SECTION II
Developing Change Strategies

Succeeding at comprehensive change entails more than thinking and discussing; it requires action. The purpose of this section is to help create movement by focusing on strategies and structures that facilitate action. The next three chapters also include specific descriptions of strategies from institutions participating in the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation that can be adapted for use on other campuses and can help institutions move from talk to action. Chapter 4 focuses on teams and teamwork as a central change strategy. It discusses team leadership, differentiates between committees and teams, and outlines how to create effective teams. The adage says, "Many hands make light work," but the work of institutional change is, in truth, heavy lifting. Many hands make the effort smoother and more likely to succeed.

For an institution to succeed with change, collaboration must extend beyond the confines of a particular team or group to include widespread institutional participation. Change is more likely to become institutionalized when it involves various stakeholders, when a wide range of people see themselves benefiting, and when a change makes sense to the campus. Chapter 5 provides suggested strategies for engaging the campus community and for continually widening the circle of participation.

The final chapter in this section presents strategies for building and sustaining momentum for change, specifically on deploying three types of resources: money, time, and attention. Because institutions live in a world of finite resources, change inevitably requires making difficult decisions among competing priorities. This chapter aims to help change leaders articulate their institution's priorities.

Chapter 4
Leading Change with Teams

Colleges and universities are particularly complicated organizations, caught in complex environments and shaped by the conflicting agendas of diverse stakeholders. Gone are the simple times of heroic leaders (if such times ever existed!), who set the institutional agenda and implemented it by the sheer strength of their position.

> *The ideal leader will be someone who knows how to find and bring together diverse minds—minds that reflect variety in their points of view, in their thinking processes, and in their question-asking and problem-solving strategies; minds that differ in their unique capacities as well as in their unique limitations. It is likely that we will stop thinking of leadership as the property or quality of just one person. We will begin to think of it in its collective form: leadership as occurring among and through a group of people who think and act together* (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pp. 2-3).

Leadership in such complex democratic organizations as colleges and universities tap the capacities of many different people. Collaborative leadership is based on the belief that a variety of people possess the know-how and creativity to solve complex problems and that successful action is grounded in a collective vision, shared ownership, and common values (Allen, Bordas, Hickman, Matusak, Sorenson, and Whitmire, 1998). Academic leadership is shared labor, not a solo act.

Team Leadership

Higher education has a long history of shared decision making and the use of committees. A key to formulating and implementing a change agenda is to bring together those individuals who enjoy credibility with their colleagues and have a nuanced understanding of the workings of the institution. Effectively structured teams provide the vehicle for tapping into collective talent. Collaborative change, in which actions are matched to intentions, requires defining intentions precisely so that everyone agrees about what they are trying to do and why a particular way of achieving that goal was chosen.

Team leadership, as demonstrated in the ACE project, differs from committee work and from the collegial model of academics governing through well-established relationships and shared norms. A team is a specifically formed group with a strategic purpose; it is "a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, p. 45). Although committees can periodically function as a team, most often they do not. The table on the following page highlights some differences between teams and committees.

Teams are dynamic and often are created for a short time. They serve a special purpose and exist only as long as the task at hand requires. Their members may represent important groups, but are more likely to be selected for their special expertise or because they are recognized as campus leaders. Effective teams are usually small, since "large numbers of people…have trouble interacting constructively as a group, much less agreeing on actionable specifics. Ten people are far more likely than fifty to successfully work through their individual, functional, and hierarchical differences toward a common plan and hold themselves accountable for the results" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, pp. 45-46).

Some standing groups function (or should function) as a team, such as the president's cabinet or the executive committee of the board. A standing group is distinguished from a team by the reason it exists (to formulate strategy versus to report information or make regulatory decisions) and how it operates.

Adopting a team approach does not guarantee progress on institutional change; teamwork must be developed and teams sometimes fail (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994). On a busy campus, the simple task of getting even a small group of busy people together at any one time may be extremely difficult. Once together, teams need time to become a functioning unit, to discuss, to draw collective conclusions, and to reach decisions. Individual members must also be committed to the concept of teamwork, to the ground rules by which the team functions, and to the collective decisions of the group, even if personally they are not in complete agreement. Teams require a mind-set that is different from the one higher education tends to reward–independent thinking and solo accomplishments. To adopt a collaborative outlook, people may have to abandon many ingrained behaviors and assumptions about how things get done.

Functions of Change Teams

Teams play two primary roles in effecting institutional change. First, a "task team" undertakes a task (or a set of tasks) to fulfill a specific responsibility or charge. For example, it might review institutional promotion and tenure policies and make recommendations to align them more closely with the institutional mission. It might explore questions related to student retention problems or find ways to encourage faculty to adopt technology into their classrooms.

A second type of team is the "strategy team," whose work is to monitor the change process and oversee and coordinate the work of task teams (Schein, 1993). It may also test new ideas. The strategy team is often composed of the chairs of task teams and senior campus leaders. If members are chosen wisely, they will represent different aspects of the institution's culture and thus be a litmus test of how an innovation will be received. Ideas not acceptable to the team most likely will not be acceptable to the larger organization (Schein, 1993). Also, the strategy team can

	Committee	Team
Membership selection	By appointment (usually representative)	By talent, knowledge, ability
Charge	Everyday institutional business	Special or strategic purpose
Possible functions	Gatekeeping, policy approval, governance functions	New initiatives, change leadership, solution of specific problems
Accountability to produce	Low/Medium	High

The Advantages of Teams

Among the advantages of a team-driven change effort are the following.

