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Critics of higher education urge educators to transform their institutions so as to align them with the needs of the twenty-first-century learner. However, colleges desiring to survive in a rapidly changing external environment often discover they must first find a way to make fundamental changes in their institutional culture. Some of the external forces driving change include increased competition from nontraditional and traditional providers, new technologies, changing student preferences, the erosion of cost and convenience as a competitive advantage, tightening resources, and an emerging focus that places learning at the heart of the academic enterprise.

A review of the literature suggests that this topic is a primary concern of many colleges. Yet, few colleges have gotten beyond the
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ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSFORMATION: LESSONS LEARNED
BY ONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Rationale for the Study

Several external forces are driving change in higher education. Increased competition from nontraditional as well as traditional providers, new technologies, changing student expectations, the erosion of cost and convenience as a competitive advantage, and tightening resources all play a role. Transformation is a primary issue for many colleges (Alfred & Carter, 1997; Daigle, 1994; Penrod & Dolence, 1992; "To Dance With Change," 1994). Seldom does change occur without both external inducements combined with a sense of internal discontent (Conner, 1992; Hasenfeld, 1983; Levy & Merry, 1986; "To Dance With Change," 1994).

Increased Competition

Competitors are fast at work reshaping the postsecondary education market. Six in particular have a significant effect on education design and delivery, yet have not been met with adequate
responses from community colleges. They include: (a) companies and
corporations providing on-site programs for current and future workers;
(b) corporate giants in the communication industry with a capability for
distance delivery into homes, workplaces, shopping centers, and areas
where people congregate; (c) supplementary education providers, such as
private tutoring companies, which use proven techniques to produce
positive learning outcomes in students; (d) K-12 schools partnering with
business and industry to prepare work-ready youth; (e) temporary
agencies using training programs to prepare flexible workers for many
different jobs; and (f) other traditional 2-year community colleges and 4-
year universities (Alfred & Carter, 1996).

These competitors are challenging community colleges by creating
value in ways that surpass what is currently being offered by community
colleges. With their emphasis on open admission and accessibility,
community colleges provide low-cost, high-quality education. However,
in addition to cost and quality, these competitors are creating value
through time (course length, times offered) and convenience (distance
delivery). Value in this context can be defined as the ability of one
educational provider over another to meet students' needs measured by
cost, quality, time, and convenience. To succeed in a market that
includes both traditional and nontraditional education providers, the
community colleges will need to provide value equal to or greater than its competitors.

New Technologies

The emergence of new technologies creates opportunities for new instructional and service-delivery methods for community colleges that are able to make the investment. Cables made of fiber-optic material, combined with digital video encoding devices enable clearer, faster delivery than ever before. In addition to data and voice, these systems deliver video, and because the capacity is so great, they also provide two-way video capability. The old course-delivery methods using broadcast and cable can now literally be delivered directly from classroom to the home in real time.

The future impact of these new technologies, combined with two-way video and audio through fiber optics, opens a new world of education delivery. Educational delivery and management is possible where the student can be any place and course material can be presented in several forms. The different formats enable the student to grasp the information more easily (English, 1994). The remote site is no longer so remote (Parnell, 1990). Investment in new technologies is essential for community colleges to compete in the future.
Changing Student Expectations

Students have become increasingly diverse as defined by: ethnicity (Hispanic, African American, Asian, Native American), disability, age, and gender. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1994), about 47% of all minorities in college attend community colleges, and more then half of higher education students with disabilities attend public community colleges. Nearly two thirds of community college students are older than the traditional age of 21. Women make up 58% of the enrollment at community colleges.

In addition, community college student populations are made up of dual and single parents, part- and full-time, working and nonworking, all with special needs for support services and instructional-delivery formats. As community colleges attempt to maintain open access to education opportunities, they must also address the support-service needs of increasingly diverse student populations.

These increasingly diverse student populations also have changing expectations (Alfred, 1995, p. 2):

1. Students as "consumers" are choosing college as a product based on price, quality and convenience.

2. Students are frustrated with traditional classes that do not fit their schedules and learning styles.
3. Students want learning that has relevance beyond the classroom.

4. Students need technological skills as an imperative inside and beyond the classroom.

5. Students want a guarantee they’ll have a job when they finish college.

Erosions of Cost and Convenience
As a Competitive Advantage

Businesses have increased the quality of customer service to stay competitive; in doing so, they establish new levels of expectations for college service functions. As colleges struggle for competitive advantage, they must examine new ways to compete and improve service and responsiveness.

