an array of options: bargaining as well as training,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions: facts, logic, restructuring</td>
<td>celebration as well as reorganization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers often value certainty, rationality, and control while fearing ambiguity,</td>
<td>They need to develop creativity, risk taking, and playfulness in responses to life’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paradox, and ‘going with the flow.’</td>
<td>dilemmas and paradoxes, focusing as much on finding the right question as the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answer, on finding meaning and faith amid clutter and confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders often rely on the “one right answer” and the “one best way”; they are</td>
<td>Leaders need passionate, unwavering commitment to principle, combined with flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stunned at the turmoil and resistance they generate.</td>
<td>in understanding and responding to events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3. Expanding managerial thinking (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 17)
Using the four frames requires flexible thinking that incorporates more than a rigid, narrow definition of organizations and how they operate.

Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames are outlined in the following concise chart which includes the metaphor for the organization, the central concepts, the image of leadership and the basic leadership challenge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAMES</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>HUMAN RESOURCE</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
<th>SYMBOLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor for organization</td>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central concepts</td>
<td>Rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, environment</td>
<td>Needs, skills, relationships</td>
<td>Power, conflict, competition, organizational politics</td>
<td>Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Leadership</td>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic leadership challenge</td>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align, organizational and human needs</td>
<td>Develop agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4. Overview of the four frame model (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 16)

**Structural Frame**

The structural frame was one of the original ways of thinking about organizations and has been used to help drive change initiatives and improve organizations. This frame has core assumptions, origins and basic forms. The six assumptions around the structural frame are:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor.
3. Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures.

5. Structures must be designed to fit an organization’s circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce and environment).

6. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 45).

The origin of this frame comes from two schools of thought. Time-and-motion studies done by Frederick W. Taylor (1911) broke jobs into parts that were analyzed for efficiencies and effectiveness. Further work by Henri Fayol ([1919] 1949), Lyndall Urwick (1937) and Luther Gulick (Gulick and Urwick, 1937) enhanced the field by looking at specialization, authority and the delegation of responsibility. The other intellectual basis came from the work of Max Weber, who recognized that organizations were growing beyond a patriarchal model in which one individual possessed an unlimited span of control and decision-making to a more rational model with major features like a fixed division of labor, a hierarchy of offices, rules that governed performance, a separation of personal and official rights, technical qualifications for hiring and long-term employment as a career. Further work looked at the relationship between an organization’s structure and productivity or effectiveness.

The structural framework looks at the interplay between the structure of an organization and its function, that is, “a blueprint for formal expectations and exchanges among internal players and external constituencies” (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 46). The two basic characteristics of the model are differentiation (how to apportion work) and integration (how to coordinate the roles and responsibilities). Specialization or position description is the hallmark of differentiation while the process of integration has evolved over time.
Organizing groups into working units can take several forms – functional groups based on skill, time-bound groups, product-based units, process-based groups and geographically located groups. Coordinating the process of work can be done in a number of ways, but two are most common – vertically through the organizational chart structure or laterally through networks, task forces or coordinating roles.

When work is structured around a vertical process, an authority figure becomes important to manage and delegate the workflow. This is most effective when the ‘boss’ has endorsed authority from subordinates as well as support from superiors (Dornbusch and Scott, 1975). Rules, policies and standards drive the formation of the work and the perfection level of the product. Generally, standard operating procedures (SOP) are helpful in getting work done in an effective and efficient manner. However, as the organization and its products evolve, SOPs can hurt the organization.

As an example, a college with a senate configuration of sixty faculty and thirty students works well unless the number of faculty is too large to reach the needed quorum for voting. Here, changes in standard operating procedures would serve to improve the performance of the faculty and student senate.

Lateral coordination is an effective tool for getting work accomplished in a short time or for a specific goal. Meetings or task forces are a staple of lateral work coordination, whether the purpose is to create policies or procedures, map out a work strategy or solve a crisis problem. They can go across the organizational structure and authority lines. The evolution of technology, particularly networked computer technology, has spawned the growth of interorganizational networks which can help with or stymie the vertical organizational work (Ghoshal and Bartlett, 1990). Lateral coordination is effective for generating creativity and problem solving around a
particular issue or innovation. However, this often comes at the expense of the everyday work needed in the vertical structure.

According to Bolman and Deal, six factors must be considered in creating an effective organizational structure: size and age, core process, environment, strategy and goals, information technology and nature of the workforce. These are outlined in Figure 2.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Structural Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size and age</td>
<td>Complexity and formalization increase with size and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core process</td>
<td>Core processes or technologies must align with structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Stable environment rewards simpler structure, uncertain, turbulent environment requires more complex, adaptable structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and goals</td>
<td>Variation in clarity and consistency of goals requires appropriate structural adaptations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>Information technology permits flatter, more flexible, and more decentralized structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the workforce</td>
<td>More educated and professional workers need and want greater autonomy and discretion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5. Structural imperatives (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 59)

As an organization grows and ages, efficiency and effectiveness cannot be achieved without more formal organizational structure (Greiner, 1972; Quinn and Cameron, 1983). Taken too far, however, this results in stifling bureaucracy. The core process of an organization must be aligned with the structure. As an organization meets new demands, structure must realign to meet them. A college that will be unable to bring in additional students due to declining numbers of available prospective students must focus on retention and might restructure the organization and realign resources to improve retention of existing students.

The environment can significantly affect the effectiveness of an organization, depending on the type of organization and the prevailing pressures. The external environment has less impact on a well-established college like Yale than on a two-year college in a small town where enrollment is heavily affected by the economy and the immediate needs of the community.
Goals and strategy vary from organization to organization, but are generally forward thinking and driven by mission and profitability. Also, unstated goals like fictitious or stereotypical objectives (common to any reputable organization) may affect the structure.

Using the structural frame to implement positive change is a potent but perilous approach. The organizational structure embodies the resolution of a number of strains or problems including differentiation versus integration, gap versus overlap, underuse versus overload, lack of clarity versus lack of creativity, excessive autonomy versus excessive interdependence, too loose versus too tight, goalless versus goal bound and irresponsible versus unresponsive.

Differentiation versus integration is the balance between allocating work and coordinating the work of individuals or groups. One affects the other and many factors play into which should take priority over another. An organization that is too loose can lose focus and direction, while organizations that are too tight miss out on the contributions of individuals to the problem solving process. Finally, an organization should be goal bound (continually upgrading and refining its goals) and strike a good balance between assuming responsibilities and adhering too rigidly to policies.

Organizations may choose to reorganize or restructure due to some common reasons: environmental shifts, technology changes, organizational growth or leadership changes. Making organizational change through restructuring is, as has been pointed out, a risky, but effective way to make improvements. Another frame from which to study or implement change is the human resources frame.
Human Resources Frame

The human resources frame works from the context that organizations exist because people do work and vice versa. It looks at how the features of an organization and the individuals in the organization characterize what each does for the other. The frame has four key assumptions, according to Bolman and Deal (2003, p. 115).

- Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
- People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy and talent; people need careers, salaries and opportunities.
- When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization – or both become victims.
- A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed.

Researchers have debated the concept of human need. Jensen and Meckling (1994) point out that individuals are willing to trade off one need for another to improve their situation. For example, a person may be willing to work extra hours to obtain more money. In particular, individuals in an organization will adjust their work and motivation to meet their needs. Specifically, people have the following hierarchical needs according to Abraham Maslow (1954):

1. Physiological (water, food, shelter)
2. Safety
3. Belongingness and love
4. Esteem
5. Self-actualization
Although this theory has not been proven, the tenets of the theory are woven into many managerial manuals at companies across the country.

Building on Maslow’s needs, McGregor (1960) developed theory X and theory Y, which states that if people are treated as if they were lazy and without direction, then they will respond accordingly and that management’s role is to build an environment so that people’s self-interest needs match those of the organization. Frequently, there is conflict between individual needs and interests and organizational needs and interests. Argyris (1964) asserted that people have the need to ‘self-actualize’ and that organizations should arrange themselves to maximize this trend. Instead, he found that most managerial handbooks emphasized specialization and did not take into consideration the job burnout and boredom inherent in such a structure.

A countervailing force is the need for a well-trained workforce. Because of globalization and increasing needs for information, workers need more acumen and commitment across the organizational structure. With networked working environments, employees need the skills and information to make sensible decisions. In addition, today’s workforce needs a much more sophisticated skill set than in the past. In the mid 1970’s one-third of the workforce was blue collar. By the mid 1990’s, the percentage was less than 20% (Drucker, 1993, Handy, 1989).

Pfeffer (1994, 1998) asserts that precisely because so few employers are willing to invest financial and time resources to developing a skilled and motivated workforce, these employers put themselves in a strategic advantage over other companies. Often the focus is on the organization as a portfolio of assets rather than a collection of human and physical capital. Organizations that recognize the strategic advantage of investing in human capital have noticed measurable positive results. Their strategies differ but generally fall into a set of six principles, as identified in the chart on the following page.
Organizations that build systems to implement their philosophy have put the structure in place to ensure that their employees know and are rewarded by effectively following the philosophy of the organization. Another key feature is to hire the right people. Simon (1996) studied highly successful midsized companies in Germany. His findings were that their key strengths were a highly skilled and motivated workforce. Turnover occurred only among new employees who discovered they were not fitting in.

To keep employees who are carefully selected, they should be well rewarded with attractive benefits. Selective companies kept good employees by offering work and family benefits like child care (Osterman, 1995). Public higher education can frequently offer good benefits and a stable retirement system. Another important aspect of keeping good employees would be to protect their jobs. Higher education, with its promotion and tenure system as well as a strong union environment prevalent in many institutions, makes it possible to easily keep employees. Promoting from within provides a number of advantages to organizations (Pfeffer, 1998) like fostering trust and loyalty, reducing serious errors made by outsiders unfamiliar with
the organization and increasing the likelihood that employees will think longer term. In higher education, promoting from within is one method of communicating to a stable and unionized workforce that certain work ethics are valued over others.

Sharing the wealth with programs like employee stock ownership plans has been shown to have a positive impact on employee performance. The downside to this is that when companies go bankrupt or are sold out, and employees suffer a loss of stock value. In public institutions of higher education, budget cuts frequently affect the ability of faculty and staff to remain competitive in the market.

Organizations that are responsive to their employees recognize the need to invest in their development. The costs are immediate and the rewards are often difficult to measure. Training must be in the classroom as well as on the job and recertification is needed for many industries like the airlines and hotel industry. In higher education, training and faculty development enrich the workforce and keep employees engaged and updated.

Employees need to be empowered to understand their work, but also to be involved in the creation of new processes that give the work meaning. To do so, they need support and the right kind of information so that they can be effective in their jobs. Some industries have turned to open-book management (Case, 1995), in which employees at every level see and understand the company’s financial and performance measures, are encouraged to think like owners and are given a stake in the company’s financial success. This communicates that management trusts its employees, relies on their contribution and provides information to everyone so that good decision-making can occur. Often, work redesign or enrichment has a positive effect on worker quality, more so than productivity (Lawler, 1986).
Self-managing teams were first proposed by Rensis Likert (1961), who asserted that organizations should look like a set of interconnected teams. Some organizations, like multi-campus colleges and Whole Foods, have embraced this feature. Researchers have found that institutions of higher education operate as loosely coupled system much like interconnected teams. Egalitarianism or participative management is an effective tool for empowering employees. Colleges and universities, with shared governance and the faculty governance system, offers a forum for faculty to be involved in the business of the college. At some institutions, the senate is composed of faculty and students, providing a place for the involvement of students.

Whether driven by external forces like public concern or by internal motivations, organizations should promote diversity. Many do so because it makes good business sense. Diversity can be achieved only by organizations that take the goal seriously and persist in meeting it. To accomplish diversity, boards must be diversified, glass ceilings eliminated and the workforce systematically diversified. Given the focus in public institutions for the employee base to better reflect the student population, increased diversity is often an important aspect of the hiring and promotion process.

Implementing an effective human resources strategy requires an understanding of the philosophy of the frame as well as some solid approaches that involve the individual in his/her development. Whether it is strengthening the bond between individuals and organizations, compensating employees well, empowering employees, training the workforce, offering job security or promoting from within, any human resources approach relies on a broad plan.

Both the structural frame and the human resource frame offer a systematic way of looking at organizational change, one relying on the underlying structure, mission and goals of
the organization to drive the change and the other focusing on the significant contributions of
human capital and its ability to drive productivity and change. Another frame that looks at the
process of making decisions and allocating scarce resources based on diverging interests within
an organization is the political frame.

Political Frame

The political frame claims that political activity comes from diverging interests, scarcity,
power relations and interdependence and that an organization is a group of coalitions that form to
accomplish some goal. The assumptions behind the political frame, according to Bolman and
Deal (2003, p. 186) are:

1. Organizations are coalitions of diverse individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs,
   information, interests and perceptions of reality.
3. Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources – who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to organizational
dynamics and underline power as the most important asset.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation and jockeying for position
   among competing stakeholders.

These assumptions delineate the sources of the power dynamics. The interdependence of
individuals causes the creation of coalitions among people with differing needs and aspirations.
Because resources are scarce, decisions become more political in nature as conflict arises among
the various parties. Power, the capacity to get things done, is another issue in the political frame
as it defines the interdependent relationships between individuals. Goals in the political frame
are set through a series of negotiations and interactions, not from decisions at the top.
The concept of an organization as a group of coalitions runs counter to the structural concept of a hierarchical organizational chart. However, the political frame asserts that organizations are made up of coalitions of people that bargain with one another to sway decision-making and goals. Higher education institutions, with their loosely coupled organizational structure and diffused authority, are examples of coalitions that bargain for influence in the decision-making process.

Power in the political frame takes a number of forms. One is positional power or authority, that which is recognized in the structural frame. Another might be power based on information or expertise. A CIO might exert power based on his expertise in technology. Other forms of power come from control of rewards or coercive power. Alliances and networks can be powerful depending upon their goals and their membership. Access to and control of agendas is a source of power as it offers entry to decision arenas. Individuals can exert power by framing the meaning and symbolism of some issues. Finally, personal power is gotten through charisma, energy and stamina. The other aspects of power, such as expertise, access, information, coercion, framing and personal power are helpful in providing the additional needed power base.

Since resources are often scarce and organizations are made up of groups with diverging interests, conflict is inevitable. The political frame focuses not on the resolution of that conflict through strategic redirection, as in the structural frame or the diminution of conflict through training and understanding, but looks at the strategy and tactics involved in the process. By challenging the status quo and stimulating interest and innovation, conflict can assist in the development of new ideas. The challenge for managers is to make the conflict productive, not debilitating. Leaders must advocate for their group in the negotiating arena and develop the alliances needed to move the group forward.

Agendas in the political arena are statements of interests and circumstances. A number of researchers who studied effective leaders, CEOs, presidents and entrepreneurs (Kanter, 1983; Kotter, 1988; Smith, 1988) found that effectiveness as a political leader began with setting an agenda which had a vision and a strategy for achieving it. Strong leaders listen and ‘plant seeds’ of ideas that establish the agenda in terms that are perceived as beneficial to the constituents. The vision must also have a strategy for implementation.

Effective leaders must also map the political terrain. Managers frequently try to implement some new initiative without thinking of the political ramifications it might cause. Besides agenda building and mapping the political terrain, it is important for leaders to be able to network effectively. Determining who best to network with is a first priority. Once that has been established, a relationship needs to be developed so that the person is available when needed. He or she also has to see a reason to be connected with you as the relationship moves to ‘horse trading,’ providing promised rewards in exchange for favors like support or resources. New initiatives can be successfully implemented only when they have merit and are perceived as positive political changes for the individual or organization affected.

Bargaining and negotiation are the cornerstones of effective decision-making. As pointed out earlier, recognizing that an idea is good is only half the battle. Getting buy-in and allies to realize the idea are critical next steps. These are accomplished through bargaining and negotiation. Fisher and Ury (1981) note that most managers engage in ‘positional bargaining’ in
which each side presents its position and then chips away towards a resolution. They claim that ‘principled bargaining’ is far more effective. The goal here is to create value for all parties involved and for the organization. This is particularly important and effective when the parties involved will need to work with one another again.

Organizations are also places where political action occurs through change agents pushing their agendas in the workplace and with employees. They also have resources and strategies for using resources that have political connotations. The various coalitions and parties in an organization help to make up the political arena. Different organizations have different agendas and cultures which drive the nature of the political games. Some can create value while others might claim value depending on the nature of the organization. While leaders can wield power through their positions to meet political goals, they need the additional types of power to be effective in implementing change. A concern regarding organizations is that they may exert undue force on society and drive agendas that have social impact.

Organizational change can be perceived or implemented through the structural frame where the organizational structure defines how work gets done, through the human resource frame where human capital is the primary force in an organization or through the political frame where coalitions form to meet diverging needs. In addition, managers might see an organization through the symbolic frame which looks to make meaning out of important symbols and beliefs that define an organization.