- The purposely constructed combination of different skills, knowledge, and perspectives permits a more complex approach to analyzing issues and developing strategies.
- Involving different people with complementary strengths provides more energy than any single individual can muster.
- The many sets of eyes and the wider range of experiences help a team more easily recognize and understand the multiple effects of change on a range of stakeholders.
- Teams provide opportunities for members to build on the ideas of others, adding increased problem-solving abilities (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).
- Teams are not as easily distracted as a single individual because the continued focus of team members can compensate for an individual's preoccupation.
- Teams increase accountability because their members must publicly disclose problems and successes, and because they have more people to monitor the work of others (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993).
- Teams provide a safe space to test new ideas, explore hunches, and challenge assumptions because individuals can say things without fear of reprisals or being wrong (Schein, 1993).
- Teams have an increased ability to agree on clearly defined goals.

become the repository of cumulative learning. As institutions work on implementing change, such a team will learn lessons about what works and what does not, and they can collect and disseminate the learning across campus.

Creating a Team

How the team is chosen is important for its function of dealing with institution-wide issues. Successful teams are composed of people who have the authority to get things done, knowledge of how the campus works, the skills needed to accomplish the tasks at hand, legitimacy and influence on campus, and the necessary time, energy, and interest.

The specific processes through which team members will be selected most likely will vary by institution because of campus norms and operating principles. For example, at some institutions, team members may be selected by presidential appointment. On others, where the norm is a caucus by the campus senate or an election by the faculty, this procedure might not be viewed as legitimate. Other institutions may identify team members by asking various units such as colleges, departments, or campus governing bodies for recommendations. Some institutions may identify team members through cabinet-level discussions or through predetermined campus policies. The selection process approaches the ideal if it can be viewed as legitimate and if it can identify people who are well suited for the tasks of dealing with institution-wide issues.

Getting the Team Underway

Because members of a newly formed team bring different operating assumptions about how to accomplish the task at hand, setting ground rules or expectations for working together is an important early step. These ground rules may concern procedures such as when and where the team will meet, the length

Assembling the Team

1. What is the purpose of the team?
2. What are the criteria for selecting team members (e.g., campus role, knowledge, political influence, skills, and abilities)?
3. Who should be members of the team? Why? Are they "the usual suspects"?
4. How many people should be on this team? What seems to be the optimal size? Why?
5. Who will chair this team? Why?

of each meeting, and attendance. The rules might cover how the team functions in meetings–for example, who will preside over the meeting, how items are placed on the agenda, how decisions are made (vote, consensus, agreement), or if a record should be kept (minutes or summary). Or the rules might be about work between meetings–for example, how members communicate, how work is circulated, or the amount of work expected between meetings. The ground rules can be set either formally or informally, but clear expectations agreed upon early in the process (and revisited as necessary) help prevent conflicts.

Sample team ground rules.

As part of launching its change initiative, Maricopa Community College in Arizona developed the following ground rules to guide its change leadership team.

- Treat meetings as a safe zone.
- Maintain confidentiality–no attribution.
- Ignore rank in the room.
- Everyone participates, no one dominates.
- Help the group stay on track.
- Have only one speaker; do not interrupt.
- Be an active/objective listener.
- Give freely of your experience.
- Keep an open mind.
- Agree to disagree only if it makes sense to do so.
- Meet each other with a fresh perspective.
- Maintain a "view of the whole."
- Make decisions by consensus.
- Have fun!
- Ask invited guests to be governed by these ground rules.

Team members will vary in their familiarity with one another. Some team members will have worked together for many years, while others will not know one another. Early on, team members should get to know one another; become familiar with the skills, attributes, and knowledge each brings; and understand the experiences that shape one another's perspectives. Teams can flounder either because the members do not know one another well enough (resulting in posturing, difficulty in communicating, or lack of trust) or because they know one another too well (resulting in "group think"). Teams composed of people who do not know one another might spend time getting acquainted as an important first step. When team members know one another, they can talk about past experiences and what they have learned that might be helpful in facilitating the team's effort. To revitalize long-standing teams, one might add new members, reorganize to work in subteams, or go on a retreat with an outside facilitator.

Getting Started: Team Purpose and Function

Use the following questions as a starting point for the team.

- What is the team's purpose?
- What expectations do campus leaders have for the team?
- To whom does the team report?
- To whom and when should this team make reports or updates, and in what format?
- What resources (broadly defined) are available to the team?

Determining Ground Rules

Identify ground rules for the team. Include the following items for discussion:

- Confidentiality.
- Meeting times, places, and frequency.
- Process for placing items on the agenda.
- Discussion of agenda items and reaching group decisions.
- Inclusion of guests (when, whom, and by what kind of group approval).
- Responsibility for note taking.
- The need for minutes (formal, informal, etc.).

Beginning a Group Process: Getting to Know One Another

Although some people scoff at "ice breakers" as corny or as a delay in getting on with the "real" business of a group, spending some time getting to know one another and articulating expectations and perspectives can be a good investment. A team's particular approach will depend on the degree to which people know one another and the culture of the institution. Some possible questions and gambits:

- What do you hope to contribute to the group? To learn from the group?
- Introduce each individual in the group, focusing on what each finds exciting about the collective task.
- Interview a team member for ten minutes and present him/her to the group.