Increasingly, colleges recognize that administrative and bureaucratic functions, rules, and regulations can be eliminated with no corresponding reduction in quality of service or program. Competitive advantage grows from improvement, innovations, and change (Penrod & Dolence, 1992).
Tightening Resources

Although state appropriations for 1999-2000 increased 7%, the biggest rise of the 1990s (Schmidt, 1999), figures show that state spending on colleges continues to be closely tied to economic cycles and fluctuates widely as tax revenues rise or fall within changing economic conditions. Most states have managed to repair the substantial damage done to their higher education budgets by the recession of the early 1990s. However, because higher education is one of the few remaining areas within state budgets for which spending is discretionary, lawmakers tend to raid college budgets when they need to reduce spending to respond to a deteriorating fiscal picture. These fluctuations in state appropriations, combined with decreasing parental and student ability to pay higher tuition (Gose, 1998), have constrained the revenues of colleges and universities. Compounding the revenue squeeze are the ever-growing operational costs of the 1990s, including faculty and staff salaries, fringe benefits, technological investments, deferred maintenance coming due, and other capital expenditures (Dougherty, Kidwell, Knight, Hubbell, & Rush, 1994).

In addition to these external forces, the world economy is in the midst of a transition from the industrial age to the information technology age, and as a result the environment for community colleges
and all of higher education is even more complex (Dougherty et al., 1994).

According to Dolence and Norris (1995),

The information technology age is an epoch where higher education could occupy a pivotal role in society. Demand for learning is expected to skyrocket, but resources available under existing models for educational delivery are expected to remain fairly static. Fresh vision is needed to create new delivery systems for learning, new paradigms for financing, and new models for higher education. (p. 7)

Community colleges have no choice but to undergo massive change in how they are organized, how they make decisions, and how they deliver programs and services to compete in a tough and rapidly changing market. They will need to regenerate or reinvent their core processes (activities that enable a college to provide a specific benefit to students/customers) to compete in the future. However, most community colleges have bureaucratic organizational structures that stifle individual creativity and institutional speed in responding to change by centralizing authority in the hands of top administrators (Alfred, 1995). In order for community colleges to be responsive to rapidly changing market conditions, leadership and decision-making must be distributed throughout the organization (Alfred & Carter, 1996).
Overview of Bureaucratic Theory

Organizations that are designed and operated as if they were machines are usually called bureaucracies. Early in the twentieth century, ideas and developments were synthesized into a comprehensive theory of organization and management regarding the nature of bureaucracy. One major contributor to bureaucratic theory was the German sociologist Max Weber. Weber observed the parallels between the mechanization of industry and the proliferation of bureaucratic forms of organization. He noted that the bureaucratic form routinizes the process of administration exactly as the machine routinizes production.

It was through Weber's work that the first comprehensive definition of bureaucracy was developed. Bureaucracy was defined as a form of organization that emphasizes precision, speed, clarity, regularity, reliability, and efficiency achieved through the creation of a fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations. (Morgan, 1997, p. 17)

Weber was concerned about the social consequences of the proliferation of bureaucracy and saw that the bureaucratic approach had the potential to routinize and mechanize almost every aspect of human life, eroding the human spirit and capacity for spontaneous action (Hasenfeld, 1983).

Mechanistically structured organizations have great difficulty adapting to changing circumstances because they are designed to achieve
predetermined goals; they are not designed for innovation. Changing circumstances call for different kinds of action and response. Flexibility and capacities for creative action become more important than narrow efficiency. It becomes more important to do the right thing in a way that is timely and good enough than to do the wrong thing well or the right thing too late. In these respects, mechanistic organizations fall victim to the kind of segmentalism that, as Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1983) and others have shown, plagues so many modern corporations. The compartmentalization created by mechanistic division between different hierarchical levels, functions, roles, and people tends to create barriers and stumbling blocks.