**Symbolic Frame**

The symbolic frame works to understand how individuals make sense out of their world by looking at faith, meaning and belief. Symbols are used to make meaning of our lives and help
to define our culture. The symbolic frame, using ideas from a number of areas, has the following basic assumptions:

- What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
- Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret them differently.
- In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction and anchor hope and faith.
- Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
- Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs. (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 242)

Through the symbolic frame existence is serendipitous rather than linear. The functions in an organization occur organically in response to a variety of traps and cushions. Culture defines an organization and is seen as both a product and a process. Briefly, Deal and Kennedy (1982, p. 4) define culture as ‘the way we do things around here.’ Leaders are seen as both shapers of culture and as people who are shaped by culture. Organizations have culture that evolves over time and is seen in myths and ceremonies. Leaders who can capitalize on these can effect change by understanding the strength of the symbols. It is important that the symbols and the culture are in sync with the marketplace forces. Symbols are tied closely with meaning, a basic human need.
Recently, the importance of symbols in an organization has become more evident. Studies that tied symbols to the bottom line showed a positive linkage between the two (Kotter and Heskett, 1992). Symbols provide clarity to combat confusion, and meaning in chaos (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Symbols in the form of myths, vision and values help individuals to find meaning in their workplace. Myths form the basis of those qualities that an organization finds key to its esteem or commitment, commonly known as its values. Most organizations have a vision, or an image of the future of the organization based on its core values. An example of a visionary company would be 3M, which insisted on allowing product development to continue until Scotch Tape was introduced (Collins and Porras, 1994).

Organizations have heroes and heroines, people whose actions and words typify the core values of the organization. James Sinegal, head of Costco, had a simple office without a bathroom or expensive furniture and was known to answer his own phone. He felt that it would be hypocritical for the head of a low-cost operation to work in lush surroundings with all the corporate perks (Bynes, Byrne, Edwards, and Lee, 2002).

Stories and fairy tales help to communicate and perpetuate an organization’s values, mission and culture. They are entertaining ways of telling historical events and can be used to make a point or communicate a difficult idea. Corporate stories communicate in an engaging way the mores and important processes an organization values.

Ritual is an important aspect of human life as well as organizational life. It generates clarity and predictability, especially in areas where things cannot be explained or are too random to be controlled. Conventions are a common ritual for organizations and groups of professionals, places where individuals can grow and reconnect.
Ceremony, much like ritual, is an event or process that has deep meaning. Ceremonies happen less frequently and are usually elaborate events. Businesses have ceremonies that signify meaning from the organization to its membership. Examples include retirement events and welcoming ceremonies. They communicate transition from one state to another. They can fire the imagination and deepen commitment or can be seen as superfluous events without meaning.

Metaphors, humor and play are ways to use symbols to communicate ideas that are too uncomfortable or mysterious to discuss outright. In particular, metaphors are useful for taking complex concepts and putting an understandable image around them. Humor is a way for groups to explore possibilities and provide face-saving opportunities.

According to Bolman and Deal (2003, p. 270), “the symbolic frame encourages us to view organizations as theatre and organizational activities as dramaturgical performances played to both internal and external audiences.” It sees the configurations and processes of work as drama that communicates expectations and emotions. It helps to reduce uncertainty and provides a venue for understanding the current state of affairs with a view to the future.

Researchers and theorists of organizational management view the theatrical perspective as a recent addition to the literature. Efficiency, internal control and economic performance were seen as the key components under review and organizational structure helped to determine these components. Organizations defined in this way could control external forces by adjusting their structure or work. In contrast, recent theorists have proposed a less rational and less technical approach, recognizing that organizations are affected by changes in the environment. As such, decision-making becomes more ritual than rational and carefully staged ‘performances’ drive the institutional reality. Events have more influence on leaders than leaders have on events.
Organizational structures are defined differently in the symbolic frame than in the structural frame. Structure in the symbolic frame represents the design of the stage, the lighting, sets and theater design while in the structural frame structure is a combination of horizontal and vertical linkages where interdependent roles are coordinated. As an example, a public school has a symbolic structure, since it must respond to the needs of the community to ensure funding (Meyer and Rowan, 1978). In many instances, when organizations change, so does the symbolic structure. As an example, the Ivy Leagues colleges were perceived as finishing schools for the elite. Following the Great Depression, the colleges needed to revise their perceived image since they did not want to be exclusively associated with the rich who were seen as predators and villains. They changed their admissions practices to admit students of high academic rank, not economic status (Delbanco, 1996).

The organizational process can also be seen from a theatrical perspective. Individuals come to work each day and engage in meetings, report writing, the creation of products, teaching and a myriad of other activities. However, each of these activities may or may not produce the intended outcome or desired results. Meetings, planning exercises, evaluations and collective bargaining are all activities that do not necessarily result in a tangible product. However, how they are played out and perceived is of vital importance to the organization. Meetings have been described as ‘garbage cans,’ places that bring together people, problems and solutions (March and Olsen, 1976). When the issue to be solved is unclear, emotional or symbolically important, meetings tend to be conducted in garbage can dynamics. An example might be a meeting to discuss a new organizational mission. The meeting becomes a stage for expression, for
individuals to practice their lines or points of view and for airing issues that might otherwise go unnoticed. Planning is a vital form of an organization’s process. Without a plan, organizations have little direction or vision. The process then is a ceremony that the organization must go through to maintain its focus and direction.

Organizational culture weighs heavily in creating a climate for performance and change. As former Visa CEO Dee Hock stated,

> In the field of group endeavor, you will see incredible events in which the groups perform far beyond the sum of its individual talents. It happens in the symphony, in the ballet, in the theatre, in sports, and equally in business. It is easy to recognize and impossible to define. It is a mystique. It cannot be achieved without immense effort, training, and cooperation, but effort, training, and cooperation alone rarely create it.

> (Quoted in Schlesinger, Eccles, and Gabarro, 1983, p. 173)

Becoming a member of a highly effective team means signing on to a role that makes you responsible for your peers and vice versa. Any well working group has diverse members – tactical members, creative mavericks and members with many different skill sets. The leaders of groups such as these lead by example and use subtle and implicit signals rather than more direct commands. Well-operating teams have their own language, unique to their needs. It brings the members together, along with stories, histories and group values. Humor and play are key in releasing tension and providing spiritual renewal. Ritual and ceremonies play a key role in identifying and celebrating special forms of behavior.

Well-working groups also have informal cultural players who bring people together and keep the project on track. Finally, soul is the secret to the success of any highly performing team. Each member is drawn to work beyond himself to create something that is greater than the sum of the efforts of the team. Culture and the spirit of an organization are key factors that affect its effectiveness and sustainability.
The four frames – structural, human resources, political and symbolic - are important descriptors that define activities and decision-making in organizations. The effective use of these frames can inform organizational decision making and provide leaders with a tool to recalibrate their views. Managers today perceive their decision making role as rational and coordinated. However, given the myriad of small issues that arise around everyday management and the ill-defined nature of problems, managers are often unable to solve problems effectively or make decisions with a broader view in mind. Further, as issues arise, the various players involved see the issue from different perspectives. Unless a manager can also see the issue from those perspectives, he may be unable to effectively solve the issue.

Figure 2.7 on the following page outlines how events can be seen from multiple perspectives. As noted in the chart, many activities can be seen from each of the frames, and the perception from each frame is quite different. Effective leaders learn to look for these perspectives as they work with peers, superiors and those that report to them. Each has a perspective and sees the issue, problem or activity from a different side.

It has also been found that different situations are best addressed using one frame rather than another. Key questions can help a leader identify which frame is most effective. As an example, if individual commitment and motivation are key to the success of a project then the solution can best be found by looking at a structural or human resources initiative. If the decision must be technically accurate, then a structural solution works best. On the other hand, if the problem has a high level of ambiguity then a political or symbolic solution would be most effective. In some instances there is high conflict and scarce resources. When that occurs, then political and symbolic solutions work best. If the work needs to be done from the bottom up, then politics and symbolic solutions are most successful (Bolman and Deal, 2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Structural Resources</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Political Frame</th>
<th>Symbolic Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>Creating strategies to set objectives and coordinate resources</td>
<td>Gatherings to promote participation</td>
<td>Arena to air conflict and realign power</td>
<td>Ritual to signal responsibility, produce symbols, negotiate meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Rational sequence to produce right decision</td>
<td>Open process to produce commitment</td>
<td>Opportunity to gain or exercise power</td>
<td>Ritual to confirm values and create opportunities for bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganizing</td>
<td>Realign roles and responsibilities to fit tasks and environment</td>
<td>Maintain a balance between human needs and formal roles</td>
<td>Redistribute power and form new coalitions</td>
<td>Maintain and image of accountability and responsiveness; negotiate new social order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Way to distribute rewards or penalties and control performance</td>
<td>Process for helping individuals to grow and improve</td>
<td>Opportunity to exercise power</td>
<td>Occasion to play roles in shared drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching conflict</td>
<td>Maintain organizational goals by having authorities resolve conflict</td>
<td>Develop relationships by having individuals confront conflict</td>
<td>Develop power by bargaining, forcing, or manipulating others to win</td>
<td>Develop shared values and use conflict to negotiate meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Keep organization headed in the right direction</td>
<td>Keep people involved and communication open</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for individuals and groups to make interests known</td>
<td>Develop symbols and shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Transmit facts and information</td>
<td>Exchange information, needs, and feelings</td>
<td>Influence or manipulate others</td>
<td>Tell stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Formal occasions for making decisions</td>
<td>Informal occasions for involvement, sharing feelings</td>
<td>Competitive occasions to win points</td>
<td>Shared occasions to celebrate and transform culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Economic incentives</td>
<td>Growth and self-actualization</td>
<td>Coercion, manipulation, and seduction</td>
<td>Symbols and celebrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.7. Interpretations of organizational process (Bolman and Deal, 2003, pp. 306-307)
Organizational change is difficult at best in most situations, and transformational change is particularly complicated in higher education, given the structure of the academy. Change is usually a four-frame undertaking, as it hits the structure of the organization, the roles and responsibilities of individuals, the power-base and the very value system and culture of the organization. Change poses risks and rewards in regards to each of the frames as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Barriers to Change</th>
<th>Essential Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Anxiety, uncertainty, people feel incompetent and needs</td>
<td>Training to develop new skills; participation and involvement; psychological support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Loss of clarity and stability; confusion, chaos</td>
<td>Communicating, realigning, and renegotiating formal patterns and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Disempowerment; conflict between winners and losers</td>
<td>Create arenas where issues can be renegotiated and new coalitions formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Loss of meaning and purpose; clinging to the past</td>
<td>Create transition rituals; mourn the past, celebrate the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.8. Reframing organizational change (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 372)

During a change initiative, individuals in the organization feel incompetent and uncertain as to their role in the new organization. They need training and an opportunity to express concerns and fears. Many change initiatives require that the organizational structure be realigned and policies and procedures redefined. This causes stress on the organization as there is lack of clarity and purpose. It is important that the changes are communicated and individuals are involved in the change process. Individuals lose power or feel a realignment of the power base when a change initiative occurs. Good leaders will provide arenas where new coalitions can form and a realigning of the power base can occur. Finally, change can bring a loss of meaning to the organization, as its purpose and values may change. There should be effective rituals to mark the transition and allow for morning and celebration.

The change process delineated through time has been studied in detail by John Kotter. His work looked at successful and unsuccessful change initiatives and over time he identified
eight stages found in successful change initiatives. Figure 2.9 lists the eight stages of change down the left side of the chart, then reframes each using Bolman and Deal’s four frames.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Change</th>
<th>Structural Frame</th>
<th>Human Resource Frame</th>
<th>Political Frame</th>
<th>Symbolic Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Sense of Urgency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Involve people throughout organization; solicit input</td>
<td>Network with key players; Use power base</td>
<td>Tell a compelling story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Guiding team</td>
<td>Develop coordination strategy</td>
<td>Team building for guiding team</td>
<td>Stack team with credible, influential members</td>
<td>Put commanding officer on team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Uplifting vision and strategy</td>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map political terrain; develop agenda</td>
<td>Craft a hopeful vision of future rooted in organization history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Communicate vision and strategy through words, deeds, and symbols</td>
<td>Create structures to support change process</td>
<td>Meetings to communicate direction, get feedback</td>
<td>Create arenas; build alliances; defuse opposition</td>
<td>Visible leadership involvement; kickoff ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Remove obstacles and empower</td>
<td>Remove or alter structure, procedures that support the old ways</td>
<td>Provide training, resources, and support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public hangings of counter-revolutionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Early wins</td>
<td>Plan for short-term victories</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invest resources, power to ensure early wins</td>
<td>Celebrate and communicate early signs of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Keep going when going gets tough</td>
<td>Keep people on plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revival meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) New culture to support new ways</td>
<td>Align structure to new culture</td>
<td>Create a “culture” team; broad involvement in developing culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mourn the past; celebrate heroes of the revolution; share stories of the journey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.9. Reframing Kotter’s change stages (Bolman and Deal, 2003, pp. 386-387)

These factors combine to describe and delineate effective change initiatives and their characteristics. To effectively describe the change initiative, accurate data collection procedures
will need to be developed. The data and information needed to study a change initiative has to be inclusive, comprehensive, valid and reliable. Chapter three will describe the methodology to be used to gather and analyze the data around a change initiative.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze how organizational change was accomplished at an urban, commuter, masters-level liberal arts institution between the years 2003 – 2007 and to show the broader implications for other institutions. While many efforts to change the institutional culture, assessment, and accountability were underway, the demand that the college seek NCATE accreditation unexpectedly provided a necessary catalyst for far-ranging change. This study examines the many changes that took place during 2003 – 2007 and looks particularly at the initiatives taken to achieve accreditation. Some of the cited changes include changes in the college culture, assessment practices and the accountability of faculty in their assessment practices.

The initiative that began the process is the change in assessment practices brought about by the NCATE accreditation in the Division of Education and across the various disciplines. This change resulted in a reorganization of the assessment practices of not only the Education Division, but also related departments that educate future teachers in the content areas. The process demanded more accountability and required collaboration between and within departments and divisions.

Several other cross-campus initiatives may have influenced the change in campus culture, accountability and assessment practices. The campus was engaged in its first general education review in thirty years, a strategic planning process involving more than two-hundred faculty,
staff, students, alumni and community members, the retirement of over a third of the faculty resulting in the hire of more than one-hundred, fifty new replacement faculty as well as planning for a middle states reaccreditations visit.

The rationale for this study is based on the premise that organizational change is a fundamental part of growth in any institution and that methodologies of change affect the depth and meaningfulness of the change. Some changes are transformational, while others are small improvements or adjustments in the status quo. For an institution without a history of assessment and accountability, pursuing and attaining initial NCATE accreditation can be transformational if it establishes a culture of assessment, collaboration and accountability across various disciplines in a sustainable and meaningful way. The ability of an organization, particularly a public institution of higher education, to effect needed transformational change is important and made more difficult when the timeline is short. Further, change of this type might be a catalyst for other transformational changes in the campus.

Study Site

The study is situated within the context of an increasingly centralized system governance structure, a faculty and staff union environment, the inclusion of new leadership (president and vice president’s), a strong faculty culture of teaching and research, a general education review, the emergence of new instructional technologies and the replacement of over a third of the faculty in a five-year period.

The college, positioned as one of seventeen institutions in a large urban system, opened its doors in 1937 as a public, commuter, liberal arts institution charged to educate the citizenry of a populous diverse county within a large metropolis. The student diversity has expanded and changed overtime and with over one-hundred, sixty countries and ninety languages represented.
The institution has maintained a solid academic reputation and strong faculty beginning with the first hires. Currently, the college has over eighteen-thousand students, thirteen-thousand of whom are undergraduates (60% of whom attend full-time) and the remainder in master’s level programs (90% of whom attend part-time). Students who pursue a doctorate do so at a graduate center which grants doctorates.

There are five-hundred and eight-two full-time faculty, 86% of whom have the terminal degree in their field (not all fields offer doctorates), and 69% have tenure. Many also teach in Ph.D. programs at the graduate center. The faculty have received numerous research grants from such organizations as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. In recent years they have also received several Guggenheim awards and Fulbright grants.

The college was named one of the nation’s twenty-five “hottest” and “most interesting colleges” by the 2008 Kaplan/Newsweek *How to Get into College Guide*. To quote the guide, “The school’s biggest claim to fame is the several generations of lawyers, doctors and other professionals who could not afford the Ivies and say ‘the college’ changed their lives.” The college was cited as being an especially popular choice for students who are the first in their family to attend college.

According to its promotional material, “The College prepares students to become leaders of our global society by offering a rigorous education in the liberal arts and sciences under the guidance of a faculty dedicated to both teaching and research. Students graduate with the ability to think critically, address complex problems, explore various cultures and use modern technologies and information resources. With a faculty and student population that reflects the exuberant diversity of ...the City, the College provides an unusually rich education.”
The college offers over one-hundred and fifteen undergraduate and graduate majors. Academic programs are organized into four divisions which hold both day and evening courses: Arts and Humanities, Education, Mathematics and the Natural Sciences and the Social Sciences. In addition to the fall and spring semesters, classes are also offered during a winter session and four summer sessions.

The college recently introduced new degree programs in graphic design and neuroscience as well as a Bachelor of Business Administration degree that offers majors in Finance, International Business and Actuarial Studies. New additions to the graduate curriculum include a unique Master of Fine Arts in creative writing and translation, a degree program in environmental geosciences, and two certificate programs: one in earth sciences for high school teachers and another in archives record management and conservation.

The college has many special centers and institutes that serve the diverse groups in the community. These units address pressing social issues, including cancer, AIDS, pollution and racism; study the changing workplace and workforce; and celebrate the borough's many ethnic communities, including Asians, Greeks, Italians and Jews. Two centers deal directly with the education of students in the K-12 system. One center forges links between public schools and the college that allow staff from each to perform their primary functions more effectively. The other center develops programs to provide equitable access to education for underserved children and families within the area.