Making Teams Successful

A successful team is the product of positive energy created by the interaction among team members; the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Researchers Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found that successful leadership teams in colleges and universities (what they called "real teams") had members fulfilling the following roles:

- *Definer*–outlines the formal and informal agendas.
- *Analyst*–provides a deep examination of the prevailing issues by assessing the elements of the problem.
- *Interpreter*–translates how people outside the team are likely to understand and make sense of the issues at hand.
- *Critic*–offers redefinition, reanalysis, and reinterpretation of issues before the team; plays devil's advocate.
- *Synthesizer*–facilitates discussion and summarizes elements.
- *Disparity Monitor*–assesses how people outside the team are making sense of the team's actions.
- *Task Monitor*–removes obstacles for the team and facilitates the team's work in general.
- *Emotional Monitor*–establishes and maintains the human, personal, and emotional elements of the team.

In successful teams, a majority of these roles are fulfilled at all times. The roles also tend to rotate among members depending upon the situation or discussion; for example, the chair is not always the Definer, but on some occasions might be the Critic or the Task Monitor. Unsuccessful teams (what Bensimon and Neumann call "illusionary teams") have only a few of these roles filled. Their members play overlapping roles and are

A Checklist for Assessing Team Effectiveness

The following questions are intended to help teams function more effectively.

- Who defines the agenda? What happens when the chair is absent?
- To what extent does the team know how its actions are interpreted on campus?
- How does the team go about analyzing the problems at hand? How wide a range of opinions is generally expressed? Does someone play devil's advocate constructively?
- How are conflicts resolved? To what extent are diverse opinions aired and incorporated into decisions?
- To what extent do team members care about one another? Does the team talk about the experience of participating on this team?
- To what extent do different people play different roles?
- How effective is the team in communicating with campus groups about its work? On soliciting views from outside the team?

Role	Individuals Playing Roles	Topic/Context of Discussion
Definer Initiates discussion		
Analyst Examines issues related to the problem		
Interpreter Translates others' interpretations		
Critic Redefines issues and/or plays devil's advocate		
Synthesizer Finds connections, facilitates closure, and summarizes elements		
Disparity Monitor Assesses how others view the topic		
Task Monitor Keeps group on task		
Emotional Monitor Attends to emotional or personal needs of group members		

not able to play different roles. For example, teams composed predominantly of Critics rarely make progress because they are too busy pointing out flaws. "Real teams," because they have members fulfilling the various roles, are better able to understand the situation they are facing and make better decisions. They are able to analyze problems, seek out solutions, explore how others might perceive their actions, understand potential implications, keep on track, and make people feel valued.

Charting team roles.

To understand who plays which of the above roles, have one person chart the next three team meetings.

Symptoms of a Dysfunctional Team

Not all teams work well. The list of questions on the following page, adapted by Green and McDade (1991) from the work of Heany (1989), might be helpful in diagnosing team problems.

Recognizing Dysfunctional Teams

The following is a checklist to identify dysfunctional habits of teams.

- Do team members view their work as stand-alone tasks? Does work proceed like a relay race—one function must be complete before another begins?
- Can representatives of one functional area contribute to work underway in another area? Or is work completed independently and recounted at a meeting or in a formal report?
- Do problems of quality ignite a search for a guilty party?
- Are finger-pointing and raucous debates common? Do those with the loudest voices dominate meetings? How often do all members of the group speak at a meeting? Are there some members who never seem to speak?
- Are team members overly concerned with avoiding criticism?
- Are members especially conscious of their ranks and positions? How does that affect the team's ability to work together?
- How well-attended are team meetings? Are members often "too busy" to attend sessions, thus signaling a lack of interest in the group?
- How often is the "standard approach" offered as the solution to a problem? How often does a variation of the phrase "that's the way we always do it here" enter the conversation? To what extent are ideas dropped because they do not fit the standard approach? How freely do group members question the basic assumptions or challenge "sacred cows"?

Conclusion: Keeping a Team Productive

While the success of any particular team depends on a number of context-specific factors, leaders can encourage habits that successful teams exhibit. The more productive teams in the ACE project tended to:

- Meet regularly (e.g., every two weeks).
- Continue their efforts over the summer.
- Use public deadlines to get tasks accomplished.
- Make public their results, as well as some of their proceedings.
- Develop multiple avenues for communication with the campus.
- Constantly search for new contributors.
- Take stock of their efforts and reflect upon the strategies that worked and those that did not.

Staying On Course

Addressing some of the following questions will help a team stay on course.

1. What is the team's timetable for meeting? How often? When? What is necessary? Why?
2. How can public deadlines expedite progress?
3. How can new ideas and energy keep flowing into the efforts? How can team members keep from burning out over time?
4. What is the plan for communicating with campus constituents? How many different ways can be used to communicate effectively (and efficiently)?

Chapter 5
Engaging the Campus Community

The challenge for most institutions working to implement campus-wide change lies not in determining what to do, but rather in capturing the attention of those faculty and staff who must act to implement the change. Important constituents have to believe that action is required before they will willingly subscribe to the change. Furthermore, the change has to present a better future, rather than simply a different one, and must improve something considered important, such as the experiences of students or the professional lives of faculty and staff.