For example, when new problems arise they are often ignored because there are no ready-made responses. Or they are approached in a fragmented rather than a holistic way so that they can be tackled through existing organizational policies, procedures, and patterns of expertise. But standardized procedures and channels of communication are often unable to deal effectively with new circumstances, necessitating numerous ad hoc meetings and committees, which, because they have to be planned to fit rather than disrupt the normal mode of operation, are often too slow or too late for dealing with issues. Problems of inaction and lack of coordination thus become rife. In such
circumstances the organization frequently becomes clogged with backlogs of work because normal routine has been disrupted, and complex issues float up the organizational hierarchy as members at each level find in turn that they are unable to solve them. On the way, information often gets distorted as people hide errors and the true nature and magnitude of problems for fear of being held responsible for them. Those in command of the organization thus frequently find themselves facing issues that are inappropriately defined, and which they have no real idea of how to approach. They are often forced to delegate them to special task forces or team of staff experts or consultants, who, since they are often remote from the concrete problems being experienced, further increase the delay and inadequacy of response (Morgan, 1997).

Mechanistic approaches to organization have proved incredibly popular, partly because of their efficiency in the performance of tasks that can be successfully routinized and partly because they offer managers the promise of tight control over people and their activities. In stable times, the approach worked from a managerial point of view. But with the increasing pace of social and economic change, the limitations have become more and more obvious.

As we enter the twenty-first century, we find bureaucracies and other modes of mechanistic organization coming under increasing attack
because of their rigidities and other dysfunctional consequences. The total quality management (TQM) and emphasis on flexible, team-based organizations that came into prominence in the 1980s and 1990s signaled an early response to these problems and the need to find other nonmechanical ways of organizing. From a historical perspective, the mechanistic approach to organization belongs to the mechanical age. Now that we are entering an age with a completely new technological base drawing on microelectronics, new organizational principles are becoming important (Morgan, 1989, 1997).

Overview of High-Performing Work System Theory

Theorists and researchers of high-performance work organizations use various phrases to describe its features: high skills, high wages, self-managed teams, restructuring, reengineering, reinventing. The most common characteristics are described by Kerka (1995) as:

1. Flatter, horizontal structure instead of vertical hierarchy.
2. Work performed by teams organized around processes; teams empowered to make decisions so management is decentralized and participative.
3. Empowered workers with high skill levels and cross-training; rewards for team performance.
4. Collaboration among teams, between labor and management, with suppliers.

5. Focus on customers, quality, and continuous improvement.

6. Utilize flexible technologies.

The new work organizations are networked and interdependent; they feature inspirational leadership rather than micromanagement. Often the new work organizations are characterized by extraordinarily capable people working in teams, equipped with proper technology, focused on satisfying customers and improving performance (White, 1994).

Two distinct models of high-performance work organizations are emerging in the United States: (a) lean production, which relies on centralized coordination, top-down total quality management, and reengineering; and (b) team production, in which empowered workers make decisions and produce innovations. The most successful high-performance work organizations are those that have combined the best features of lean and team production with innovative human-resource and labor-relations practices (Appelbaum & Batt, 1994).

Some obstacles to becoming a high-performance organization are ingrained in the U.S. system: The infrastructure still supports mass production, incentives keep managers focused on the short term and the
bottom line, and many organizations remain more accountable to stockholders than to more broadly defined stakeholders (students/customers, employees, suppliers). There is also the very human resistance to change. Many horizontal organizations are still being managed with a vertical mindset, and when available resources decline the pendulum swings back to autocratic management (Galagan, 1994).

The fundamental resource of any economy is people. The qualities demanded of higher performance workers include (a) the ability to create, extend, and apply knowledge; (b) sophisticated skills; (c) adaptability and flexibility; (d) change management; and (e) the ability to work in teams of diverse people. These qualities are also needed to solve the economic and social problems created when an organization utilizes a high-performance workforce.

The following are common principles of high-performing work organizations (Alfred, 1995; Penrod & Dolence, 1992):

**Competitive:** focus on strategies to increase competitiveness of the organization through adjustment to dynamic changes in market.

**Decentralized:** emphasis on a flattened hierarchy and streamlined staffing to develop nimble organization strategies.
Empowerment/owner mindset: considerable effort spent on delegating decision-making power to staff. Empowered staff view the organization from the perspective of a stakeholder, not hired help.

Teamwork: preference for the use of teams to solve problems through the interaction of ideas and skills to develop innovative products.

Speed/flexibility: organization-wide emphasis on rapid response to market changes through streamlined structures and flexible staff.

Continuous learning: ongoing commitment to gathering information about the organization and its markets at all levels of the organization as a strategy for innovation and renewal.