During 2003 – 2007, the college was also going through a general education review, a middle states accreditation preparation, the beginnings of a strategic planning process as well as the NCATE accreditation process. All of these factors affected the degree and sustainability of
the changes at the college. All had intended results that needed to be accomplished and each affected the faculty and staff differently.

The study analyzes how organizational change is accomplished at an urban, commuter, masters-level liberal arts. In particular, the study analyzes the change in organizational structure, campus culture, accountability, assessment practices and teaching methodologies brought about by the NCATE accreditation process in the Division of Education and across various disciplines. This study also identifies other changes that occurred during this time period and analyzes the affect of each initiative on all the changes that occurred.

To provide a context for looking at change, this study compares the four aspects of change that affect its depth and meaningfulness in an organization: the *why*, *what*, *how* and *target* of the change. This is suggested by Kezar (2001) who in her book, *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*, takes a micro look at theories of change in organizations. Then, an analysis will be done to assess the type of change, i.e., first- or second-order change. That is, which changes were incremental, representing adjustments to the status quo (first-order change) and which were transformational (second-order change).

Organizational change is described using a number of models or typologies as outlined by Kezar (2001). Bolman and Deal draw on four of the six typologies and weave them together into an integrated framework for understanding and defining organizational change. Using Bolman and Deal’s Four Frames from *Reframing Organizations*, a macro analysis will be done to identify which factors fit into each of the four frames - structural, human resources, political or symbolic.
These identifiers will help determine which activities led to transformational (second-order) change and which led to incremental (first-order) change, as well as those factors that stalled the change initiative. To identify and classify the activities and processes that fit into the frames, appropriate research questions should be addressed. These are outlined in the next section.

Research Questions

The study will look at a number of key questions, assuming some important factors. The faculty is unionized as are most of the workers on campus excluding the top-level administrators. The NCATE accreditation process had been completed by a number of institutions in the system. The accreditation process was a requirement from the system in order to maintain status of the Division of Education. Through the collection and analysis of data, the study asks the following key questions:

- What forces and sources were the cause of the change in assessment processes, faculty accountability and campus culture during the time of the NCATE accreditation process (2003 – 2007)?

- What was the role of the NCATE process in bringing about these organizational changes?

- What other alterations in the organization during the time of the NCATE accreditation could account for the incremental and transformational change at the college?

- Were the four frames of organizational change (e.g. structural, human resources, political and symbolic) as defined by Bolman and Deal observed in the analysis of the
institutional change? If so, in what way did each of those frames impact the organizational change?

- What are the implications for other liberal arts institutions looking to make similar changes? Providing that the changes were positive for the institution with this culture, structure and mission, could this process be replicated in other initiatives?

These questions will be answered using a variety of modes including interviews and document reviews. The process of data collection and analysis for this case study is dependent on a quality research design. Four tests are generally used to ascertain the quality of empirical social research. These have been summarized in the following way:

- **Construct validity**: establishing correct operational measure for the concepts being studied.

- **Internal validity** (for explanatory or causal studies only, and not for descriptive or exploratory studies): establishing a causal relationship, whereby certain conditions are shown to lead to other conditions, as distinguished from spurious relationships.

- **External validity**: establishing the domain to which a study’s findings can be generalized.

- **Reliability**: demonstrating that the operations of a study – such as the data collection procedures – can be repeated, with the same results (Kidder & Judd, 1986, pp. 26-29).

With descriptive case studies, **construct validity** can be dealt with by using multiple sources of evidence and establishing a chain of evidence during the data collection phase, and then having key informants review the draft case study reports during the composition phase (Yin, 2003). This study will use data from memos, emails, official correspondence and interviews from individuals involved with the process, both as leaders and as participants.
Triangulating these multiple sources will provide a means of validity for the data collection process. According to Yin,

The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows an investigator to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal, and behavioral issues. However, the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence is the development of *converging lines of inquiry*, a process of triangulation...Thus, any findings or conclusion in a case study is likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information, following a corroboratory mode (Yin, p. 98).

Specifically, the data will be collected from the following documents:

- Reports sent to the NCATE Accrediting Board
- Minutes and reports from the assessment committee, professional education council, departmental committees, divisional caucuses and unit assessment committee
- Reports from the NCATE Board of Examiners and rejoinders submitted in response to those reports
- Letters from the chancellor, the president, the dean and NCATE relevant to the process
- Reports on the evolution of the unit mission, unit philosophy, unit core values and unit vision
- Minutes and reports from the education unit advisory board
- Faculty profile, publications and scholarship reports
- Precondition report for conceptual framework and accreditation
- Program reports and review for school media specialist, school psychologist, speech-language pathology, music education, school building leader and school media specialist
- Working papers from 2002 – 2005
- SPA reports
• Emails from and to the president
• Emails from and to the dean of education
• Literature review from knowledge base for core values and for seven principles
• Minutes from the personnel and budget committee, 2003 – 2007
• Minutes from the faculty and student senate, 2003 – 2007

Interviews will be conducted to corroborate data collected from the documents. The interviews, which will be conducted with individuals involved in the process, individuals who led the process, those policy makers who influenced the process and those who were not involved in the process will also provide an individual perspective to the change in assessment practices, change in faculty accountability and change in campus culture that might not be evident in minutes and memos.

According to Patton (1987), there are four types of triangulation in data analysis: data sources (data triangulation), different evaluators (investigator triangulation), perspectives of the same data (theory triangulation) and methods (methodological triangulation). This study will rely on data triangulation and methodological triangulation. Data triangulation will be achieved by using different types of data like interviews, memos, discussion papers, working papers, reports and letters. Each of these had a particular focus and is written for a certain purpose. As an example, working papers are centered on the process of achieving consensus on an idea, while reports are produced to describe the results of a process or working group. The interviews are the personal reactions to the processes and interactions that occurred during the time period from 2003 – 2007 as well as a report on the results. Also, the various methods of data gathering – retrieving memos and reports, retrieving emails and working papers and conducting interviews – will be examined to determine if the processes result in the same conclusion.
According to Yin (2003), *external validity* in a single descriptive case study is achieved by taking the findings from the research study and generalizing the findings to a broader theory analytically. Unlike survey studies which rely on statistical data to generalize a study to a universe, a case study relies on an analytic generalization to a theory. To fully generalize to a theory, the findings must be replicated in similar situations, just as a scientist must replicate the results of an experiment to be able to make a generalization.

This case study will not accomplish the goal of external validity using replication. However, the case study will use the data analysis and map the findings to the theoretical framework described in Bolman and Deal (2003). It might also make recommendations regarding additional studies that would help in fully generalizing to the theory.

Reliability is one of the four tests used to determine the quality of a case study. To increase the reliability of a study, the evidence should follow a logical chain from the case study questions to the protocol to the specific evidentiary sources to the case study database to the report and conclusions. This means that the data collection and the data analysis should be clear with appropriate citations (where the actual documents can be located as needed), and that the data collection procedures followed the protocol (which was linked to the original research questions).

In this case study, the transcripts from the interviews and all written documents including emails, reports, working papers and letters will be stored in the investigator’s office for three years in accordance with the IRB requirements from the college being studied and the researcher’s home institution. The protocol, which included signed consent forms for the elite interviews and for the release of documents, and an informational letter describing the study to the interviewees, was vetted by both IRB offices and given approval. The signed consent forms
will be kept with all other documents which are part of this study. A sample of the consent form and the informational letter are included in the appendix (A & B).

With these guidelines in mind, the data will be collected to maximize the construct validity, external validity and reliability of the study. The study will look to triangulate the data, the investigator findings, the theory and the methods so that the study has strong validity.

Data Collection Procedures

The method of collecting the data will be important to the validity of the study. The research looks at organizational change instigated by an initiative within a unit of a college but also investigates change across the college in assessment practices of faculty, accountability of faculty and campus culture. The data collection will need to be designed to capture this information so that it might be triangulated across data types. The chart below outlines the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Data Collection Source</th>
<th>Study Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| About an Individual | From an individual  
Individual behavior  
Individual attitudes  
Individual perceptions | From an organization  
Archival records  
Other reported behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions | If case study is an individual |
| About an organization | How organization works  
why organization works | Personnel policies  
Organizational outcomes | If case study is about an organization |

Figure 3.1: Design versus data collection: Different units of analysis (COSMOS Corp.)

Since this study is about organizational change at a college that must achieve accreditation and establish new assessment policies college-wide as well as the change in individual characteristics like assessment practices, accountability and attitude toward the college, data will need to be collected from individuals as well as from the college or units like
the Division of Education. The interviews will be designed to obtain information on individual changes and assist in triangulating the data around organizational changes. Since numerous faculty will be interviewed, some conclusions might be made regarding organizational culture change or perception of accountability changes. The documents will reflect the group decisions, new policies and the processes that occurred to achieve these new policies. The working papers might provide information on the process of policy change as they were written to chronicle the process. Meeting minutes will also help triangulate the data in terms of policy changes and the processes that resulted in the changes. The written report of the discussions may help inform the research about attitudinal changes or culture.

Archival Data

Data will be collected from a variety of sources. One resource will be minutes from faculty and student senate meetings for the time period 2003 – 2007, minutes from personnel and budget committee meetings during the time period 2003 – 2007, three NCATE-related memos from the provost to deans sent in the time period 2003 – 2007, two NCATE-related memos from the president sent in the same time period, minutes from the NCATE committee meetings dating from 2003 – 2007 and NCATE-related memos from the central office from the same time period.

Documentation from the NCATE accreditation process will be collected, including the various drafts of the report, as well as correspondence between the dean and the accrediting body and memos and emails to the faculty in the Division of Education and faculty and chairs of other divisions.

Interviews

The individuals chosen for the interviews fit into one of several categories. They were either the policy maker or vision setter for the college, an implementer of policies and initiatives,
a participant in the initiative or a colleague not involved in the initiative or change. Their perspectives on the perceived change will be recorded and analyzed to answer the questions regarding the why, what, how and target of the change. Interviews will be conducted with the following fourteen individuals:

- Dean of education
- Associate dean of education
- Provost & associate provost
- Dean of humanities
- Two chairs of education
- Divisional faculty, at least one from each of the three departments
- Two faculty from various academic disciplines, one who was involved in the process and one who was not involved
- Programmer in office of converging technology
- President

The interviews will be conducted as guided conversations instead of structured questions. As indicated in Rubin & Rubin (1995), the flow of the questions will be fluid and not rigid although there will be a consistent line of questioning. To accomplish this, the questions will need to follow the line of inquiry relevant to the study, and the questions will need to be unbiased in their approach (Yin, 2003). The questioning will follow the guide provided by Yin, (2003, p. 74):

The protocol’s questions, in essence, are your reminders regarding the information that needs to be collected and why. In some instances, the specific questions also may serve as prompts in asking questions during a case study interview; however, the main purpose of the protocol’s questions is to keep the investigator on track as data collection proceeds.
The questions to be answered fall into one of five levels, according to Yin (2003). The first two apply to single case studies and to this research.

- Level one where questions are asked of specific interviewees.
- Level two where questions are asked of the individual case, i.e. the mental questions that the researcher seeks to answer in the study. These can be directly asked although they may be surmised from the data collection process.

The interview protocol and questions were vetted by the IRB Office from both institutions for approval. An information letter was sent before setting up the interview and then the interviewee contacted the researcher either giving consent to be interviewed or not. The interviews were conducted in the office of the interviewee or a place of his or her choice. If an interviewee chose not to be interviewed or not to share private documents then the researcher will keep that information confidential. In addition, the interviews were recorded and transcribed and stored for three years in the researcher’s office. The interviewee can choose not to answer any of the questions.

To mitigate against the position of the researcher in the institution being studied, interviewees’ confidentiality will be maintained and data are reported in aggregate. The interviewee was informed that he/she could choose not to answer any question and that this will not affect the interview nor have consequences beyond the study, as per the IRB consent form signed by the study participants.

The interviews were designed to help the researcher find some strong themes and trends, which can be corroborated through a review of documents. Although the interviews were conversational in nature, the following questions were used as the guide for the interview process:
• Now that we have concluded the NCATE process, how does it feel?
• Was it worth it?
• What is the problem we were solving?
• Can you tell me something about the accreditation? What work needed to be done?
  Who had to do the work?
• How was the work decided upon? Who instigated the process and can you tell me something about that process?
• What were the perceptions of the faculty towards the NCATE process at the beginning? Did that change? If so, how and when?
• What has changed about the way you conduct your work now because of the accreditation process?
• Were there things or people that helped the process along?
• Were there things or people that hindered the process?
• Are things done differently here today? If so, how and how do you think that happened?
• Is this a different college today than 2003?
• What do you attribute the changes to? As you know, we have had a general education review, hired many new faculty, conducted a strategic planning process and participated in a middle states accreditation process. Did any of these change your work or your perception of your work?
• Do you think that you perceive your work and the college differently today from 2003?
• If so, how is it different?
• Were there other things that you can attribute any of the changes to, assuming there have been changes at the college.

• Does your department conduct itself differently? Does your division work differently now? If so, how? And to what do you attribute this change?

• Has the college changed? If so, how? And to what do you attribute the change?

• Do you think the changes have been transformational or incremental?

• What was your role in the NCATE accreditation process?

Data Analysis

Using Kezar’s model of organizational change to identify the why, what, how and target of each change, data were be analyzed from various sources. Data collected from documents included relevant faculty senate and personnel and budget committee minutes, memos from the president, provost, the NCATE accrediting agency, the central office and deans. These documents were analyzed to find information regarding the four aspects of change. The activities outlined in these documents were then classified using Bolman and Deal’s four frames – structural, human resources, political or symbolic (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Using the four frames approach, an analysis was undertaken to identify the types of activities that promoted the transformational change and were more responsible for the incremental or first order change. The proposition is that change occurs when all four frames are used in the process, capitalizing on the strengths of each frame to make sustainable change.

To improve internal and external validity, three analytical techniques will be used in varying degrees: pattern matching, explanation building, and time series analysis. Pattern matching logic compares an observed pattern with a predicted one (Trochim, 1989). If the patterns match, then internal validity is made stronger. In this study, analysis will rely on the
effect of all four frames around the change in assessment practices and faculty perceptions. The analysis also looked at the effect of the external force provided by the NCATE accreditation process in changing faculty assessment practices and perceptions by faculty of their roles. In this study, pattern matching may best be found in looking for similarities in interview answers, in similarities between interview responses and documented evidence relating to the same area.

Explanation building is a version of pattern matching where a series of cause links are established to ‘explain’ a case. It usually occurs in narrative form and reflects a proposition from a theoretical background. It is iterative in nature and the gradual process of building the explanation includes making an initial theoretical statement, comparing the findings against such a statement or proposition, revising the proposition, comparing more details against the revision, and comparing again (Yin, 2003). Because the study will look at a multi-year process that moved from the accrediting agency to the system office to the institution and back again in an iterative process, this tool will help in the explanation of the change initiative.

Time-series analysis is similar to the time-series analysis carried out in experiments. Kratochwill (1978) used time-series analyses in clinical psychology single case studies and found that the results followed very intricate patterns. In general, these patterns form a solid basis for the conclusion of a case study. A special form of time-series analysis is the gathering of chronological events. Its strength is that it provides a methodology for tracing events over time. More important, the process has the analytic purpose of examining presumed causal events (Yin, 2003) since the cause and effect cannot be turned around and the chronicling of the events will probably cover many different variables instead of specific dependant and independent variables. The idea is to compare the chronology of the events with those that might be predicted by some theory. The theory specifies one or more of the following conditions:
• Some events must always occur before other events, with the reverse sequence being impossible.

• Some events must always be followed by other events, on a contingency basis.

• Some events can only follow other events after a pre-specified interval of time.

• Certain time periods in a case study may be marked by classes of events that differ substantially from those of other time periods (Yin, 2003, p 126)

Time-series analysis should look at the ‘how’ and ‘why’ relationships in events over time. Before beginning the study, certain expected events should be presumed. In this study, it is assumed that the accreditation process will follow the standard course of action in regard to activities by the departments, the faculty and the committees charged with the implementation of the process. Any deviation of this would be of interest in the time-series study as the process is chronicled.

Finally, consideration should be taken to ensure that four principles undergird the analysis (Yin 2003):

• The analysis should indicate that all the evidence has been collected and reviewed. By reading all relevant memos and emails, interviewing key players in the process from the faculty, administration, accrediting agency and central office as well as bystanders from other departments, all relevant data would have been collected.

• The analysis should address all rival interpretations. Only findings that have been triangulated will be reported. Other data will be included but with the caveat that it has not been corroborated. This will help address rival interpretations.
• The analysis should concentrate on the major aspect of the case study. The analysis in this case study will look at organizational change over time initiated by an external mandate and influenced by other internal factors.

• The analysis should make use of the researcher’s expert knowledge. Through the review of the literature and by understanding and using Kezar’s model for organizational change and Bolman and Deals’ four frames, an explanation can be given for the changes that occurred around the NCATE initiative and other internal factors.

Given the structure of the research design outlined in chapter three and the theoretical framework posited in chapter two, the data will be gathered with the goal of answering the research questions outlined in this chapter. From such data, analysis will be done using the protocol outlined by Yin with an eye to validity and reliability. The results of the study are described in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Using the methodology outlined in chapter three, data were collected from a number of sources: elite interviews as described earlier, letters and correspondence between the policy makers, the accrediting agencies, the administrators and the faculty, minutes of committee meetings, departmental meetings, faculty senate meetings and various reports that led to the final NCATE report as well as the NCATE report and rejoinder.