This chapter focuses on strategies that campus leaders can use to engage the campus community. These strategies–making a clear and compelling case, crafting a sensible and blame-free change agenda, engaging people via conversations, and making connections–are crucial to engaging the interest and support of the very people who will make the change happen.

Making a Clear and Compelling Case for Change

Change leaders must articulate and frame discussions that explore why a specific change is needed. At different times throughout the change process, different people–trustees, community members, faculty, staff, business leaders or legislators, alumni, and students–must have opportunities to talk together about why the change is or is not a positive step. Doubters and dissenters must have an opportunity to be heard early on because their voices will push the "true believers" to question and clarify their positions, and even to modify them. The critics' early involvement also lessens the chances of other critics jumping in later in the process and derailing it.

Making the case that a change is needed and beneficial in terms that speak both to institutional values and individual aspirations is not about marketing a particular idea or selling a set of solutions, but about engaging people in serious and sustained conversations. This dialogue must convince the campus community that there is a clear and compelling case for change and that doing things differently is not a matter of executing the arbitrary wishes of some leader, group of leaders, or pressure group, but rather that it furthers institutional goals.

There are different approaches to making a clear case for change. A *data-driven approach* relies on data collection and studies to assess the extent of a problem. Enrollment and retention numbers, student outcomes and placement data, and student satisfaction surveys and exit interviews paint a comprehensive picture of an issue. A *qualitative approach* links various factors–what most faculty experience as a series of discrete and well-known "irritations," as one provost calls them–to demonstrate that together they have a substantial negative impact on the institution. Raw information alone is rarely instructive. Rather, the stories that come from the information are what capture people's attention because stories tell people what is important and valued, where the institution has been, and where it is heading.

WHAT WORKS

At the **University of Minnesota,** which was seeking to enhance the first-year experience of students, leaders had to redefine and create systemic structures to enrich the overall experience of first-time students by providing them with opportunities to find balance in their academic, co-curricular, and social lives. This work has created institutional change in how these leaders interact, collaborate, and integrate their services, knowledge, and expertise to serve students better.

They started by designing a new student orientation program, then broadened the project to include a comprehensive review of the first-year experience. A project team of students, staff, faculty, and administrators researched first-year experience programs at peer institutions, and then created benchmarks for the project. The president highlighted the effort in his state-of-the-university address, allocated funds for Freshman Seminars, supported the restructuring of new student orientation into a two-day overnight program, and worked closely with the Office for Student Development and Athletics to re-establish a New Student Convocation.

Making the case in clear and compelling ways often involves many different and concurrent strategies. Examples of formal approaches include the formation of a highly visible ad hoc task force to articulate the problem and publish a report, presentations to the faculty senate and other important bodies, and monthly columns in the campus newspaper or on a web site devoted to the change initiative. Ways of making the case implicitly include continuously engaging in informal conversations and having leaders publicly tie the change initiative to other pressing campus issues in public presentations and dialogues.

Whatever the strategies, members of the campus community must have convincing evidence that the status quo is not satisfactory, as well as opportunities to debate and explore why change is necessary and desirable; they cannot simply be told the way.

Missteps in making the case.

Conger (1998) provides a list of common mistakes people make when they try to persuade. The institutions in the ACE project were not immune to these dangers.

They attempt to make their case with an up-front hard sell. When people start by strongly stating their argument and then through persistence, logic, and exuberance try to sell their idea, any opposition has something tangible to grasp. "In other words, effective persuaders don't begin the process by giving their colleagues a clear target" (Conger, 1998, p. 87).

They resist compromise. Compromise is a central feature of persuasion. It is not a weakness and it has nothing to do with surrender. Compromises often result in better ideas and new, shared decisions. Persuasion includes give-and-take. An even more critical reason for leaders to avoid a hard sell is the importance of people finding their own definitions of the problem as well as their own solutions. If the campus community does not own the change, it is unlikely to happen.

They think the secret to persuasion lies solely in presenting great arguments. Sound arguments are important to changing people's minds, but they are only one component. "Other factors matter just as much, such as the persuader's credibility and his or her ability to create a proper, mutually beneficial frame for a position, connect on the right emotional level with an audience, and communicate through vivid language that makes arguments come alive" (Conger, 1998, p. 87). Although colleges and universities profess to be rational, idea-driven places, good ideas do not always triumph on their merit. Human nature and politics are also important factors.

They assume persuasion is a one-shot effort. Persuasion occurs over time; it is a process. "Persuasion involves listening to people, testing a position, developing a new position that reflects input from the group, more testing, incorporating compromises, and then trying again" (Conger, 1998, p. 87). This process takes time.

Making the Case Convincingly

1. How can "the case" be made to the campus? What approaches worked well in the past?
2. Who will make the case? How? To what extent will the case use data? Will it use anecdotes?
3. Because making a rational case alone is not enough to ensure successful change, what other actions should be taken?

Crafting a Change Agenda that Makes Sense and Does Not Assign Blame

For a change to succeed, it has to make sense to those who will implement it, and at the same time, it has to challenge values and practices that are no longer working. Well-articulated change agendas reinforce and reflect what is important to the institution and its sense of self while pushing the institutional "comfort zone." For example, an institution that has a history and culture of autonomous schools most likely will not successfully adopt a campus-wide template for assessment. The template may work well in some schools, where it fits their expectations and needs, but may not work elsewhere. Proposed changes that fall outside the boundaries of what makes sense will be met with resistance and skepticism.