Information sharing: commitment to sharing information about financial matters and critical success factors as a strategy for getting staff to take ownership of projects and be accountable for performance.

Core competency focus: focus on building excellence in a small number of competencies as a method for cutting costs and limiting investment requirement.

Seamless/boundaryless: close working relationships with suppliers and customers to ensure constant awareness of market needs.

Customer service emphasis: continuous effort to determine customer needs and satisfaction as a strategy for improving service.
*Visionary leadership:* leaders articulate vision, are engaged in its implementation, and frequently interact with staff to turn vision into reality.

*Market foresight:* commitment to anticipating market needs and forecasting changes as a strategy to "get to the future first."

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of the study was to investigate and describe the efforts of one community college to develop and implement transformational change. More specifically, this research sought to discover the factors and strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process. What are the key elements necessary to implement successful change? Barriers to change may be structural (involving how work is performed, organizational structure, and reporting relationships), cultural (core values, attitudes, and philosophies), or political (involving difficulties in managing conflicts and differences effectively). How does a community college overcome these barriers to change?

This study describes one community college's efforts to transform from a traditional bureaucratic organization to a high-performance work system characterized by cross-functional work teams, increased
employee involvement in decision-making, and shared leadership. Through the study, methods illustrating how the community college built the capacity for ongoing change became apparent.

This study is limited to one community college. Focusing on one community college facilitates gathering the broadest range of information to increase the trustworthiness of the results. However, the results are bound to the context within which they are identified.

**Significance of the Study**

Given the elements identified in the above introduction about increased competition from nontraditional and traditional providers, new technologies, changing student expectations, the erosions of cost and convenience as a competitive advantage, and tightening resources, it is understandable why major changes in community colleges' programs, services, and delivery systems will be needed to overtake competitors. Deliberate change (alteration in the allocation of resources, distribution of power, and the internal structure) in an organization requires planning, the commitment of institutional participants, development of methods to deal with institutional culture (coping with the legacy of the past), and a system of monitoring, evaluating, and adjusting the change process (Levin, 1996).
The outcomes and successes of the change process in organizations are not clear in organizational literature (Goodman & Dean, 1982). Organizational theorists (Hasenfeld, 1983; Levy & Merry, 1986) have identified external and internal forces that enable change. External forces include shifts in political sentiments, legislative and governmental policies, funding patterns, client characteristics and needs, and service technologies. Internal forces include strategic choices, human creativity and innovation, inner conflicts, emergence of new needs and new belief systems, and the inner urge or tendency of organizations to grow. Even with the presence of these forces, there is the suggestion that fundamental, enduring change (Smith, 1982) may not occur unless those aspects that shape and perpetuate an organization are also changed (Levin, 1996). Organizational values, beliefs, rituals, and methods of sense-making, what organizational theorists (Morgan, 1997; Schein, 1992) have referred to as organizational cultures, function to preserve organizational patterns of behavior (Tierney, 1988a).

Studying organizational change in a community college is a valuable endeavor; it enables educators to describe, explain, understand, and perhaps even predict behavior within institutions of higher education. A review of the literature and current periodicals suggests that this topic is on the forefront of many colleges’ agenda. Yet, few
colleges have gotten beyond the design stage and realized the successful implementation of the improvements that were desired (Cooper & Kempner, 1993; Levin, 1996). This study describes how a community college developed the capacity to realize change and the difficulties encountered with implementation.

The lessons that can be drawn from this study may be relevant to community colleges that are confronted with similar challenges. The need is especially evident if one believes that community colleges must fundamentally change their core processes and administrative structures to compete in the future. According to Alfred and Carter (1996), "to compete in the future, community colleges will need to challenge their own orthodoxies to get beyond established ways of designing and delivering education" (p. 16). Through this study, community colleges can learn how one community college attempted to remove structural, cultural, and political impediments to organization transformation.

**Research Design and Methods**

All research designs can be discussed in terms of their relative strengths and limitations. The merits of a particular design are inherently related to the rationale for selecting it as the most appropriate plan for addressing the research problem. Qualitative case studies are
particularistic in that they focus on a specific situation or phenomenon; they are descriptive; and they are heuristic--that is, they offer insights into the phenomenon under study and rely heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources. Qualitative data, rich in descriptions of people, places, and conversations, are not easily handled by statistical procedures. Since qualitative investigators are concerned with understanding behavior from the subject’s own frame of reference, they tend to collect their data through sustained contact with people in settings where subjects normally spend their time. As a result, participant observation and in-depth interviews are considered exemplary means for collecting qualitative data. Qualitative methods are a natural extension of other human activities, such as looking, listening, speaking, and reading. These activities are naturally related to research methods such as observing, interviewing, reviewing documents, and interpreting.