This chapter reports on the findings of the data collection and uses the data to make conclusions regarding the key research questions in the study:

• What forces and sources were the cause of the change in assessment processes, faculty accountability and campus culture during the time of the NCATE accreditation process (2003 – 2007)?

• What was the role of the NCATE process in bringing about these organizational changes?

• What other alterations in the organization during the time of the NCATE accreditation could account for the incremental and transformational change at the college?

• Were the four frames of organizational change (e.g. structural, human resources, political and symbolic) as defined by Bolman and Deal observed in the analysis of the institutional change? If so, in what way did each of those frames impact the organizational change?
What are the implications for other liberal arts institutions looking to make similar changes? Providing that the changes were positive for the institution with this culture, structure and mission, could this process be replicated to other initiatives?

In addition, this chapter reports on other findings that emerged as a result of the data collection process that may not be related to the research questions. As outlined in chapter three, the analysis will be done by triangulating the data between sources – sources of the same category (e.g., interviews) and different types of sources (e.g., memos, minutes) – to look for trends, conclusions and themes. The data will also be presented in multiple ways – chronologically, thematically and in response to the four questions around changes in organizations – the why, what, how and target of change as well as in the context of Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames – structural, human resources, political and symbolic. The changes will also be examined in light of first order evolutionary change or secondary or transformational change as informed by the social cognition model that looks at learning organizations.

To put this in context, a chronological timeline is presented based on documents housed in the NCATE resource room at the college as well as official college documents related to its general education initiative and strategic plan. This timeline is presented in summary fashion in Appendix C.

Chronological Review

The college, one of seventeen in the system with one of five having a Division of Education, was approached by the central office in the fall of 2001 about obtaining accreditation for the education unit. The faculty in the unit attended an orientation meeting about NCATE along with collaborating schools and districts. The Division of Education at the college was a new entity, although education had been a part of the college for many years.
Ten years ago, in 1998, the various departments at the college that provided pedagogy, educational psychology, urban education and educational leadership were brought together into one Division of Education (from the three departments where they were previously located). These chairs of these departments were accustomed to broad autonomy over their budget and their activities. This new Division had been without a permanent dean of education for over six years, having been through two failed searches. In addition, there was no permanent provost at the college and the sitting president was leaving.

Given these issues, the college requested to defer the accreditation process for another year. Other system schools pursued the accreditation process, and were subsequently not subject to the new NCATE process that awaited the college in the following year, which included a number of more rigorous requirements in terms of assessment. In addition, the faculty and the associate provost reported in the interviews that the new NCATE accreditation process required that the specialty program accreditations be completed in addition to the unit-wide NCATE accreditation. Finally, the state also had its own required state certification for education programs. Therefore, departments and faculty were looking at a process that included specialty and unit accreditation as well as state accreditation.

According to one faculty member, “The dragon in all of this was the state. Because the state said that all teacher ed programs had to be accredited…They just want it accredited, so once we were told its NCATE, it was the state that would close us down not the chancellor.”

This external force – the state and the chancellor’s office – imposed on the Division the impetus of accreditation. Several of the faculty interviewed noted that they wanted to use the New York State certification process, but that the chancellor insisted on NCATE. When asked why, one faculty member noted, “It’s harder and it was considered premiere, supposed to be the
best and the most prestigious and at the time he chose it I think it was supposed to be the most rigorous in terms of process.”

The Division, housed in temporary trailers while their building was being renovated, was made up of three departments, early childhood and elementary education, secondary education and youth services, and educational psychology and community programs. According to the associate dean of education, “[the] College departments, individuals, programs are fiercely autonomous.” This parallels the findings of Kezar (2001) who notes the multiple power and authority structures and the loose coupling of the various units prevalent in higher education (Kezar, pp. 68-70). The autonomous nature of the departments, combined with the vacuum from a permanent dean, changed the power relationship within the division, and the chairs assumed more power. The president noted, when interviewed, that “when I arrived in 2002, the chairs college-wide possessed a lot of autonomy and the deans’ role was very weak. The deans were perceived as paper pushers with little authority and little budgetary latitude.” These conditions are indicative of a steady-state system, as described by Gersick (1991) as long periods of stable, evolutionary change interrupted by compact periods of transformational change, or ‘punctuated equilibrium’. According to Gersick, “This deep structure is what persists and limits change during equilibrium periods, and is what disassembles, reconfigures and enforces wholesale transformation during revolutionary punctuations” (Gersick, 1991, p. 12).

At this time (fall 2002), a new president was hired and the Division submitted the paperwork “Intent to Seek Initial NCATE Accreditation,” requesting a mock site visit in spring 2004, and board of examiners visit in fall 2004. In fall 2002, faculty from all teacher education programs (the education unit) met in a one day workshop to explore ideas regarding the vision, mission, philosophy and conceptual framework for the unit. According to minutes from the
workshop, a consultant was hired by the system to assist in this workshop. Questions like, ‘Why
do we exist? What is the college vision?’ were explored and lists generated (minutes,
Conceptual Framework Committee). Under another acting dean of education and the associate
dean of education, and with input from the department chairs, a NCATE coordinating team was
formed into three working groups: a) conceptual framework, b) assessment and c) student
teaching and field experiences. This provided the first structure for developing a plan for the
accreditation process.

Following the workshop, the team began preparation for the preconditions report to be
submitted in January (memo to Program Coordinator, October, 2002). Course release time,
summer pay arrangements and two graduate assistants were made available to the Division of
Education by the provost. Using Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames to explain the change
process, a structure was developed to help implement the change, providing the faculty with an
organizational model around which they might do their work. Their human resources needs
were met by a consultant who guided them through the process of understanding the goals and
outcomes for the accreditation process and a framework around which to get the work done.

Although support and a structure were present, the faculty were reluctant to pursue this
process. According to the associate provost,

The initial history was rather difficult as you know. The faculty felt initially that they
doing a good job because the students were graduating, getting good grades, getting
decent jobs. And why they even needed to go through this whole process of defining
goals and determining how they would measure whether these goals were being achieved
and keeping track of the performance of each student to certify the success of each
student in the program so there was a great deal of faculty resistance.
The acting associate dean was charged with managing the process, and continued to push the committees to complete their work. Faculty from other divisions involved in the process also expressed criticism at having to assess. One faculty member remarked,

Before this big “A” word, assessment came on the scene. Like this was something new that someone was etc. Well what do you think I’ve been doing for thirty five years? I’ve been testing, I’ve been giving papers to write, I’ve been giving presentations, we’re assessing them constantly; its just now you have to make it formal. I don’t resent that to a certain extent because it does seem like your spending your life trying to assess something when you really should be spending time preparing an interesting class.

Representatives from the educational programs not in the Division were invited to join the team that met weekly. The commitment was scheduled to last until June 30, 2003. These divisional faculty interviewed reported that in fall 2002 they met to establish some unit principles in response to the mandate to seek NCATE accreditation. According to the faculty, seven principles emerged, coming out of the conceptual framework working group made up of faculty across the education unit. The “Evolution of Relationship between Principle and Core Values” document (exhibit CF.24, NCATE report) notes that the education faculty attended an all day retreat in fall 2002 to explore the basic values of the education unit. They then created faculty groups to plan and implement efforts toward NCATE accreditation. The CF.24 documents note the following:

Conceptual Framework Working Group – interfaced with faculty across the Education Unit to create the statements of Mission, Vision, Philosophy and the set of themes (We later discovered that the themes were redundant and focused on core values)

(exhibit CF.24, NCATE report, p. 1)

At another half day meeting, the conceptual framework working group, with input from faculty representatives, created the vision and mission for the education unit. The faculty attending came from the three departments in the Division of Education and education faculty housed in other departments, such as the music department where students major in music and
minor in education. The group compiled from the earlier meetings seven themes which became the conceptual framework: pedagogy, curriculum, learning, families and community, diversity and inclusion, technology and assessment. To get buy-in and move the process forward, faculty were asked to write briefly about one theme, set in the context of their work and field. These activities represented evolutionary changes, with faculty simply incorporating their existing goals and practices into a new framework. Although the press for accreditation might be seen as an event that punctuated the equilibrium of the system, at this point in time, little change had occurred within the Division.

The seven themes were still diffuse and did not attempt to identify core values and objectives. There was an inability to have ‘double-looped learning’ as described by Morgan (1997) where an organization frames and reframes. As he notes, “it means that organizational members must be skilled in understanding the paradigms, metaphors, mind-sets, or mental models that underpin how the organization operates. They must be able to develop new ones when appropriate” (Morgan, 1997, p. 92).

According to a faculty member, “There was a lot of discussion; I was on that conceptual framework committee. Who are we and what do we believe in? People would come in with various thoughts and designs. We made a lot of charts you know big charts and all types of things. It was a process that evolved.” According to the interviews and minutes, the core competencies evolved, but so did the education unit’s understanding of what it was and what it believed in.

While these activities were happening during academic year 2002 – 2003 in the Education Division, the college began the important process of a general education review, the first in twenty-five years. The president appointed a task force to consider general education at
the college in the twenty-first century. The committee, comprised of well respected faculty, was charged with identifying a set of definitions and goals for general education, with the task of ensuring that assessment was incorporated into the results.

It should also be noted that the college, with the oldest faculty in age in the system, was replacing and adding new faculty at a record pace, according to data from the central office. Seven new faculty joined the Division’s ranks in the fall of 2002. New faculty at the college were provided one course release time each year until tenure, the fifth year, to pursue research. Chairs were charged with managing this scheduling. This eventually played into the Division’s ability to get the NCATE work accomplished.

During January 2003, when faculty were not on campus, the NCATE coordinating team met to prepare the preconditions document. For a faculty accustomed to a highly contractual lifestyle with little summer or intersession work, this was an inconvenience. The union mentality that permeated the faculty culture meant that any additional work beyond the contract had to be carefully negotiated and choreographed with the provost and president. For the faculty, this ‘extra work’ symbolized their commitment to the accreditation process. Indeed their work was not progressing at the needed pace, as evidenced in the following months activities. The union mentality, combined with the independent nature of the faculty, created what Kezar calls, the ‘loosely coupled’ nature of higher education (Kezar, 2001), which affects the types of change that occur in higher education.

In late January 2003, five working groups, some of which had just been created, were each asked to focus on one of the following: conceptual framework, assessment system, field and student teaching, diversity or technology. The education unit met in these committees to: 1) develop consensus for conceptual framework, 2) design an assessment system for teacher
education at the college and 3) develop recommendations for field experiences, internships and to review curriculum development for meeting the NCATE diversity standard. In March, NCATE returned the preconditions report submitted in the fall with two unmet requirements, largely centering on the lack of an assessment system. A commitment is made to submit revisions by August 1, 2003.

In the meantime, each special program needed to seek accreditation, some of which were new accreditations. They included: Secondary English Education (BA and Post BA), Secondary Science Teacher Education (BA, Post BA, MS), Mathematics Education (BA, Post BA, MS), Elementary Education (BA, MAT), Early Childhood (MS, MAT), Special Education (MS), TESOL (BA, MS).

In late February 2003, the education unit met for a half-day meeting to review progress made on developing the conceptual framework. The purpose was to begin to address the first four of six accreditation standards (minutes, NCATE Education Unit Meeting, February 24, 2003).

According to one faculty member, it was important to the faculty in the Division that everyone had an opportunity for input,

You have to have your mission, your statement of what it is you’re trying to do, conceptual framework. And so it takes time to develop a conceptual framework that all these so called stakeholders can actually buy into.”

Another faculty member noted that,

It always has to go up and down, it had to between the faculty that was representing that department, back down to the department and then back again, to kind of get that agreement.

In March 2003, a system-wide workshop was created for faculty and teams, and consultants visited the campus following the workshop. From the conceptual framework
committee, seven standards emerged which became the basis of the education unit. The conceptual framework working group then produced additional standards to include specialty areas and literacy. The total now reached eleven standards which had to be assessed for each program.

In the meantime, the assessment working group reported that they would like to “frame an assessment system that would leverage a process designed to transform...college into a “self-evaluating organization” (minutes, Assessment Working Group Report Progress Report, May 28, 2003). The group created eight parameters to direct the development of the assessment system.

Four of the NCATE working groups met throughout the summer with one member of the NCATE coordinating team to complete their portion of the work. With the assessment system document complete, it was sent to NCATE by August 15, 2003. Then, the NCATE assessment working group met to finalize the assessment matrix to be given to the departments in fall 2003 for pilot testing. They recommended a standing unit assessment committee to oversee the work for the programs. Further, they recommend hiring a senior-level individual to oversee the assessment process, which would be electronically collected, stored, processed and managed.

With eleven standards and an ambitious goal of creating a complex electronic assessment system, the Division welcomed ten new faculty and the new permanent dean of education who came from an outside institution accredited by NCATE with a stellar history of obtaining grants. She was charged by the president and provost to move the NCATE process forward to completion and began her work in August, 2003. In September, the NCATE coordinating team hosted an all-day retreat to review accomplishments thus far and to examine the assessment system, the assessment matrix and its corresponding standards (agenda, NCATE Retreat, September 12, 2003).
During the same timeframe, the general education task force completed its work and submitted to the president its report, according to a letter from the task force chair to the president. The president then sent the report to the undergraduate curriculum committee, a committee of the senate, whose responsibility it was to take the conceptual framework for curriculum review and revision and make it operational. The document addressed the need for a change in faculty culture around assessment and faculty rewards:

A new curriculum must be accompanied by methods to assess its effectiveness that will permit adjustments and improvements based on student outcomes. Such curricular change challenges the College when considering tenure and promotion to recognize the time and effort such activities require and to genuinely value these contributions. (report, General Education Task Force, June, 2003)

General education faculty working groups were established with the goal of producing a report at the end of the academic year entitled: “The Entry Experience, Areas of Knowledge/Intellectual Activity, Integrative Capstone Experience and Suffusing Critical Abilities throughout the Curriculum.”

It should be noted here that tenure decisions at the college, which must occur by the fifth year of a faculty member, came as recommendations from a department’s personnel and budget committee, then to the college-wide committee of seven. In a number of cases, faculty who did not get tenure were uncertain about the process or the requirements. One faculty noted that, beginning in 2002, “the process became clearer and much more rigorous due to the letter sent by the president each year to the untenured faculty.” The president, when asked about this responded, “I felt it was important that new faculty knew what their requirements were for the tenure and promotion process and that they knew where they stood in that process.”

This is an example of the use of the human resource frame as well as the symbolic frame. To better inform new faculty as to their progress towards tenure, constructive criticism was
provided. The fact that the president needed to do this rather than the chairs or deans indicates that symbolically only the president was empowered to make these statements. This might be due to the strong unionized environment and the role of the chair who is elected from his peers for three years.

The NCATE conceptual framework group met following the retreat and discussed the issues that arose around assessing eleven standards for each program, some of which did not include particular standards. An education unit meeting was called to pare down the number of standards. The faculty and chairs reported in their interview that at this point the eleven principles became seven. When asked how that happened, various responses were given.

According to exhibit CF.24 from the NCATE document library (Evolution of Relationship between Principles and Core Values):

As the Assessment Working Group examined existing assessments and worked with faculty in the Education Unit to create additional assessments, it became clear that the original eleven principles were unwieldy and, in some cases, redundant with each other. They were, therefore, consolidated into seven principles. The language for some of the principles was changed so that it would more completely represent the variety of programs that are offered in the Education Unit’ (exhibit CF.24, p. 3).

The importance of the principles became apparent to the unit when the assessment working group began to use these for assessment purposes. This is an example of incremental change where the Division experienced cognitive dissonance, realizing that their eleven principles were unworkable and reconstructed their principles. Minutes from an October 23, 2003 Standards 1 & 2 Conceptual Framework Group meeting noted that:

In addition to having too many standards, departments are now rolling up their sleeves and looking at the standards in terms of what they need to assess their candidates, program by program. All of a sudden, these standards that were written with such care last year are now coming to life. In doing so, we’re getting to know them at an intimate level and we’re struggling to understand what these standards say (minutes, Standards 1 & 2 Conceptual Framework Group Meeting, October 23, 2003).
Work continued on all program reviews which required complete assessments to be
developed using the assessment matrix. Six new faculty committees were formed from the
education unit which included faculty from the Education Division as well as faculty throughout
the college involved in the process to write the institutional report for each of the NCATE
standards. The site visits were scheduled for October 16 – 21, 2004 with a mock visit in May,
2004. In the meantime, NCATE awarded candidacy toward accreditation following their review
of the assessment system document. Here, structural changes were made to help implement the
change.

At this point, the accreditation process was being led by an associate dean who had been
at the college for a number of years and rose through the ranks to this position. The new
associate dean who was hired the spring of 2004, noted (about the previous associate dean) that,
“the work was tremendous and took more than she could do. She needed the support of all the
faculty and it was not there.” The associate dean leading the NCATE took a sabbatical at this
point and returned to the classroom. According to the president, the dean requested an associate
dean with experience in NCATE accrediting processes and assessment.