The change also should be framed in such a way that it does not assign blame. Change often seems threatening to people because they interpret the need for change as an indictment of their current or past knowledge, competence, or performance. Faculty and administrators invest significant time and energy in their institutions—for many, their whole professional lives. Thus, if they believe that the change effort implies shortcomings on their part, it is not surprising that individuals can become defensive or resistant to the change.

Change initiatives should be framed so that they do not make people feel attacked or diminished. For example, several institutions in the ACE project framed their change agendas for enhancing technology in the classroom around improving student learning.

Framing the Change Initiative

Change Initiative	Questions that Invite Reflection and Participation	Statements that Foreclose Possibilities and Imply Blame
Curricular Change	What should a graduate of this institution know and be able to do?	The core curriculum is out of date and does not reflect the needs of today's society or tomorrow's graduates.
Teaching with Technology	How can learning be improved? What can be accomplished through technology? Through other means?	In the next decade, old-fashioned techniques, such as lectures, will have to be eliminated.

Others framed similar agendas around changing faculty teaching methods. The latter met with resistance; the former did not because the focus was on helping students, not blaming professors.

One way to craft a change initiative is to articulate the pressing issues as a series of questions rather than jumping prematurely to "solutions." The question format presents issues in such a way that people want to be involved in constructing responses and devising solutions.

Institutional leaders will find that when questions are posed in open, non-threatening ways, they will elicit many different answers, implying multiple possible avenues of change. Encouraging conversations that forge workable solutions enables an institution to harness creativity as well as to develop ownership for the resulting change initiative.

Widening the Circle of Participation

A major challenge in achieving comprehensive change is developing an ever-widening circle of engagement with the issues and the process. Many change initiatives founder because they remain isolated; a few "true believers" or "early adopters" fail to engage a broad group of participants. Academic change requires grassroots support, which cannot be achieved by fiat or salesmanship. This does not mean that all will become supporters–or even remain neutral–but the aim is to engage as many as possible in conversations about the issues. The enthusiasts will come to the fore quickly. The critics need to be heard, but the key is to have sufficient support and respond positively to legitimate concerns so that the critics cannot paralyze the process.

There are many different ways to engage stakeholders and campus groups in conversations, and the methods chosen will vary depending institutional history and culture, as well as the topic at hand. The following list, though not exhaustive, gives several examples of strategies for engaging faculty, administrators, staff, students, and others.

Articulating a Change Initiative

1. How is the change initiative framed and articulated? How might it be interpreted by various groups on and off campus?
2. Which stakeholders might feel targeted as responsible for the situation or think that the problem is their "fault"? How can such reactions be managed?
3. What solutions are proposed in the change initiative? How might the initiative be re-articulated so it presents questions, not solutions?

Focused discussions.

Discussions focused on particular aspects of the change initiative may involve groups of ten to 30 individuals representing a cross-section of the campus. Faculty and administrators are typically included, and–depending on the campus culture, norms, and topic–students, board members, and alumni may also be invited. Participants are asked to speak and listen as citizens of the campus community, not as representatives of particular groups. Focused discussions can last from several hours or be held over several days. The participants may take part in the whole discussion, or they may flow in and out of the conversation. Focused dialogues are led by a facilitator who helps summarize major points, pushes those involved to think more deeply and build on each other's ideas, and avoids conversational dead-ends.

■ WHAT WORKS

Leaders at **Valencia Community College** in Florida engaged their campus in widespread discussion through a series of 13 focused dialogues in which nearly 300 faculty, staff, and students participated to help define and shape their change initiative, *Collaborating to Become* *a More Learning-Centered Institution.* All of the comments from these dialogues were compiled and circulated college-wide, and all faculty and staff were asked to comment. A truly collaborative decision-making process was put into place, and major changes in student learning outcomes are being achieved.

At **Northeastern University** in Massachusetts, a number of cross-unit interest groups formed to bring faculty together from various departments. These interest groups enabled faculty to develop and refine the *Academic Common Experience,* a new approach to general education that defined common competencies to be integrated into the existing curricula of autonomous schools. Each interest group focused on an aspect of teaching related to one of the academic goals, such as information literacy, ethics, aesthetics, experiential education, and effective writing. In an institutional report as part of the ACE project, group leaders wrote, "Faculty involvement on a grassroots level has substantially helped to implement the *Academic Common Experience* [throughout] the curriculum, for it represents a push for 'buy-in' from the bottom-up."

Retreats.

Retreats can facilitate conversations among a broad range of people. Typically held off campus, retreats provide time away from daily worries to concentrate on larger issues. Retreats may be useful for launching a new change initiative, or revitalizing or modifying the direction of a current initiative. They offer opportunities to bring a diverse group of people together to explore issues from multiple perspectives and try to find new approaches. They may lay the groundwork for future efforts, or they may be used to take stock of what has occurred, why, and its effect.

Retreats may follow a range of formats, from highly structured agendas to nearly open ones that are created as an initial task of the participants. They provide valuable and rare opportunities for people to get to know one another in a relaxed atmosphere and build trust and personal relationships that help people work together when back on campus.

WHAT WORKS

The **University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras,** held two weekend retreats at strategic points in their change process. The retreats were structured to give their project team members "extended time and comfort to do their work," as they wrote in an ACE project report, and to facilitate communication among the various subgroups working on their change initiative, *Reconceptualizing the Baccalaureate Experience.*

Seminars.