Qualitative case-study research design was selected for this study because it represented the best approach for gathering data on a community college that had articulated its immersion in a transformational change process. In addition, the majority of organizational change studies, according to the literature, have been qualitative in nature and have involved interpretive methods. The purpose of documenting this study was to gain an in-depth
understanding, and expand the knowledge base of change processes in education, rather than to test hypotheses.

Participant observation was the major means of collecting data for this case study. The investigator in this study was a participant observer and organization member assigned the role of project manager for this change initiative. This research method gave a firsthand account of the situation under study and, when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allowed for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being investigated. Participant observation is the technique of choice when behavior can be observed firsthand or when people cannot or will not discuss the research topic. Even so, there may be problems with the data collected. Most acute are the biases an investigator brings to the situation. Overall, however, there is no substitute for the participant observer. To maximize the trustworthiness of the findings and reduce bias, the investigator gathered data over a prolonged period (4 years) at one community college. Data gathering involved participant observation, unstructured interviews, extended conversations, and documentary methods, so that the broadest range of information could be gathered. In addition, participants in the study were invited to correct, clarify, or comment on the accounts reported in this study. These data-gathering methods were appropriate procedures to
deal with the complex interaction between the topic, investigator, and study site.

The dominant mode of data analysis utilized a chronological approach for describing the results. By chronologically delineating the various phases of the transformational change process, the investigator sought to trace events over time and to determine any causal relationships. The phases (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) formed the structure for describing the study. The analyses in this study were ongoing, open-ended and inductive, involving thick description (thoroughly documented data) and constant comparative analysis (comparing multiple sources of data to find connections that support a theme, hypotheses, assertion, or conclusion). A complete description of the research design and data-gathering methods can be found in Chapter III.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

Chapter II contains a review of the literature relevant to this study. This chapter describes and characterizes planned/managed change, first- and second-order change, and organizational transformation. Transformation theories are reviewed as well as
literature on sustaining change. Finally, literature is reviewed related to organizational change in education.

Chapter III presents justification for and description of the study design. Included in this chapter is a review of the rationale for choosing qualitative research, the rationale for selecting case-study research design, and a description of methods used to gather and analyze data.

Chapter IV highlights data that relate directly to the study purpose. The chapter includes: (a) a description of the community college's history; (b) a description of the developments that led up to the study; and (c) a description of key elements in the change process, discussed chronologically in three phases--explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation.

Chapter V forms conclusions about the study and study results. It includes a summary of the study, discussion of findings, implications for higher education practice, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter includes a review of literature that defines planned/managed, first- and second-order change, and organizational transformation. Theoretical perspectives are examined, such as the evolution of living systems, from which transformation theory draws its roots. Emphasis is provided on why organizations change and what is the driving force of radical (second-order) or transformational change. A focus is devoted to articles and books in higher education relating to organizational change, with a special emphasis on literature relating to organizational change in community colleges. Additional related literature is referenced throughout the presentation of data and findings in Chapter IV.

Planned/Managed Change

The concepts of planned change and managed change refer to changes that are deliberately shaped by the organization members (managers, consultants, groups). According to Creamer and Creamer (1986) planned change is an intentional effort to modify organizational goals, authority structures, program activities, and the normative culture of a college or university, including values, attitudes, beliefs and
behaviors of employees. What distinguishes between the two concepts of planned and managed change is the category of staff to which they refer. Planned change usually refers to how experts, outside or inside the organization, can help the organization cope with difficulties, as well as plan and implement desired changes. Managed change usually refers to how managers can plan and implement changes. Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) have distinguished between spontaneous or evolutionary change, fortuitous or accidental change, and planned change. The first two types are unplanned. The characteristics that distinguish planned change from other forms of organizational change include:

1. A deliberate, purposeful, and explicit decision to engage in a program of change.
2. Reflecting a process of change.
3. External and internal expertise.
4. A strategy of collaboration and power sharing (power derived from knowledge, skills, and competencies) between the expert and the client system.