The power structure and coalitions here were with the departments and chairs who felt
that the accreditation process was ancillary to their work. Faculty participation in the work
involved those individuals who sat on the committees. New faculty, given course release time,
were frequently relieved of working on this process. According to a faculty member, “it was
difficult to find people to be on the committees, as we had so many new faculty who had release
time for their research. Our chairs wanted to make sure they got tenure.” This combination gave
the accreditation process little clout or importance in the life of the Division.
By February 2004, a new associate dean was hired and assumed the role as the coordinator of the process. According to the associate dean, “I was really led to believe not by the dean because she fully admitted it that I am not, that’s not my primary role (as lead) and she explained to me and that was clear in her hiring process. I mean she is ultimately and has always accepted that responsibility.” Immediately, the new associate dean recognized issues with the special accreditations,

When I arrived in February 2004, every program that had submitted to its specialized professional association had failed. I was aware before I took the position that they had failed. But, I was informed that they had failed because they had not… the unit had not developed and submitted its assessment system. When I got here I got to touch the documents. They had failed because they didn’t know how to align programs… I think that is because this institution went for initial accreditation first time ever accreditation. So, the idea of you seeking important advice or information from someone else in the creation and development (of a program) or you hold yourself accountable to a set of standards in the creation and development of a program was beyond the scope of their view.

In terms of Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames, the faculty and the chairs perceived their role as simply educating future teachers, graduating students who were successful in the local school systems, and maintaining consistency within the department. Symbolically, they saw the chair as the key authoritarian who helped shape the values of the department and who mentored faculty to tenure. They had no experience with a strong dean as leader of an education unit and the chairs did not want to release any of their power. The faculty had no experience or training in developing programs using external standards. Using the lens of social cognition model, the faculty were experiencing social dissonance. What they were asked to do did not fit into their frame of reference. They had to learn or create a new reality in terms of their perception of themselves as a Division.

Certainly individual faculty sought to ensure that their work met national standards for their academic area. According to a faculty member,
There is early childhood and elementary, and reading and the literacy. So some of those, we call those SPAs (Special Program Accreditations). I think it was a whole new world with all these SPAs. For us it was all firsts. We spent a few years really trying to do that and it was finally decided that we can’t. You can’t measure disposition but what you can measure is coming into a program what do you value? And how does that differ from when you leave the program so that’s what we have and NCATE also really had a template for this, they wanted entry level assessments, middle level they call them transition points.

The associate dean spoke with the dean and shared the following reasons for not moving forward with the accreditation,

So, it’s February 2003 and I have to go to the dean and say here are three reasons why we’re in trouble and one was it’s not that we failed our specialized association reports; we failed because we don’t know how to align which means we don’t understand the idea of standards. We have not…while the assessment system is approved we have not developed one piece of the assessment system. We have no assessment forms, we have nothing. Zero, zero movement…Piece of paper. Yah it was a piece of paper.

The president noted that in a meeting with the dean and the provost in February, 2004, “She was deeply concerned about the upcoming mock visit in May, 2004. She did not feel that the Division understood how to create and align standards and that they were surely going to fail the accreditation visit because the measures to be assessed did not align with national standards. Also, there was no data collected.” The decision was made by the president, based on input from the dean and recommendation by the provost, to request a delay of the board of examiners accreditation site visit by one year – until October, 2005. The rationale behind the decision was that not enough work had been done by the committees to assure accreditation. Most of the missing information centered on assessments. Some faculty in the Division requested a longer delay. Here again, incremental change was occurring at best, with the balance of power sitting with the chairs and faculty, and with lack of focus on the real work that needed to be done. The Division had not developed a vision or mission that had buy-in from the faculty.
The new dean and associate dean continued to push the Division to move towards accreditation. There seemed little impetus to bring ideas, values, or processes together or need to assess across departments. According to the associate dean,

Procedurally we weren’t following best practices. Because no one ever said you need to. Because no one ever asked the question. Because the deans prior to our current dean was a revolving door. And nobody was held accountable. Just this accreditation process aside, was the fact that the deanship had a revolving door prior to her arrival. There really was no one sitting in the chair of responsibility holding programs accountable. And the dean would go to each one of them. But they were their own separate little things and there was no, there was no one sitting in the chair of responsibility in the dean chair. So, they just did whatever they wanted to do including funny things with budgets because there was no one to oversee it.

The coalitions in the division were with the departments. Faculty identified with their chair and their department, and saw no need to connect with other departments or to attend to the requests of the dean.

However, the chairs and the faculty began to see small incremental changes in the Division. As one chair reported,

The structure changed, the direction changed, the focus changed so it wasn’t as if we were not doing anything, of course we were but the giant of it the focus, the movement, the forward movement more than backward, because then it was two step forward three backward two sideways then one forward. So there was movement but wasn’t the movement to get us through unified division and the goal.

Using meetings, release time, and junior faculty, the dean engaged the Division in the accreditation process. According to the dean of education,

I knew we had so much work to do to get accredited and I had to use a lot of levers, carrots and sticks, to get it moving. The newer faculty and some of the more senior faculty were the first to be helpful. It was a lot of work and so many of them just didn’t want to do it.

In the meantime, the college continued to move forward on the general education review, which had a significant assessment component. Following feedback on earlier reports and focus
groups, the president’s task force on general education presented a report on the reorganization of general education at the college. The need for assessment was noted:

    Maintenance of curriculum effectiveness, including ongoing assessment and periodic re-evaluation – functions absent from the current….curriculum (report, President’s Task Force on General Education, July, 2004).

The general education task force report was approved by both the faculty and student senate in the spring of 2004, to be implemented by fall 2009. An undergraduate curriculum committee was charged with developing an implementation plan.

    Funded by the provost, department chairs and the working groups met in the summer of 2004 to continue developing assessment instruments for courses, programs and the educational unit. At the end of the summer, the dean discovered that the chairs had failed to get the needed information from the faculty in terms of assessments. Reporting this to the provost, the president met in late August with the chairs and the dean to encourage them to complete their tasks. The NCATE report needed to be completed by October, 2004.

    During the fall of 2004, as five more new faculty joined the ranks of the Division, the assessment committee met with the IT department to develop an online assessment database. Efforts to streamline the process continued and the seven ‘standards’ were renamed ‘principles’ so that they would not be confused with the six required standards in the NCATE process. Meeting minutes reflected the difficulty in matching these seven principles to the individual departmental and program standards:

    Our Assessment Committee was struggling with data emerging from the two years of collection that we had experienced. We were still trying to measure too many variables for thoughtful consideration of the results (NCATE resource, CF.24 Evolution of Relationship between Principles and Core Values).
To remedy this problem, the dean led the work to bring the ideas together. The result was that three core values emerged, excellence, equity, and ethics (NCATE resource, exhibit CF.24, *Evolution of Relationship between Principles and Core Values*). The faculty chairs and administrators interviewed had varying views on the evolution of the three core values. Some noted that the Division was unable to bring the varying departmental standards and seven principles together into a unified conceptual framework. Most reported that the dean was able to take all those ideas and unify them into three core values. Several faculty felt as if the core values were a ‘top-down’ decision and some indicated that the core values were something that they only marginally believed in. One faculty member recounted,

> Yes, we started with the second principle, and then the dean had this amazing brainstorm because the principles were killing us – no one could remember them. So then she figured out that, you know it’s the old start, maybe if we started with the three E’s it would had been a pain but since we started with seven. Because everything in our syllabus even on our schedule we had to say which principles were being used, everyday which principles? Every class meeting.

Another faculty noted, “It’s sort of like if it’s on paper you’re in compliance. It’s never, I think in some ways we got the form rather than the function.”

To promote the conceptual framework, the dean had mugs, paperweights and banners created with the three core competencies posted so that faculty and the college would identify the Division with the three “Es” that were their conceptual framework. All Education Division materials contained these three competencies, complete with a logo. These items symbolized the new vision and mission of the Division of Education, and gave faculty something around which to coalesce. Symbolically, it communicated enthusiasm and unity for the Division, although not all faculty were yet on board. Some faculty had recreated their perspective on the division through social cognition, that is dissonance followed by a new cognition around the
meaning of the Division and their work as a unit. Other faculty had not become engaged and did not feel that this defined their division or the relationship of their own work to the Division.

The core competencies became the basis for the assessment documents which were used by all faculty in the Division as well as faculty in other divisions where education programs existed. This affected the syllabi, the course materials, the coordinating teacher’s role and the pedagogy in each classroom, including content area faculty. Here, through large group meetings, smaller meetings of various groups and departments and individual reflection, the education unit began to experience double-looped learning, where their operating norms changed. This process, according to Morgan (1997), requires three steps:

1. the process of sensing, scanning, and monitoring the environment
2. the comparison of this information against operating norms
3. the process of questioning whether operating norms are appropriate
4. the process of initiating appropriate action

(Morgan, 1997, p. 87)

The syllabi had to reflect in each day’s work, the three competencies. This was a dramatic change for faculty, many of whom felt put upon and constrained. One faculty noted,

There was some resentment of what was seen as standardization in the extreme – there was a lot of pushback when we were asked to use common templates for our CVs and Syllabi. My attitude was that I had several CVs – my own professional CV and the one that I had in NCATE format. However, the syllabus…we all ended up with 7-8 page syllabi – which was very frustrating for the students and probably killed thousands of trees….Truth be told – in some ways it flies in the face of what we are trying to teach our students – which is to think outside of the box – not to be a cookie cutter teacher.

Another faculty member noted,

Yes we have a template and not only that we have a police person who we said, he was in charge of this, you send him in a 15 page syllabus and he’d write back, well very nice. Could you speak a little bit more about diversity and how you’re addressing that? Everything and it had to be very clear in every course. Oh anything, any assignment you give had to have a rubric. If one of your assignments was a paper, what was the rubric? You know in my syllabus I got about five rubrics.
The chairs were tasked with ensuring that the faculty were developing the syllabi, course materials and collecting data. The results were mixed. In the spring of 2005, the mock visit was conducted by the NCATE accrediting team and the education unit failed because of lack of assessment and lack of clarity on standards. Twenty-two pages of weaknesses were cited with five hundred specific areas noted. The dean noted in her interview, “I knew we were going to fail. I had been through this before and I knew we did not have enough assessment information. I hoped that this was going to wake up the faculty.” According to the president,

The mock visit in spring 2005 was an eye opening experience for me. Over five-hundred issues had to be resolved in the six months before the next official visit. I was greatly concerned that the dean did not have the support of the faculty and that the division might fail. I requested a meeting with the dean and the chairs.

On the afternoon following the morning report from the visiting team, the dean called for a divisional meeting to ‘rally the troops’ and outline what needed to be done in the next few months. One of the three departments did not attend. According to a faculty member,

There was perception by some faculty, that our leadership was questionable. After the mock site review, we were all summoned to a meeting that was to take place within the hour. Many of us had previously scheduled meetings, and it was suggested by our Dept. Chair that we reconvene the next morning so that we could all attend our scheduled meetings and have some time to digest the news from the reviewers. The Dean insisted that everyone attend that afternoon. I don’t remember where I had to be, but I couldn’t attend. I’m not sure who actually went, but I know that anyone from my department who did not attend paid for it in one way or another over the next few months.

This action by the chair was a clear attempt at keeping the power base in the departments. The action did not go unnoticed by the other departments or the higher administrators. In a month, when the election for chairs was held, the chair was replaced by the faculty in the department. The president, when asked about this, responded, “We had communicated to the chair the importance of the accreditation and the participation by all faculty and chairs in the process. I was disappointed that this department was not at that very important meeting.”
The president and provost called the department chairs and dean’s office in and stressed the seriousness of the problem. The president recounted,

I let them know that the Division might not exist as a Division of Education if it could not be accredited and that this put everyone’s job in jeopardy. I then visited each department over the course of the next few days to encourage them to do their assessments and to thank them for their efforts thus far.

Faculty reported on the significance of the support from the administration,

Yea because he was more then serious…I think he was really saying this is something we need to get and we got that message but as far as day to day operation it was mostly with the dean. The other support that I felt came from the administration and the dean and the associate dean made money available to pay people and I think that as crass as that sounds it was appreciated because we really just by having a title, that’s nice but and there were nights that people stayed till ten, eleven o’clock at night to get things done.

As Bolman and Deal (2003) point out, it is important that symbolic things are made available to individuals that communicate their importance in completing a project that is key to the success of the institution. Having faculty willing to work extra hours to put together the assessments and the report for the education unit was important, and providing them with some extra funds symbolically communicated its importance.

As evidenced in the interviews, the chairs began to press upon the faculty to administer and record the needed assessments. Some complied and provided the information. As one chair noted, the process was complex, as the assessment needed to cover the many different programs in the Education Division,

That was the toughest; it was both an organizational and a conceptual problem. Conceptually we realized that we had to think about it so it was both general and specific, yet we had to have the representation of the supporters in terms of involvement. Otherwise there was top down, although if we did it for the masses we would still be here.
In fall 2005, the college began the final push for the middle states accreditation process by putting together the resource room containing needed data for the review team. Assessment was a key component in the process, as was the concept of strategic planning.

In October, when the board of examiners from NCATE visited, there were still missing assessments due to lack of faculty participation – missing syllabi and missing data sets from courses and programs. According to the dean’s office, at this point only about half the faculty were on board. The searing report with provisional NCATE accreditation was enough to convince the faculty of the seriousness of the problem. According to the president and provost’s office, this was the catalyst that got the faculty moving and they noted that the faculty realized that they might lose their jobs, as the college and system would only keep an accredited Division of Education. At this point, work began in earnest by nearly everyone, according to the dean, chairs and faculty. The chairs and dean reported that at this point most of the faculty were engaged in the process, with a few still not completing their work towards assessment.

The chairs, some of whom were new to the job, took a key leadership role at this point to get the assessment documents and data needed. According to one chair,

Yes and we promised two conditions, that we will have a functioning electronic system and even though when they did come visit us in 2005 and we had the data and we had the analysis, it was manual and we held up our promise. In a way, that was a little harsh because what really was the issue here was that we were going to hold people to the fire or is it that if we get the information whether it’s electronic or manual. We were all really disappointed when we realized that we didn’t have the data but they rejected because it wasn’t consistent with our commitment to have it done electronically.

Two events or ‘revolutions’ as outlined by Gersick (1991) helped to created the needed impetus to change. In the spring, when the mock visit resulted in over five-hundred recommendations and the president and provost informed the chairs that the Division and their jobs were in jeopardy, the chairs began to get faculty engaged.
In the fall of 2005 when the Division was only provisionally accredited with the vital assessments missing from all the faculty, individuals in the Division finally understood that the effort was needed from all the faculty in the Division and beyond in the content courses. Only then, did the faculty in the Division understand that the process had to be division-wide and that it required the efforts of everyone.

Some faculty continued to resist the constraints put upon their teaching and their time, and they were uncooperative in NCATE meetings. At this point the chairs recognized the importance of the accreditation and partnered with other faculty and the dean. They solved the problem in a number of ways. As one faculty noted,

I think we all used humor, I think to a certain extent we said, look I mean at a certain point that’s me again. What else can I say, there was always time on the agenda and it’s the same people that object so at some point you say its time to get a drink, get coffee. It was a negotiation it was, it really was. Then I guess when push came to shove there’s always a small group of people who end up doing the majority of the work because its just a way of getting it done. You just don’t, it’s easier.

A chair indicated that,

Jane Doe was like a second chair, so I think the leadership was really the chairs and we sat down with all those principles and tried to figure out again though the dean sowed the seeds for us with the three E’s, she’s the one that came up with the three E’s. The dean waited till the process to unfold and for us to come around. This is why I say it’s due to the dean’s leadership because her style was, it was like she planted the seed and was patient enough for it to germinate and then getting anxious when it’s not getting up yet. When we really tackled with those principles, what is excellent, what’s under ethics and equity. Those again are broad universal principles. So under excellence you could put all the things that had to do with academics. So that’s where everybody can find a home. We all can subscribe to the principle of ethics and equity. So it wasn’t hard to have justification for those principles and we left it to programs to figure out idiosyncratically, where you want to put what.

Here, the political frame became important as faculty coalesced with the chair to get other reticent faculty on board. Symbolically, the dean moved the responsibility for the
completion of the accreditation process to the chairs, relying on their work to get the assessments from their faculty.

During the next two years, the chairs assumed a larger leadership role, helping the faculty incorporate the three core values into their syllabi, assessments and pedagogy. As the associate provost noted about the faculty,

They started to work with the deans and the chairs. They started to come together, they thought about the goals, they analyzed, they thought about ways in which they could show performance in particular courses was related to students learning and achieving goals. At first I would say there was still a lot of complaining about the fact that they were being forced to do all this work. It was clear that they had to do it but they were still unhappy about it. But as they started to do it, there started to be a sense that maybe this is actually a good thing, that maybe being able to show that students are learning and maybe thinking about why I am teaching my course and how my course contributes to the education goals for the students in this program. This is actually forcing me to rethink in good ways my teaching and evaluation of students. That sounds optimistic but I really do think there has been that kind of culture change.

The impact went beyond the education faculty to any department teaching content for education majors as well as other programs at the college with education minors, like music education and physical education. As the associate provost noted,

Well also to some extent some of the content faculty as well because if someone is going to be certified as a biology teacher, they have to have taken a certain number of biology courses and they also have to be able to show that students are actually learning biology, learning about evolution, cells and so on. Those biology faculty that teach the education content courses also have to be able to show that students are achieving the learning objectives. When you do that in one course you subsequently do it in other courses.