Seminars are scholarly inquiries that focus on a specific issue or subtopic of the change initiative (e.g., how students learn or what constitutes global competence). They are useful for beginning a change initiative or giving a mature effort a revitalizing boost because they can present innovative (even controversial) ideas for participants' consideration. Participants may all read and discuss some piece of writing, while considering implications for their campus. Participants (or teams of participants) may produce a series of discussion papers for response by other seminar participants or by the campus community.

Because such seminars are a scholarly process, they draw on the participants' sophisticated skills and strengths, allow them to explore new questions in familiar ways, and lend intellectual substance to the change agenda. They may take place over an intensive weekend or occur throughout a semester, and they can be offered to groups of various sizes–for example, limited only to the change team or open to the entire campus community.

■ **WHAT WORKS**

The team leading the change efforts at **Portland State University** in Oregon organized a research and learning seminar to study "the current state of academic culture and the nature of the academic profession." Their seminar focused on the historical, sociological, and economic aspects of being a faculty member, specifically in the context of an urban university. Their common readings included current criticisms of higher education, as well as discussion papers written by team members.

Symposia.

Symposia are campus-wide meetings that revolve around a presentation or a collection of papers on a common topic. Some campuses organized events that included a prominent speaker and some type of facilitated conversations. The speakers provoked ideas and catalyzed thinking; the follow-up conversations, either in plenary sessions or smaller groups, allowed participants to further explore ideas and implications. Symposia may last a few hours or all day, depending on the purpose, the time available, and the speakers.

■ **WHAT WORKS**

Leaders at **Stephen F. Austin University** in Texas sponsored three campus-wide symposia focusing on issues related to their change agenda, *Revitalizing Faculty, Staff and Administration*. Each symposium featured a nationally prominent speaker. Following the speech, organizers held small group conversations to discuss ideas presented by the speaker. Summaries of the discussion were posted on the institution's web site to continue the dialogue on an electronic "posting page." Organizers wrote in one institutional report: "Colleagues began talking about change and the actions we needed to take at SFA. Individuals and groups began to step forward to spearhead new efforts."

Town meetings.

Town meetings allow the entire community to engage in a broad discussion and debate on a range of ideas designed to move the institution to a new level of understanding and consensus. Periodic town meetings may help leaders gauge the campus climate, hear feedback, and share ideas.

■ **WHAT WORKS**

Olivet College in Michigan held a campus-wide town meeting to craft its *Campus Compact,* a guiding statement for the college related to its institutional change initiative, *Education for Individual and Social Responsibility.* The day-long meeting, held in the gymnasium, allowed students, faculty, staff, and trustees to further define the institutional vision related to the change initiative and to "formulate a set of principles about what it means to be a responsible member of the college community."

Centenary College in Louisiana held three town meetings (open to students, trustees administrators, and faculty). The first meeting helped the campus reach consensus on the challenges facing the college and the nature of the change initiative, while the other two meetings furthered its change process, *Quality Teaching and Scholarship.*

Engaging people in conversations does not require formal, structured experiences. Useful exchanges can occur informally over dinner, through hallway conversations, or at regularly scheduled meetings.

Strategies to Engage the Campus		
Type of Conversation	**Length**	**Participants**
Focused Dialogues	Two hours to two days	Representatives (ten to 30) from various on-campus groups
Retreats	One to two days	Representatives (20 to 100) from on-campus and off-campus groups
Seminars	Several hours	Varies from small, targeted team to widely diverse group
Symposia	Several hours	Entire campus or a selected group
Town Meetings	Several hours	Entire campus

WHAT WORKS

At **Seton Hall University** in New Jersey, the project team used e-mail to communicate with the campus, distributing its meeting minutes and key project announcements to the entire faculty. "E-mail came in handy and made it easy to keep the entire university informed of the nature of the project and the progress we made.… We disseminated a detailed and often extensive summary of the deliberations of the project team over our campus-wide information system to everybody in the university willing to take an interest in the activities of the project team," team members noted in a report to ACE.

Change leaders can encourage participation in campus-wide conversations in many ways. A personal invitation to participate from the president or chief academic officer sends a message that the event is important. Follow-up reminders–by phone for smaller groups or via e-mail for larger groups–are helpful. Finally, running on skeletal staffs and using blocks of time when no classes are scheduled will enable as many people as possible to attend a campus-wide event.

Making Connections

Creating linkages among related activities leads to fresh conversations that generate new ideas and strengthen shared purposes. They help create and sustain energy needed for the change effort to continue and evolve.

Connections within the institution can link together a variety of small initiatives whose collective impact is more than the sum of the parts. Several departments may be working to improve teaching, or individual faculty across the institution may be pioneers with technology in the classroom. Linking these disparate efforts can provide additional energy and ideas. Helping groups become connected overcomes a sense of isolation, creates synergy, provides multiple opportunities

Conversations that Work

1. What types of conversations has the institution used in the past (focused dialogues, seminars, retreats, town meetings)? What were the effects of those processes?
2. Around what topics might conversations be conducted? Are they central to the desired objectives?
3. How might conversations be structured? What has to happen to make them successful?

for participation, and allows people to benefit from the trials and learning of others.