Once the data were collected, it needed to be input into the electronic system. According to one chair,

It was really troublesome to get the data, once they got the data out from top down we then had to sit there and organize it. Especially in my department, let me tell you what I did, they told me, listen if you want me to do this and I said I do, you have to make this tangible to me, I don’t have time to go through this mass of fifty pages to understand what this means for my program, for math for social studies for English…I do have an adhoc committee made up of coordinators and directors and that’s where I would bring the sample and do a little brainstorming with them and you have to allow for the
fermenting and the…when do you need this, I said anytime because I know individuals…I need it in a week so I would say to Jane Doe I need it tomorrow. That’s why we couldn’t put all of this in email, that informal level that has to go into deconstructing the mandate. We needed a job in the UN; we would all laugh at it. The dean didn’t know half of it – she would say get it done. It wasn’t about, we knew yes, you were answerable to other people and we were answerable to our faculty so everyone had to figure out how to get it done.

Some of the faculty’s perceptions of the process changed at this point. They recognized the importance of the accreditation and that it was their accreditation. One faculty member noted, “I think the second time for me was a more intimate experience than the first time. The first time everybody was new, the second time I ended up, this is too big, this is somebody’s baby.” Another chair noted that the workload was not evenly distributed. Many of the faculty were new and were not expected to participate as heavily as others. “Sometimes as chair I chose to say ok this is easier, I don’t want to deal with Jane Doe, I might as well just sit down and do it.”

As the data collection process evolved, the faculty relied on their chairs to champion their needs. One faculty member noted,

Humor and patience which you know that settled us down because this isn’t up her alley either. We always knew she was representing us well. If we found something too difficult to do she would go back and say I’m not doing that. They had to put up with this. If we were going to be late, they had to take it. The chair was not going to stay up all night. Not at all. I think that was a big mitigating factor for the whole department, was the way our leadership, she didn’t get uptight about it. She was relaxed, she was nice, she was trying to reduce our stress. We knew she was trying to help us, that was a tremendously helpful thing I would say.

The chairs helped implement the change needed by providing the needed support and assistance, meeting the human resources needs of the faculty.

Finally, in fall 2008, the visiting team returned to review the assessment system, complete with multiple years of data. At this point, the Division had coalesced behind the process and all faculty had produced the needed data for assessment. The Division passed with
no recommendations and its online assessment system was praised as a model for other institutions. Many of the Division faculty knew that their culture and work ethic had changed. According to one faculty member,

People did an amazing job; I’m not sure how helpful it will be in the long run. But we did develop an identity as a division in the process and did get to show leadership and the president and the provost got to show their support. I think it was, ultimately were accredited, it was positive, I’m just not sure, there’s no data to say that schools who have NCATE accreditation.

Other faculty noted,

Well so far as whether the people in the college recognize this or not the education department is not just the education department. It has all sorts of tentacles, major tentacles and so I would say because of that it has affected the larger college community, cause all of our programs and in secondary education we’re only a minor, so there are ongoing negotiations with the content areas all the time. And in that way I would say yes.

The divisional faculty perceived themselves as an educational unit with an identity that went beyond their departments. As one faculty member noted, “I think as a Division we are more cohesive and there is a much clearer path of leadership. I feel kind of that’s been something we’ve waited almost eight years to have a dean in place and an associate, so that piece is good.” Another faculty member noted,

I think it’s different because it’s like you, people got to know each other then. Like even if the quality of the programs hasn’t changed, you couldn’t operate in your own little thing. Though some people who are on the committee with them or search or something, but people really got to really know each other across departments.

Faculty from outside departments that collaborated with the Division on accreditation noted significant changes. One faculty noted,

It was really a mess and when this process started; oh my, I remember being in a big meeting. I remember going over there to this big workshop and I was thinking how in the world is this group ever going to come together? We are going back years – way before the dean arrived. She came along and things started to happen. I think it was before the dean came along or else she was brought in right at that time. So then there were all these committees that were formed and I was on the conceptual framework committee.
That went on and on, I think our first go around we had about twelve points and I think it
got down to six standards and those three E’s the equity. It started out much more
elaborate and it got boiled down to much smaller things.

The faculty in the Division, the deans interviewed and the faculty outside the Division of
Education as well as the provost’s office indicated that assessment was now a mainstay for their
programs. Some of the aspects of the NCATE process spilled over into the larger academic
community. As the associate provost noted,

I think that faculty are more able to think about and try to find ways to measure how
students are doing in their course not just assigning an overall grade but seeing what the
course is about whether the students are learning what the department believes the course
should be about. Another example of that would be, until recently we have not had any
guidelines for a syllabus. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) generated a
set of such and is awaiting the senate for approval. They will not call them guidelines
they will call them suggestions. That’s a significant step; the senate which sort of
represents the faculty sees that it’s appropriate to think about guidelines for a syllabus. In
particular those guidelines say that the course goal has to be specified and explained to
the students.

They cited the NCATE assessment process as a means for helping other programs and the
middle states self study to create assessments. It was noted that some programs outside the
education unit still struggled to develop assessments that are part of their program five-year
reviews. According to the dean of arts and sciences, “It was part of the self study but all the self
studies were already to some extent certainly focused on the outcomes assessment part. From the
office of the provost, the associate provost this became a crucial element in the self study
because we knew that middle states was coming.” The associate provost noted that the NCATE
assessment process provided a structure for creating the assessment portion of the middle states
self study. The political coalitions formed by developing the assessment documents within each
educational program brought in the faculty from other disciplines. They, in turn, used this as
they developed assessments for their five year reviews and for the middle states assessments.
The faculty housed in other departments outside the Division of Education who had education programs noted that they felt more connected to the Division of Education and felt that they understood how their program fit into the larger picture. They also noted that there was much more communication between departments as a result of the study. The coalitions and the learning that took place as they worked through the accreditation created a sense of identity that went beyond their own department.

While the Division of Education was changing its perception of itself, its assessment practices, its culture and its power structure, other areas in the college were also changing. This was due in part to a number of factors. These changes were noted in the interviews conducted, as one of the questions explored other changes on campus. In addition, the minutes from the senate and the personnel and budget committee reflect some of the more formal changes made on campus. These are outlined in the next section.

Other Significant Changes

Many of the faculty interviewed in the Division and elsewhere noted the new faculty members that were added to their departments. Some indicated that the searches had made them think more deeply about their own work. Others observed that the tenured faculty were having to carry more of the service load now that there were so many untenured faculty in the department needing time to do research. The dean of humanities reported,

They (the senior faculty) are aware that we have been hiring certainly who are our College standards in plentiful ways. They’re aware that junior faculty are getting released to conduct their research. Curiously enough we have senior faculty who are resentful. We did not get that or why should they? We just have to work harder.

Some of the interviewed faculty in the Division of Education also noted that the departmental culture had changed. They were not as close as before, although many were still doing good work. The collaborations were different. The provost indicated that that grant
getting was more productive in all divisions and that faculty were publishing more than in previous years. This was also evident from the minutes of the personnel and budget committee. When asked why, the faculty and the dean reported that the expectations are higher and that the bar had been raised for faculty productivity.

The faculty and administrators also noted that the promotion and tenure process was much clearer now. When asked why, they pointed to the annual letter that goes to untenured faculty from the president, a practice started one year after the new president arrived. According to the chairs, deans, provost and president, information is sent to the dean regarding the progress of a junior faculty member during an academic year. Classroom observations and a review of progress in research is made by the chair and faculty in the department. These are then crafted into a letter from the president to the junior faculty member letting them know their progress towards tenure and providing the needed suggestions so that the process is clearer. When asked why it came from the president, the faculty, chairs and the deans noted that he was the only person with the authority to make such a statement. The president recalled, “I felt it was our obligation to these new faculty to be very clear on our expectations. Hiring a new faculty member is a significant investment. Helping them succeed protects that investment.” This is an example of a symbolic change (the letter from the president) and a human resource change (the process of department chair review and information gathering for the letter) that made the promotion and tenure process clearer.

The deans were appreciative of the effort as it clarified the expectations. The dean of humanities recounted her experience with this,

I believe that is another area where things have mightily approved because we monitored much more closely. We meaning the administration from the dean’s office. We are much more careful in the use of adjectives, much more careful in how much praise we give in written form to faculty. We monitor much more closely. But the closer
monitoring really has happened from the deans upwards. Because everything else has always been contractual in place anyways. The annual evaluations, the classroom observations, the students evaluation surveys all those things you know are were there. The fact we are doing a closer job here. We do it for two reasons. One, to give better guidance to junior faculty. Two, to be better protected when things go wrong. But I feel you know this is not about me or my learning process but because the president wanted closer scrutiny over annual reappointments.

The interviewed chairs all reacted similarly regarding the president’s letter. As one chair noted,

In rigor, even though it’s anxiety provoking to get a letter from the president that informs you, he has stood his ground, I’ve sent back a few letters to explain, you didn’t understand my faculty. Even though it created more tension it was good because it put faculty on notice that tenure is not guaranteed and to get a letter in your second year that’s a big warning. Even though we may still put you up for tenure, the chances of getting it will be so much reduced and so that has been an incentive for faculty to be more vigorous really keep scholarship and teaching on the front burners.

Some of the faculty still did note that the actual promotion and tenure year was particularly stressful for junior faculty, as the committee of seven, who makes final approval of promotion and tenure cases, was not clear on its expectations. Therefore, faculty did not really know why they are denied tenure or promotion. According to one faculty member,

Well I mean the attitude is that when it gets into the hands of the committee of seven its like a blood search you know its like your guilty until proven innocent. It’s not an open process and its very scary process. The insiders will have, it’s not the same, it’s not a gentle process, it’s very difficult and the truth is the guidelines can’t be that clear so it’s very nerve racking. I see our junior professors around here their under a lot of stress. That’s where I see, if there’s anything negative I would say that.

This dichotomy indicates a lack of understanding between the expectations for promotion and tenure and the practice by the committee of seven. Using Bolman and Deal’s (2003) frames, it seems that the president has more work to do in the political arena to gain understanding and to coalesce the committee around a more transparent process. Symbolically, he made a statement via the letters that transparency and clear expectations are important to the process. He also built a structure that provided information and a methodology for tracking progress to tenure.
However, the process broke down as the committee of seven exerted its influence on the process, separate from the work done by the deans, provost and president.

Other factors led to the change in culture on campus, according to the interviewees. The infusion of a technology fee and the hire of many new faculty accustomed to using technology in the classroom began to change the college. As the associate provost stated,

The whole thing of technology, how we communicate and how we teach using technology that of course has been a big change…which wasn’t driven by anything, it just came about. In terms of teaching the NCATE did play a role in people thinking about teaching and how they teach. I think that also the infusion of new faculty, you mentioned that we hired many new faculty in the last five odd years that certainly has had an effect as well. They come first of all with much higher technological expectations. They also come with pretty serious thoughts quite often about teaching and how you should teach and evaluate teaching. They often take it very seriously and that to the established faculty served as a wakeup call.

A faculty member also indicated that the infusion of new faculty changed the departmental dynamics. The interview with the associate provost indicated the same findings: “I think anecdotally there is evidence for that (departmental change due to new faculty) and every once and a while a chair or a faculty member will say having these new people has reinvigorated our department. It’s nice to hear that.” Here the evolutionary change in the environment with the introduction of new faculty produced a change in departmental culture and an increased emphasis on using technology.

Some of the interviewees reported that the strategic plan was something that they felt would impact them and that they identified with their unit in the plan. However not all had actually been on the committees. Some of the faculty interviewed noted that they helped with the assessment piece of the strategic plan. They also noted that it was obviously tied to fundraising, something the college had never done before. They recognized that some efforts
had been started and pointed to the recently completed $100 million campaign. As the associate provost noted,

The college had just gone through this whole traumatic leadership issue and enrollments had declined and budgets were not in really good shape and there was a sense perhaps that the college was not really going anywhere. Now we definitely don’t have that at all. The strategic plan has helped but in general you see enrollments growing, budgets that are stable, new faculty being hired, buildings being renovated and the campus looking better.

The strategic plan was a political process designed to garner support and input from all the constituencies on campus as evidenced by the membership of the committees as seen in the final document. Initiated in the fall of 2006, the College’s strategic planning process was guided by a strategic planning council, chaired by the president and composed of faculty, students, administrators and alumni. The council met a number of times, including a one day planning retreat in September 2006, to identify key issues and consider possible approaches. The council was actively supported in its work by eight committees that studied a broad range of issues and areas. The council and the committees met together in a second all day planning retreat in November 2006, the major focus of which was to envision the College in 2026 as a backdrop to defining a set of strategic objectives for the five-year period of 2007 – 2012 (The College Strategic Plan, 2007). This process included over two-hundred committee members from faculty, staff, alumni, community and the foundation board and resulted in a three point strategy (The College Strategic Plan, 2007).

When asked about the other changes on campus that had occurred since 2003 other than the processes caused by NCATE, all respondents noted that the facilities had greatly improved. The Division of Education had moved into a new facility with renovated classrooms, and there were many more places on campus for students to linger. They noted that there were more coffee shops and lounge areas in the buildings. They also felt that the landscaping, including a
new fence, was very much improved, and that things were kept cleaner. They felt that there was more pride in the campus facilities. The associate provost reported,

You see your own classroom and offices being spruced up, new equipment in your classrooms and so on. You really get a sense that the college is on the move. I’m talking a little bit like the president now but it’s really true, not just hype. So that leads to a sense of pride in the college and also a sense that maybe you should take the college more seriously and not just show up for your two courses but actually get involved.

When asked why this occurred, the majority of the interviewees indicated that this was a priority of the president. One chair noted, “The College is more beautiful, when you walk through the campus, under the president’s watch he has done so much to beautify the campus that’s transformational in a physical aesthetically appealing way.”

Symbolically, the president communicated to the faculty, staff and students that the college should be an attractive place to work and learn. According to the president,

I wanted the college to be a place where students would linger after class, where faculty would stay and be engaged in the life of the college. Many faculty here are only on campus two days a week and that does not give them time to interact meaningfully with their students and colleagues.

Faculty were pleased with the improved facilities. According to one faculty member,

I think there is a general feeling that things are good on campus; the environment is nicer, even in the facilities, the plantings, and the benches that have come in. I think there’s satisfaction with the president and the leadership. I think there’s a general feeling that people’s opinions are respected and things are being looked at.

These are examples of symbolic changes (like benches and flowers on campus) to emulate a sense of community and pride and human resources changes when faculty and staff are listened to and respected.

Most interviewees also noted the increase use of technology on campus. When pressed to define the changes in technology, they reported that everyone used the college email unlike five years ago. They also indicated that many of the classrooms were ‘smart’ and that some
departments had laptop carts that were not there three years ago. One faculty member from the Division of Education noted, “I think there’s been a real push to incorporate technology. The willingness for us to get the technology we need, we have real needs in our program to show our students how to use technology.”

The scientists interviewed pointed to upgraded equipment and a core facility where expensive equipment had been purchased to be shared by multiple departments. Most interviewees noted the new website and a more extensive use of email, plasma boards and kiosks for communications, all of which had been added in the last four years. Some noted that a new student, budget and human resources management system that was being installed for all the colleges in the system was going to change the way the College conducted business and were proud that the college had been chosen to be first to embrace the system.

The faculty reported that there was more openness on campus now. Faculty who serve on campus committees noted a transparency about the administrative process that was lacking several years ago. Several interviewed indicated that there was more trust within the college, that a chair could call the provost and get their question answered. Some interviewed saw a definite ‘old guard’ and ‘new guard’ and noted clashes between the two. Several of the faculty in the Division of Education noted that the dean was willing to ‘go to bat’ for the Division. One faculty noted,

Well I mean it’s also that we have like, there is so many things that happened, like we have a president and a provost and we have a dean. It would be hard to say, I mean if nothing else happened and you had a provost, a president and a dean. Especially like you know a pretty strong president; you don’t have to agree with everything he does but he’s not like someone that say let me just sit around here and see what happens. The dean also is a strong person and the provost is doing things too.

As the faculty noted, the presence of a dean, a provost and a president filled voids that had been there for several years. Further, these individuals were willing to play their role in the
organization – the dean championing the cause for the Division, the provost ensuring that the
processes took place and the president stepping in as needed to provide support or make broad
decisions. The presence of this following the years of no leadership or interim positions met a
need at the college, providing a structure around which decisions could be made and supported.

This structure also provided a framework for the human resources needs of the faculty
and staff to be met. Consultants, working meetings, conferences and peer training for
assessment all helped faculty focus on their work, whether that was the NCATE accreditation,
the middle states review or their work towards tenure. Faculty felt supported to learn and grow
professionally. As several faculty reported, there was more cross communications between
departments, and faculty began to identify with their division and the institution.

Summary of Findings

The activities and attitudes that defined the work around the accreditation process were
affected by the actions and decisions of the individuals involved. Whether it was reconstituting a
working group to change the structure or bringing together the campus community to define a
new process for making decisions around strategic planning, changing organizational structures
can assist in the change process. The dean, chairs, provost and president each used structure to
help create change. While the structure was changing, the individuals involved wanted to feel
empowered to do their work and make a difference in the process.

The dean provided many opportunities for learning by bringing in consultants, hosting
retreats and sending faculty to seminars and workshops to better understand the accreditation
process. The IT programmer worked with the Division of Education to create a new assessment
process that would work for them and that was tailored to their needs. As reported by the
faculty, they felt that they owned the process and that they were proud to be part of a unit as well
as a part of their department. The faculty also coalesced as a group and used their power to bring others along who were far less willing to participate.

The accreditation process moved the power structure from three loosely configured departments to a cohesive Division with a strong leader. The provost’s office used the momentum of the assessment process in NCATE to get the college’s assessment process well on its way for middle states accreditation. The strategic planning process coalesced groups of faculty and staff who wanted to make sure that their programs were included as part of the college’s plans for the next ten years. Additionally, faculty began to identify with the college as a place on the move as well as a place to be proud of.

The president used many opportunities to promote a vision of the college as a pleasant place to work. One of the three goals in the strategic plan included making the college a welcoming place to be for students, faculty and staff (The College Strategic Plan, 2007). The college community became aware of these things through meetings, retreats, new banners on the lawn, kiosks and benches where they could linger. The changes that occurred over this process can be described and put into context through Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames.

As outlined in this chapter, the actions and ideas put into the context of Bolman and Deal’s four frames combined to create change at the study site. Some of those changes were more sweeping or transformational and some were incremental. As articulated above, some of the changes were made possible through a new construction of processes by faculty, an aspect of social cognition. Chapter five looks at the implications of the findings and conclusions in chapter four.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The process of gaining initial accreditation is complex but not unusual for most institutions. However, as a first-time applicant for NCATE accreditation, the institution understudy faced many mitigating circumstances. The Division of Education graduates more majors than any other division and there are a number of education programs where the faculty are housed in other academic disciplines yet teach the education methods courses for their area. Because the NCATE accreditation required assessments from all the programs, many departments across the campus were affected by the accreditation process.

Complicating the accreditation effort, the Division of Education lacked a permanent dean for over six years when the work started. The three departments conducted themselves as independent units and the three acting deans simply provided the needed support for the work of the departments. Additionally, NCATE required the education unit to have a mission, vision and philosophy – something that the college and certainly the faculty had not conceptualized for over a decade. Moreover, because the decision was made to delay the start of the process by a year, the college was required to meet the new NCATE standards which were more rigorous than the previous standards. When the NCATE process started, the college had an interim president, interim provost and two of the four deans were acting. Enrollment had declined for three years in a row, resulting in a budget deficit. The interior renovation of the classroom building where the Division of Education was to be housed was stalled when the contractor went bankrupt.
Given the constraints structurally set up by the lack of permanent leadership, and the void of permanent leadership in the dean’s office, the chairs and faculty of the Division of Education felt disinclined to pursue the accreditation process and felt that it would probably ‘just go away’ with a new administration. The mandate of the state system central office, combined with the push from the administration, was sufficient to get the process going. However, the faculty had great difficulty developing a cohesive understanding of who they were and what they were all about.

External forces like the NCATE accreditation process can provide the needed catalyst for change in a faculty culture. In this instance, transformational change or double-looped learning occurred through a process that involved the intervention of the president and provost, the constant prodding and encouragement of the dean, the persistence of the associate dean of education, the leadership of the chairs as well as some faculty, and influx of new faculty and resources to improve the campus. All of these factors played into the change, which was transformational in some areas and incremental in others.

The Division of Education was transformed in that it developed an identity with values and a mission. It should be noted that the faculty continue to refine the values and the mission as well as the assessment tools as evidenced by the reports by the interviewees.

The general education review, given its complexity, was an incremental change. Perhaps as it is implemented, it will be treated much as the NCATE external force, and affect positively the creation of new courses and teaching methods. It will depend, as with the NCATE accreditation process, on the leadership and the ability of the president, provost and designated leader to coalesce the faculty behind a ‘new way of thinking’ in regards to general education – what it means to a program of study, how it is taught across disciplines and how it is assessed.
The middle states accreditation process benefited from the NCATE process as faculty understood and could articulate assessment across courses, programs and units. As a result, this area of the middle states review went quite smoothly.

Parallel to the middle states review was the strategic planning process which engaged faculty, students, staff, alumni, foundation board members and community members. Perhaps the boldest and broadest project, the strategic planning process began with taking a look at where the college could be in five years. Realizing the limited nature of the suggestions, the group was asked to look twenty-five years hence and forget budgetary constraints. Much broader and bolder ideas emerged. The document, which was finished in the fall of 2007, reflects a campus community better equipped to work together.

Other notable changes that influenced the change in faculty culture were:

- Improved facilities and landscaping. The college is a more welcoming place.
- A more rigorous promotion and tenure process and one that is more transparent, thanks to better communications and the president’s yearly letter to junior faculty.
- More focus on grant-writing and research, as well as a stronger push for excellence in teaching.
- Better, more reliable and up-to-date technology for the classroom and for business practice use.

The transformations noted by the interviewees reinforced each other to bring about change. For example, the changes in general education, the ease with which the college went through the middle states re-accreditation and the general understanding that a strategic plan should have assessment built into it, each benefited from the NCATE process. Likewise, the faculty involved in the NCATE process also benefited from the general incremental changes that
occurred over the years from 2003 – 2005, including the improvements to the landscaping, the general education task force discussions and report and the beginning of the middle states review process. There was a sense that change was in the air and that things were not going to be as they had been.

The faculty culture changed over time due to a number of factors – the hire of over one third new faculty who, as noted by the interviewees, had to meet higher standards for promotion and tenure; the development of ‘smart’ classrooms and an online course management system; the growth of assessment through NCATE and middle states; improved facilities affording opportunities for faculty and students to meet outside of class; a strategic planning process that gave faculty a focus and direction for the college mission. As the associate provost noted,

In terms of mood I would say transformation from lets call it depression to optimism. We are somehow an institution that’s going somewhere I’d say that is transformational because it means that people are more engaged in the institution and more committed to it and are putting more of themselves toward the goals.

The multiple wide-ranging changes in the institution over a specified time typifies the ‘punctuated equilibrium’ described by Gersick (1991). Prior to the beginning of the aforementioned changes, the institution existed in equilibrium with faculty identifying with their department, working on campus only as needed and with little sense of institutional or divisional identity. Several factors, called revolutions by Gersick, were the catalyst for the change. Throughout the five years, new faculty hires brought more energy and new ideas. A new president, provost, dean and other changes in leadership brought stability and focus at the top. The general education review provided a venue to look more thoughtfully at the curriculum and teaching, along with the infusion of technology. However, the single most aggressive event was the imposition of NCATE on the division and the campus.
NCATE caused the Division of Education to rethink its identity and how it did business. It changed the Division’s structure and mission from being departmentally centered to divisionally coordinated. The NCATE assessment requirements spilled over into the institution overall and affected faculty and other processes. NCATE also caused ‘cognitive dissonance’ and forced the faculty to reframe the context of their work, learning about new and better ways to operate.

Though much of the change was evolutionary in nature, it was made real for faculty as they constructed their new reality and work process through social cognition. The transformational change, as confirmed by those interviewed, was in the Division of Education who now see themselves in a new way and who teach from a different context, keeping their articulated core values in mind.

In this instance, the accreditation process provided a catalyst for transformative change in an institution that was in need of an identity and a means to assess student progress that went beyond courses and departments. It gave the Education Division a collective identity and provided a model to the rest of the campus for how frame breaking change can occur. The change literature, including the work done by researchers investigating change across all organizational types is useful in helping organizations determine the effectiveness of a change, the reasons for a change or the best methodology to employ in implementing a change.

As noted by Kezar (2001), the loose governance structure of higher education makes change difficult, particularly transformational change throughout an institution. Her review of change literature within the context of higher education indicated that some theories were more applicable than others, given the goals, mission and governance structure in higher education institutions.
Morgan’s (1997) work helps organizations identify the characteristics of evolutionary change as the organizations become more complex either proactively or reactively in relation to changes in the environment. His work is effective in describing change for higher education institutions as it looks at proactive and reactive change activities. It also incorporates the differences in change begun by external forces and those begun by internal forces. From this study, both types of forces helped to cause change, although the external force of the NCATE accreditation served as a strong catalyst for change.

Gersick’s (1991) punctuated equilibrium serves as an effective model that uses evolutionary change and enhances its characteristics using revolutionary events. The NCATE accreditation process with its emphasis on unit identity and assessment served as the revolutionary event to change the culture and identity of the Education Division. Other more subtle initiatives – like better landscaping, the president’s letter to new faculty regarding progress towards tenure and the hiring of new faculty with an emphasis on technology – influenced the degree and type of faculty and institutional change. Morgan’s (1997) model of evolutionary change helps institutions identify the characteristic events and initiatives that may affect an organization’s capacity to change.

Since institutions of higher education have as a mission the process of education, social cognition is a useful interpretive lens to inform change initiatives. In this study, the work of faculty in the NCATE process as well as the work done by new faculty, chairs, deans and the provost to provide clarity (and hopefully more success) in the tenure process are examples of the social cognitive process. The development of the three E’s in the Education Division occurred as the faculty experienced social dissonance about who they were and what the division held as its core values. Through the letter writing process, the individuals involved had to reconstruct their
understanding of the tenure process. Organizations, as well as the individuals in them experience cognitive dissonance either as a result of external forces or through the slow realization that the ‘status quo’ is not working. They then reconstruct their reality and change in the process.

The changes that occurred in this study were described using Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames (also outlined in Appendix D). There were structural changes (note the various committees and readjustments of personnel assignments), human resources changes (training for faculty in the assessment process and assistance from consultants for the accreditation and strategic planning process), political (the coalescing of the chairs behind the NCATE accreditation process) and symbolic (the many retreats, graphics and newsletters that celebrated the successes as they occurred). The four frames were useful tools for identifying the various aspects of the change and would be useful to those studying change in higher education. They are useful in categorizing the various events, products, attitudes and decisions that produced the change, as well as identifying the types of change that occurred.

The leaders involved, and indeed the individuals implementing the NCATE accreditation process, used many tools to accomplish their goals. The changes were not accomplished without much work and maneuvering that engaged all of Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four frames. Leaders looking to implement change would be well served to understand the influence of symbolism in change initiatives, the support and empowerment that the human resources frame can bring to the individuals in the organization and the importance of coalitions and power bases in changing an institution. Managers and leaders often are aware of the consequences of structural changes but may frequently minimize the effect that structural changes have on human capital. A misplaced employee can lose effectiveness and eventually become disheartened and
unproductive. This process of implementing change using the four frames can be useful for higher education.

Implications for Other Institutions

Institutions looking to change faculty culture, whether it is around assessment or another important aspect of an institution, would do well to take advantage of external forces that might begin the process. However, as noted in this study, these changes should be done in parallel with other related activities. Meeting the needs of employees by providing a good working environment is important, particularly in a unionized environment that seeks to find issues that need resolving in regards to the work environment. New facilities can energize a campus, as can the stimulating ideas that grow from a strategic planning process. The reflective work done by the general education task force and undergraduate curriculum committee all forced faculty to think again about their programs and the relationship of that program with the college and to think about their professional work in relationship to the discipline and the institution.

Leaders should look to the change literature to help them identify those factors that played important roles in any change initiative. In addition, in looking to plan for change, leaders should consider using a variety of tools as suggested by Bolman and Deal (2003), capitalizing on the structure of the campus or unit, the human resources needs of the individuals, the politics of the groups and individuals involved and finally the symbolic nature of their decisions and activities that can either enhance or disable a change initiative.

Campus leaders at liberal arts institutions should employ a variety of ways to engage faculty and the college community in exploring new ideas and new initiatives. This, along with some key external forces can do much to bring change in a campus culture.
The process is slow and sometimes comes with unexpected results as outlined in Gersick’s (1991) punctuated equilibrium. However, effective leaders will use external forces to help with change, as well as internal levers to initiate new directions for their campuses. Leaders must employ a variety of techniques to assist in the change and must be open to multiple ways to accomplish the goals. As one chair noted, “We had problems in our respective departments and again thanks to our associate dean’s freedom to do it your own way, she would say as long as you do it. Many roads to Rome, and boy there were many. We got to Rome, and everyone had a different role.”
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:
CONSENT FORM

CONSENT TO SERVE AS A PARTICIPANT IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

Project Title: An Investigation of Change Around an Accreditation Process

Project Director/Investigator:
Sue Henderson, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, XXX-XXX-XXXX

You are being asked to participate in a research project conducted through the College and the University of Georgia. If you decide to participate, the College requires that you give your signed authorization to participate in this research project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss it with the Research Investigator. If you then decide to participate in the research project, please sign the last page of this form.

Nature and Purpose of the Project

The reason for this study is to investigate the factors and activities that led to transformational change and alterations in attitude and campus culture around an external accreditation process for faculty and administrators at an urban liberal arts institution. The researcher is conducting this study as her theses for PhD in Higher Education at the University of Georgia under the guidance of Dr. Libby Morris, Director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. (lvmorris@uga.edu).

Explanation of the Procedures:
Volunteers who decide to take part in this study will be asked to do the following things:
1) Answer questions about their involvement in the accreditation process and the changes in faculty and staff perceptions of their role on campus in a one hour interview with the principle investigator.
2) Respond to questions regarding the new assessment procedures for all faculty in Education as well as those who might teach content to prospective teachers.
3) Reflect upon and report on perceived changes from personal views of the institution and that of the division of education.
4) Reflect upon and report on the perceived role of individuals in the process.
5) The interview, which will be audio recorded and transcribed will be kept for 3 years.
6) The interview will be kept confidential.
One of the two should be initialed to indicate consent regarding the audio-recording of the interview.

_____ Please check if you agree that the interview may be recorded.

_____ Please check if you do not want the interview recorded.

**Potential Discomfort and Risks:**

Minimal risk is expected as the interview will be confidential and the transcripts will be destroyed after three years. No individually-identifiable information about you, the college or the system, or provided by you during the research, will be shared with others or will be included in the study. The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project. Although the researcher holds a position of authority at the college, the risk of coercion should be mitigated to some extent by the fact that the questions to be asked you do not appear to be such that you would feel uncomfortable in responding; in fact the study may help those involved to better understand the change process. Throughout the interview, you may choose to not answer any individual questions in the study. Further, the investigator will not reveal your identity should you decline to participate.

**Potential Benefits:**

The benefits for you are not direct. However, the study might help the larger higher education community by providing a better understanding of the activities and the processes that aided the accreditation process. In addition a better understanding of the activities and processes that helped change the campus culture might also be a result of the study.

**Costs/Reimbursements:**

There are no costs or reimbursements in this study.

**Alternatives to Participation:**

There are no alternatives to participation for this study.

**Confidentiality:**

The tapes and transcripts will have all identifiers removed. The report will not identify the name of the institution or the name of the individual interviewed. The raw data will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office for three years.

**Withdrawal from the Project:**

Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You may decide to stop participating in this project at any time without penalty, and are free to leave at any time.
Whom to Call if you have any Questions:

The approval stamp on this consent form indicates that this project has been reviewed and approved for the period indicated by the College Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research and Research Related Activities.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, or to report a research related injury, you may call:

Associate Director of Regulatory Compliance
The College

Concerns or questions regarding the conduct of this research project should be directed to:

Sue Henderson, Vice President of Institutional Advancement
The College
XXX-XXX-XXXX / email
Dr. Libby Morris, Director of Institute of Higher Education
University of Georgia, Meigs Hall
Athens, Ga.
706-542-3464 / lvmorris@qc.cuny.edu

What Signing this Forms Means:

By signing this consent form, you agree to participate in this research project. The purpose, procedures to be used, as well as, the potential risks and benefits of your participation have been explained to you in detail. You can refuse to participate or withdraw from this research project at anytime without penalty. Refusal to participate in this study or withdrawal from this study will have no effect on any services you may otherwise be entitled to from the College. You will be given a copy of this consent form.

__________________________________    ___________________________________________
Printed Name of Participant     Participant Signature   Date

_________________________________   ___________________________________________
Printed Name of Research/Study Investigator  Signature of Research/Study Investigator Date

Institutional Review Board Approval Stamp:      Revised 10/9/07
APPENDIX B:

INFORMATIONAL LETTER

Date
Dear :

I am a graduate student at the University of Georgia under Dr. Libby Morris, Director of the Institute of Higher Education. I invite you to participate in a research study entitled “An Investigation of Change Around an Accreditation Process” that is being conducted as part of completion of my dissertation. The purpose of this study is to describe how organizational change is accomplished at an urban commuter liberal arts masters level institution. The initiative that began the process is the change in assessment practices brought about by the NCATE accreditation in a Division of Education and across the various disciplines. This change resulted in a reorganization of the assessment practices of not only the Education Division, but also those related departments who educate future teachers in the content areas.

Your participation will involve being interviewed about your involvement in the process and about your perceptions of the process as well as your views on the change in the college culture in the past few years. It should take about an hour. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. The interview will be recorded and a transcript will be created. The interview and transcript will be kept for three years in a secure location. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. Your identity will not be associated with your responses in any published format. The study will be written by obscuring all identifiers regarding the college, the system and the personnel involved.

The findings from this project may provide information on the nature and extent of change around an intitatives at an institution and looks at the activities and processes that helped facilitate that change and which were impediments to the change. It provides a context for understanding the process of implementing change and what changes are first order and which are second order. The anticipated risks for participating in this study are not greater than those of everyday life.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or email. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to Associate Director for Regulatory Compliance, the College Institutional Review Board, address; telephone.

If you are interested in participating, please contact Sue Henderson at XXX-XXX-XXXX. Thank you for your consideration!
APPENDIX C:
TIMELINE

• Fall 2001
  o Education unit faculty attend an orientation meeting about NCATE accreditation with individuals from collaborating schools and districts.
  o College has an acting dean of education, interim provost and interim president.
  o While the college holds back, other system institutions begin NCATE accreditation process as mandated by system.
  o College searches for new president.
  o Division of Education faculty are housed in temporary trailers awaiting completion of new classroom building.