Institutions can also look outside themselves to create useful linkages. Energy created by external connections to other institutions, funding agencies, and national efforts provides an additional impetus to undertake change and helps sustain momentum for change currently underway.

Understanding how the issues of a particular institution are tied to those of higher education regionally, nationally, and internationally can help institutions overcome the effects of insularity that impede movement. Outside connections lead to new conversations that help develop new solutions to old problems, build camaraderie with fellow change leaders elsewhere, explore operating assumptions, and form neutral testing grounds for ideas. These connections help set important public deadlines and lend a degree of external accountability and legitimacy to an institution's change agenda.

WHAT WORKS

The **State University of New York at Geneseo,** under the umbrella of its change initiative, *Reforming the Undergraduate Curriculum,* presented some of the results of its change initiative at a National Science Foundation regional conference that, as leaders noted in an institutional report, "provided a springboard for focusing faculty attention on learning and technology."

Kent State University in Ohio built linkages among several campus activities related to its initiative to *Reconceptualize Faculty Roles and Rewards,* which in turn were tied to national and regional projects that stimulated one another. In one report, participants wrote, "The mutually reinforcing roles of the Kent Pew Roundtable, the Kent AAHE peer review of teaching teams, and the Kent, ACE, and Michigan State University/Pew project steering committees… have all contributed to the notable progress the university has made on its ACE project change issue." As a result, Kent State's revised tenure and promotion policies moved the concept of the teacher-scholar into practice.

Making Connections Explicit

1. What different initiatives currently are underway on campus that relate to the change agenda?
2. How can the institution become aware of other initiatives?
3. How can the team work with those other campus groups?
4. What are the best ways to approach those currently working on other initiatives?
5. How can connections be created outside the institution? What groups, consortia, or foundations are working in similar areas?

Conclusion: The Benefits of Conversations

Skeptics argue that higher education's culture and values of collegiality and widespread discussion are merely clever diversions from the hard work of change. They charge that faculty members would rather talk anything to death than act and that they are expert at stalling decisions through their insistence on involvement. Although every campus has its eloquent change resisters, conversations are not just a stalling strategy; they are critical to the change process. Conversations help broaden acceptance of new ideas or proposed changes, help refine ideas, and facilitate the implementation process.

In colleges and universities, effectively managed conversations are an important strategy for engaging a critical mass of support. Excessive conversations can become distractions, a form of "work avoidance," when they "divert attention from the issues on the table and diminish a sense of shared responsibility" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 38). Thus, leaders have to be careful that the conversations they prompt lead to action and do not become an end in themselves.

A crucial step in implementing institution-wide change is expanding the group of supporters from the few (the president or administrative and faculty leaders) to the many (a critical mass of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and other interested groups). Through the process of informed and energetic conversation, a change permeates a campus by getting others excited about and moving toward change.

Conversations also help refine ideas. By continually being the focus of conversations, ideas become more clearly articulated and better conceptualized. Adding new participants to the conversations challenges assumptions and introduces new expertise and viewpoints. In the end, through engagement and collaborative conversations, ideas improve.

Chapter 6
Deploying Resources: Money, Time, and Attention

No institution ever has enough financial or human resources to do all it wants to do or all it believes it should do to enhance quality. While the concept of insufficient resources is a relative one, with some institutions having much greater constraints than others, the key for all is strategic deployment of time, money, and attention, and making choices among worthy competitors for scarce resources.

Intentional institutional change adds yet another complication to everyday resource constraints. Most often, change is an add-on, requiring that good campus citizens find the extra time to serve on committees and task forces, and that new financial resources be found to support new activities. But at some point, the add-on approach ceases to be useful. People become tired of the extra load and return to other priorities.

The institution does not have the luxury of unlimited funds. While start-up funds can get a new idea rolling and the novelty makes it interesting, ultimately the new initiative must be able to sustain attention and become part of the ongoing budget or it will die.

This section considers three types of resources: time, attention, and money. Each of these is central to the change process and must be intentionally and strategically directed to ensure the success of a change initiative.

Time as a Resource

Finding the time required to initiate and sustain a major change is difficult. Administrators and faculty lead very hectic professional lives. To make progress on change, campus leaders must find time to invest in new projects. And because most are unable to make the day 25 hours long, time has to be reallocated; something must give. An additional task for leaders is to convince other people to dedicate some of their precious time to the change initiative, which will happen only if it is connected in meaningful ways to their interests and becomes their personal priority.

Leaders either can find people who already hold the change effort as a high

Finding Time for Institutional Change

Restructuring time is difficult, as others try to commandeer calendars and influence priorities.

1. What percent of the change leaders' time is dedicated to the change initiative? Should it be more? Should it be less? What can be done to make the needed adjustments?
2. Who should be spending time working on this change effort? To what extent do they allot adequate time? What can be done to enable them to spend more (or less) time on the change initiative?
3. How long are people willing to undertake a leadership role in the change initiative and what might they have to give up during that time? What will they gain by participating?
4. What time can they devote to reading and thinking about the change issue (preferably out of the office)?
5. How flexible are their "top priorities"? How might they shift their commitments to spend more time on specific issues?

priority, or they can help people reconfigure their priorities so that individual and institutional priorities become aligned–a much more difficult challenge. An example of the former strategy is to identify faculty already "techno-savvy" to help lead an initiative on improving teaching and learning through technology.

Recruiting more reluctant people into the work of change is a more difficult challenge. How do change leaders make a particular issue or set of issues a priority for others? How can other people find the time necessary to think through the issues, gather the data, conduct campus conversations, and shepherd a change initiative? The following suggestions might be helpful.

Widening the Circle of Change Agents

Leaders need to help others find the requisite time to spend on institutional change. Consider the following strategies.

1. Provide release time or temporary support staff to people who are shouldering significant leadership responsibility for the change initiative.
2. Impose and respect deadlines so people do not feel trapped on a committee that never finishes its work.
3. Ensure broad participation so that a few individuals do not carry most of the burden. (This may be difficult in small institutions or those with high percentages of part-time faculty; consider adding non-academic staff to work groups.)
4. Send teams of people to regional or national conferences on the issues.
5. Conduct a retreat devoted solely to the change issue.
6. Devote regular time to the change agenda at every staff, department, or senate meeting.

Attention as a Resource

Campus leaders focus people's attention on change by constantly speaking about the issues, asking for periodic assessments of progress, and providing updates in committee reports or in the campus newspaper. They also provide moral and tangible support for initiatives tied to the change agenda.

Focusing attention serves several purposes. First, it demonstrates the importance of an issue, claiming it as an institutional priority worthy of time and resources. Second, when leaders focus attention, they help define a common reality. Birnbaum (1992) notes that different people on campus have different "takes" on the same events; they see different actors at different moments in time, and draw different conclusions. "The function of leadership is to give the organizational audience a more pointed and consistent view" of what is occurring (Birnbaum, 1992, p. 13). Third, focusing attention helps people tackle tough problems that require sustained effort (Heifetz, 1994). Leaders keep campus attention centered so that the institution is not tempted to avoid the difficult work of change, but instead honestly confronts what is not working.

WHAT WORKS

To emphasize the importance of their initiative, four participants from the project team at **Kent State University** in Ohio participated in a panel discussion on *Abbreviated Responsibility-Centered Management,* a portion of their change initiative, at an American Association for Higher Education Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards. In turn, they planned on-campus presentations for the president's cabinet, deans, and additional faculty from units participating in the initial phase of the project. Following these presentations, a number of changes in budgetary management shifted the institution toward greater unit responsibility.

To help capture attention, leaders at **Stephen F. Austin University** published weekly guest editorials in the local community

Focusing Attention on What Matters

1. How can campus attention be focused on the change initiative? What vehicles (on or off campus) might be useful? What strategies have worked in the past to capture campus attention?
2. What distractions can be curtailed that may tempt people to avoid the work of change?

newspaper about their change initiative, *Revitalizing Students, Faculty and Staff.* They also used a web page to communicate with the campus by periodically posting new ideas and asking for comments.

Money as a Resource

Change has inevitable monetary costs; new programs, new equipment, and additional staff require hard dollars. There are real costs associated with supporting meetings, release time, and summer stipends. Institutional change efforts also typically require investment in course and program development, support services, and faculty development.

Monetary support for change can come from new monies or reallocation of existing resources. New monies have the advantage of providing external validation of the change initiative without stressing the existing budget. The obvious disadvantage is that gifts and grants are usually finite in duration, and eventually hard money must support the effort. Many institutions in the ACE project used external funding to jump-start an effort. Some had a series of foundation grants to support various aspects of the initiative; one used some of its quasi-endowment funds to invest in the change agenda. For many institutions, small grants from discretionary funds held by presidents and provosts went a long way in providing incentives, supporting meetings, and generally affirming the importance of the task at hand.

The impact of small amounts of money cannot be overstated. Small summer stipends of $2,000 helped faculty produce new courses and use technology. Trips to national meetings helped energize faculty and connect them with other change agents and new ideas. These modest investments reaped big benefits because they sent the strong message that faculty time has value.

Ultimately, the values and priorities of an institution are embedded in its budget. Sometimes, reworking a program may incur few added costs; the pieces are simply rearranged. Other times, change requires reallocating funds. An important indicator of the durability of the change is the extent to which it becomes reflected in the budget of the institution.

WHAT WORKS

At **Seton Hall University,** the president set aside funds for requests stemming from the initiatives pursued as part of the change effort. Some of the money was reallocated from within the divisions and some came from the quasi-endowment spending approved by the board. For example, the English Department was given the resources to hire five new full-time and four part-time faculty when the department decided to restructure freshman writing as part of its initiative to *Transform the Learning Experience of the First 18 Months.* Another element of the institution's change initiative was a summer faculty development program that provided new technology and summer stipends for participants.

In their final project report, change leaders at **Ball State University** in Indiana, who worked on *Defining, Refining, and Implementing the Teacher-Scholar Model Through Technology,* wrote: "We believe it was the way the resources were used as much as the fact that they were available that helped shape change. Initially, we invested in our faculty. There was no top-down agenda for how technology should be used, how departments should change curricula, or what technology should be purchased. The initial funds were invested in departments, in workshops, in technology that the faculty selected, and in an infrastructure that could support a wide variety of technology initiatives. Faculty who showed interest were supported, but none was directed to do anything. As a result, a wide variety of initiatives were going on at the same time in a wide variety of disciplines."

Investing Institutional Resources Wisely

1. From what new sources might money be found to support the change initiative? How might the institution learn about potential funding sources?
2. How might money be reallocated internally? What are the implications of reallocation? Who might protest against this change?