• Summer 2002
  o New president joins college.
  o Education unit submits paperwork, “Intent to Seek Initial NCATE Accreditation,” requesting mock site visit, spring 2004, and board of examiners visit, fall 2004.
  o The one year delay results in the college being subject to new NCATE standards requiring three years of formative assessment data across courses, programs and the education unit.

• Fall 2002
  o Seven new faculty members join Division of Education.
Faculty from all teacher education programs (the education unit) meet in a one day workshop to explore ideas regarding the vision, mission, philosophy and conceptual framework for the unit. Questions like, ‘Why do we exist? What is the college vision?’ were explored and lists generated.

Under another acting dean of education and the associate dean of education, and with input from the department chairs, a NCATE coordinating team is formed into three working groups: a) conceptual framework, b) assessment and c) student teaching and field experiences.

The team begins preparation for the preconditions report to be submitted in January (memo to Program Coordinator, October, 2002).

Course release time, summer pay arrangements and two graduate assistants are made available to the Division of Education by the provost.

Representatives from the educational programs not in the division are invited to join the team that meets weekly. The commitment is scheduled to last until June 30, 2003.

The NCATE team, drawing on input from the education unit (who met in November, 2002) devise the first notes on a conceptual framework.

Design begins for assessment at the course level, program level and departmental level.

The conceptual framework working group, with input from faculty representatives at a half-day meeting, create the vision and mission for the education unit. The faculty attending come from the three departments in the Division of Education and education faculty housed in other departments,
such as the music department where students major in music and minor in education.

- The conceptual framework working group compiled seven themes from the meeting which become the conceptual framework: pedagogy, curriculum, learning, families and community, diversity and inclusion, technology and assessment. Faculty are asked to write briefly about one theme, set in the context of their work and field.

- College responds to a request from the system office to participate in a general education review as part of the system master plan – the first review of the curriculum in twenty-five years.

- The president appoints a committee to consider general education at the college in the 21st century. The committee, comprised of well respected faculty, is charged with identifying a set of definitions and goals for general education.

- Spring 2003

  - NCATE coordinating team meets to prepare the preconditions document in January when most faculty are not on campus.

  - Five working groups are created and each is asked to focus on one of the following: conceptual framework, assessment system, field and student teaching, diversity or technology.

  - Education unit meets in committees to: 1) develop consensus for conceptual framework, 2) design an assessment system for teacher education at the
college and 3) develop recommendations for field experiences, internships and to review curriculum development for meeting the NCATE diversity standard.

- In March, NCATE returns preconditions report with two unmet requirements, largely centering on the lack of an assessment system. A commitment is made to submit revisions by August 1, 2003.

- Various special programs begin the individual accreditation process – some of which are new accreditations. They include: Secondary English Education (BA and Post BA), Secondary Science Teacher Education (BA, Post BA, MS), Mathematics Education (BA, Post BA, MS), Elementary Education (BA, MAT), Early Childhood (MS, MAT), Special Education (MS), TESOL (BA, MS).

- Education unit meets in late February for a half-day meeting to review progress made on developing the conceptual framework. The purpose is to begin to address the first four of six accreditation standards (minutes, NCATE Education Unit Meeting, February 24, 2003).

- System-wide NCATE workshop is planned in March for faculty and teams. Consultants visit college following workshop.

- Seven standards are written based on themes that emerged from the conceptual framework working group. The standards are the basis for the assessment of the education unit.

- Conceptual framework working group meeting produces additional standards to include specialty area and literacy. The total now reaches eleven standards which must be assessed for each program.
The assessment working group reports that they would like to “frame an assessment system that would leverage a process designed to transform….college into a “self-evaluating organization” (minutes, Assessment Working Group Report Progress Report, May 28, 2003). The group created eight parameters to direct the development of the assessment system.

New dean of education is hired from an outside institution accredited by NCATE with a stellar history of obtaining grants and is charged by president and provost to move the NCATE process forward to completion. Expected start date is set for August, 2003.

General education task force hosts a series of seminars directed by leaders in the field to generate faculty discussion around the topic of general education, and establishes focus groups to gather input from faculty.

For the first time, president sends letters to junior faculty outlining their progress to tenure, noting both deficiencies and positive efforts.

**Summer 2003**

Four NCATE working groups meet throughout the summer with one member of the NCATE coordinating team to complete their portion of the work.

The assessment system document is completed and sent to NCATE by August 15, 2003.

The NCATE assessment working group meets to finalize the assessment matrix to be given to the departments in fall 2003 for pilot testing. They recommend a standing unit assessment committee to oversee the work for the
programs. Further, they recommend hiring a senior-level individual to oversee the assessment process, which will be electronically collected, stored, processed and managed.

- The general education task force completes its report and makes it available for review by the faculty.

- Fall 2003

  - A new dean of education arrives and the Division of Education hires ten new faculty members.
  - Division of Education classroom building and offices reopen. Approximately fifty faculty move in between August – October.
  - NCATE coordinating team hosts an all-day retreat on September 12, 2003, to review accomplishments thus far and to examine the assessment system, the assessment matrix and its corresponding standards (agenda, NCATE Retreat, September 12, 2003).
  - The NCATE conceptual framework group meets and discusses the issues that have arisen around assessing eleven standards for each program, some of which do not include particular standards. An education unit meeting is called to pare down the number of standards. That meeting results in reducing the number of standards to seven concepts.
  - Work continues on all program reviews which require complete assessments to be developed using the assessment matrix.
  - Six faculty committees are formed to write the institutional report for each of the NCATE standards. Site visits are scheduled for October 16 – 21, 2004.
o NCATE awards candidacy toward accreditation following review of
assessment system document.

o General education task force presents its report to the college community
which provides the conceptual framework for curriculum review and revision.
It addresses the need for a change in faculty culture around assessment and
faculty rewards:

A new curriculum must be accompanied by methods to assess its
effectiveness that will permit adjustments and improvements based on
student outcomes…..Such curricular change challenges the College when
considering tenure and promotion to recognize the time and effort such
activities require and to genuinely value these contributions (report,

o General education faculty working groups are established with the goal of
producing a report at the end of the academic year entitled “The Entry
Experience, Areas of Knowledge/Intellectual Activity, Integrative Capstone
Experience and Suffusing Critical Abilities throughout the Curriculum.”

o College creates three new outdoor seating areas for students, faculty and staff.

• Spring 2004

  o Associate dean leading the NCATE process goes on sabbatical and returns to
the classroom.

  o A new associate dean with NCATE experience is hired from outside the
college and is charged with completing the NCATE process.

  o The special program accreditations fail.

  o Decision is made by president, based on input from the dean and
recommendation by the provost, to request a delay of the board of examiners
accreditation site visit by one year – until October, 2005. The rationale
behind the decision was that not enough work had been done by the committees to assure accreditation. Most of the missing information centered on assessments. Some in the Division had requested a longer delay.

- President continues writing letters to junior faculty regarding progress toward tenure.

- Summer 2004

  - Funded by the provost, department chairs and working groups meet to continue developing assessment instruments for courses, programs and educational unit.
  
  - Following feedback on earlier reports and focus groups, the president’s task force on general education presents a report on the reorganization of general education at the college. The need for assessment is noted:

    Maintenance of curriculum effectiveness, including ongoing assessment and periodic re-evaluation – functions absent from the current….curriculum (report, President’s Task Force on General Education, July, 2004).

- Fall 2004

  - Five new faculty members join the Division of Education
  
  - Assessment committee meets with IT department to develop online assessment database.
  
  - Education unit meets to review the NCATE process, structure, standards committee, external advisory board and steering committee. Unit reviews new timeline, database development and rejoinders and program reviews.
  
  - First draft of the NCATE report is completed to be sent to NCATE.
• Spring 2005
  o Mock visit conducted. Education unit fails mock visit because of lack of assessment and lack of clarity on standards. Twenty-two pages of weaknesses were cited with five-hundred specific areas noted.
  o With the next site visit less than six months away, dean immediately meets with entire division to ‘rally the troops’ and put together a plan for meeting the deficiencies.
  o President and provost meet with dean and department chairs in a crisis meeting to stress the importance of their leadership in getting the required information from the faculty for the assessments.
  o President meets with each department separately to encourage them to meet the many concerns of the mock visit and to remind them that time is short.
  o Some faculty begin to submit assessment documents, syllabi and required materials in advance of the next visit.
  o Steering committee meets to go through revisions to the introduction and conceptual framework documents. They note that the assessment system is not up and running. Chairs are not present at most of the meetings and they find it difficult to create the report without their input.
  o General education task force report is approved by both the faculty and student senate to be implemented by fall 2009. An undergraduate curriculum committee is charged with developing an implementation plan.
• Fall 2005
  o Six new faculty members join the Division of Education.
Resource room is organized for the October site visit containing all materials related to the accreditation process including minutes of meetings, reports, assessment instruments, assessment results, student work, letters and memos.

NCATE Board of Examiners visit – October 21 – 26, 2005.
- Education unit is given provisional accreditation due to the lack of longitudinal assessment data.
- The assessment methodology is judged to be sound.

- Spring 2006
  - Departments, programs and education unit continue collecting assessment data.
  - Middle states committees continue to meet and create committee reports.
  - Undergraduate curriculum committee proposes pilot programs for upper level interdisciplinary synthesis courses in general education.

- Fall 2006
  - Five new faculty members join the Division of Education.
  - Middle states report completed and sent in.
  - President begins strategic planning process and hires a consultant to facilitate project. Retreat held at the president’s residence with over fifty faculty, staff, students, alumni and community leaders in attendance to generate ideas for the college through 2035.
  - Six strategic planning committees are formed and a large, one-day meeting is held with over one-hundred and eighty stakeholders to further the
development of the plan. One of the committees established is the “assessment committee.”

- Strategic planning assessment committee devises an assessment overview for the strategic planning process as seen in the notes from the retreat:

  **Setting performance measures**
  - Need to go back to the mission statement – what are our core values?
  - Of the ideas from this morning – could we measure how they went back to our core values
  - Look at the mission statement – does it need to change
    - Pull out core values from the statement
  - Any recommendation from other committees has assessment component – what is the value added to the student and how are we assessing that?
    - What are the anticipated performance measures for students
      - Formative?
      - Summative?
    - A smaller group should be assessing on how we are doing on the plan?
      - Who uses the assessment information?
      - Use the assessment to change the culture of the college.
      - It should not necessarily be punitive.
    (notes, Strategic Planning Retreat, November 17, 2006)

- Education Unit continues assessment process. Department chairs work with faculty to ensure that the data is coming in.

  - **Spring 2007**
    - Education unit continues NCATE assessment process.
    - Middle states accreditation visit.
    - Completed strategic plan sent to college community for comments and includes an assessment component:

**A LEADER IN ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY**
The college...will become widely recognized for the ways it assesses the quality, relevance and effectiveness of its programs and activities. In particular, we will:
**Become a nationally recognized leader in the use of clear metrics to evaluate and strengthen our programs, activities and services**

- Make learning outcomes and assessment an essential component of our culture by improving learning at all levels; this will involve defining clear learning objectives for our students, measuring student achievement and using such measures to inform the allocation of resources for teaching and the distribution of faculty training. (Strategic Plan, May, 2007)

  - Faculty senate approves another series of pilot upper level interdisciplinary synthesis courses designed to meet general education requirements.

- **Fall 2007**
  - Education unit prepares report for NCATE visit in the spring.
  - Strategic plan distributed to college community for comments.

- **Spring 2008**
  - NCATE board of examiners return visit.
  - Education unit passes with no recommendations.
  - Strategic plan approved and distributed to college community, external community, alumni and foundation board members.
APPENDIX D:
FOUR FRAMES MATRIX WITH STUDY EXAMPLES

This chart analyzes and matches events, attitudes and reported processes between the four frames from Bolman and Deal’s, *Reframing Organizations* (2003) and the four questions compiled by Kezar (2001) in *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*. Details and examples from each of the chart’s sixteen cells are then outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolman and Deal’s Four Frames</th>
<th>Questions Around Organizational Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Why (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Why (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What (VI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How (VII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target (VIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Why (IX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How (XI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target (XII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Why (XIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What (XIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How (XV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target (XVI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. Questions around organizational change vis-à-vis four frames model

I. Structural/Why
   a. The system mandates the use of NCATE as the accreditation to be sought for system schools.
   b. The Division of Education lacks a structure that assists the dean in managing the departments.
c. The NCATE accreditation process requires an assessment process that captures data across all programs in response to divisional goals.

II. Structural/What

a. The dean creates committees in 2004 to help in the NCATE work and to organize the efforts of the Division of Education.

b. The president and provost want to communicate to junior faculty regarding their progress to tenure.

III. Structural/How

a. The Division of Education creates committees in 2002, recreates committees in 2003 then relies on a NCATE working group to finalize the report in 2005.

b. The president, using information from the deans and chairs, creates a letter to junior faculty regarding their progress to tenure.

IV. Structural/Target

a. The committees created in 2002, and recreated numerous times, provide the framework around which the accreditation process was accomplished. As the process neared completion (2005 – 2008), the dean created the last super-structure comprised of the dean, associate deans and the chairs who met regularly to troubleshoot issues and to ensure that everyone was keeping pace.

b. The database structured assessment instrument created for the NCATE accreditation process became a structural model for the middle states accreditation process.

c. The dean’s council and other divisional committees that evolved from 2004 to present provided a framework around which the Division of Education got
common work accomplished. As an example, the fundraising committee works across the division to identify opportunities and implements them.

d. A structured process was put into place where chairs report to deans who send information to the provost that provides the basis for the president’s yearly letter to junior faculty regarding their progress to tenure.

V. Human Resources/Why

a. The individuals in the Division of Education had to learn how to work as a group.

b. Part of the NCATE accreditation process required that they identify as an educational unit with a vision, mission and core values or principles.

c. The faculty in the division needed to understand the importance of accreditation to them, to the division and to the college.

d. Junior faculty at the college needed to understand how they progress to tenure.

VI. Human Resources/What

a. The faculty from other divisions learned the importance of assessment to NCATE and some used the ideas for their own program assessment.

VII. Human Resources/How

a. Faculty helped to create the online assessment system that they would use to track their assessments across departments.

b. Faculty attended workshops to learn about NCATE and used consultants for advice as they progressed through the process.
c. The division and the dean used the pre-accreditation report, the mock visit and the 2005 visit to identify areas of failure so that they could correct those areas in moving to accreditation.

d. Once faculty were aware of the importance of the accreditation to their job security, they coalesced as a group and learned from one another about effective assessments.

VIII. Human Resources/Target

a. The faculty in the Division of Education were engaged in the process of assessing their work as it fit into the larger Division of Education.

b. Faculty across the college felt more trust, more transparency and more communication with the administration. They felt like they were listened to and more empowered to do meaningful work because they were engaged in the decision making process.

c. The faculty felt that there were more expectations on them in terms of promotion and tenure, but because the process was clearer, they knew how to proceed.

IX. Political/Why

a. The Division of Education had no leadership for six years and needed to be accredited as part of the system to remain a viable unit in the system.

b. The president and provost needed for the faculty in the Division of Education to coalesce behind the leadership and identify themselves as an education unit, as required by NCATE.
X. Political/What
   a. The faculty in the division and those in other divisions had to come together
      and create the vision, mission and core values of the division from those of
      each individual department and program.
   b. The chairs in the Division of Education had to take the requirements for
      accreditation and gain buy-in from their departments in the face of many new
      hires and pressure from the special program accreditation. Ultimately, they
      had to bring their departments along.

XI. Political/How
   a. The chairs, deans, provost’s office and president coalesced behind the
      accreditation effort after the mock visit in spring 2005, when over five-
      hundred areas needed to be addressed. The president stressed the importance
      of the accreditation and indicated that the division could not exist unless it
      was accredited.
   b. Faculty on various committees learned to work around colleagues who were
      not getting the work done, working across departments to create the needed
      reports and assessments. This had not been the practice, as faculty identified
      with their department almost exclusively in the past.
   c. The president, provost’s and dean’s office relied on transparency to gain
      support for the process.

XII. Political/Target
   a. The power structure for the division of education moved from three loosely
      coupled departments to one cohesive unit under the leadership of a dean.
XIII. Symbolic/Why

a. The Division of Education needed an identity that could be articulated and assessed.

b. The faculty, chairs and deans needed a new perception of the college as one of quality, one on the move.

XIV. Symbolic/What

a. The Division of Education achieves a unit identity with a vision, mission and core values.

b. The college achieves a preliminary view of its potential ten years hence through a strategic planning process.

c. The college began to have more pride in its facilities and in its processes, which were more transparent.

XV. Symbolic/How

a. The faculty understand the importance of the accreditation process when the president meets individually with each department to encourage them on and as the provost provides funds for the extra work.

b. The visiting team and the faculty better understand the importance of the visit as detailed meeting arrangements are made and the resource room is created to show the team all that the division had done to achieve accreditation.

c. The faculty better identify themselves as a unit when the dean’s office creates a logo around their three core values that is put on bags, mugs, and paper pads.
d. Junior faculty understand the importance of staying on track when the president communicates with them in their yearly letter regarding their progress towards tenure.

e. Flowers, benches and a new front fence (replacing a chain link and barbed wire fence) provide a lever to promote pride in the institution.

XVI. Symbolic/Target

a. The education unit now sees itself as a single unit with an identity.

b. The faculty identify with a more common goal for work towards tenure and promotion.

c. The college community feels pride in the facilities and in increased transparency and communications.

d. The faculty feel supported with new technologies.