First- and Second-Order Change

Within planned/managed change there can be first-order change or second-order change. Levy and Merry (1986) and Torbert (1989)
provide the following definitions and characteristics that create a framework for distinguishing between the two types of change:

First-order change involves minor incremental improvements and adjustments that do not change the system’s core; first-order change occurs as the system naturally grows and develops. The characteristics of first-order change include:

1. A change in one or a few dimensions, components, or aspects.
2. A change in one or a few levels (individual and group levels).
3. Change in one or two behavioral aspects (attitudes, values).
4. A quantitative change.
5. A change in content.
6. Continuity, improvements, and development in the same direction.
7. Incremental change.
8. Change that is logical and rational.
9. Change that does not alter the world view, the paradigm.
10. Change within the old state of being (thinking and acting).

Second-order change is a multidimensional, multilevel, qualitative, discontinuous, radical organizational change involving a paradigmatic shift. Second-order change characteristics include:
1. Multidimensional, multicomponent, and multiaspectual change.

2. Multilevel change (individual, groups, the whole organization).

3. Changes in all the behavioral aspects (attitudes, norms, values, perceptions, beliefs, world view, behaviors).

4. A qualitative change.

5. A change in context.

6. Discontinuity, taking a new direction.

7. Revolutionary jumps.

8. Seemingly irrational change, based on different logic.

9. Change resulting in a new world view, a new paradigm.

10. Change resulting in a new state of being (thinking and acting).

The process of second-order planned change usually starts when needs, problems, crises, or opportunities are recognized by means of threshold phenomena. Organizational transformation is another way of referring to second-order change.

**Organizational Transformation**

Organizational transformation is a completely new field of practice and theory, and deals with a radical, basic, total change in an organization, in contrast with improving the organization and developing it or some of its parts. Transformation often deals with a condition in
which an organization cannot continue functioning as before. In order to continue to exist, it needs a drastic reshuffling in every dimension of its existence: its mission, goals, structure, culture. Some call this second-order change; others call it transformation (Levy & Merry, 1986).

Organizational transformation is on the cutting edge of science. It is in the forefront of the field of organizations, and draws insights and ideas from pioneering, innovative thinking in such other sciences as physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology. Transformation deals with topics and concepts that touch on the very core and essence of human existence and being. It deals with core processes, spirituality, consciousness, creativity, and evolution. It applies approaches such as changing myths and rituals, envisioning and creating new paradigms, energizing, and raising consciousness.

Transformation Theories

The following describes theoretical perspectives that explain the process of second-order change in social systems. The theories described provide a historical, evolutionary perspective explaining the differences between first- and second-order changes. They focus more on how living systems transform than on what is transformed and why.
This cluster of theories provides the context, the theoretical basis, for the practice of organizational transformation. The theoretical perspectives presented include:

1. Scientific revolution.
3. Order through fluctuations.
4. Evolution and consciousness.
5. Growth.
6. Futurist perspectives.

Scientific Revolution Perspective

The common denominator of this perspective is the utilization of Kuhn’s (1970) theory of scientific revolution for explaining the phenomena of first- and second-order change in organizations. In Kuhn’s terminology, first-order change is "normal change," and second-order change is "paradigm change," or "transformation."

Scientific revolutions occur in two complementary ways. The first is the accumulation of enough scientific observations contradicting the old paradigm and the existence of enough scientists who keep gathering data seeking new formulations to account for these observations. The second is through the vision of able individuals who
suggest an overarching new concept, a new world view so different, so stimulating, that defending the existing ideas becomes less important than exploring the ideas suggested by the emergent paradigm.

Organizational theoreticians argue that the way organizations are operating, their world view, culture, and belief system, actually represents a paradigm, an organizing paradigm (Markley, 1976; Sheldon, 1980). Further, they argue that organizations pass through periods of normal changes, in which they develop and change within the current paradigm, and periods of revolutionary changes, in which the organizational paradigm itself changes.

A paradigm shift is triggered by organizational decline or crisis, and the accumulation of evidence that the old paradigm fails to provide new directions and satisfactory solutions, explanations, and legitimization to the present state. Further, it is triggered by the accumulation of evidence that there are, or might be, alternative ways of doing things, and alternative perspectives on present situations. And, last, a paradigm shift is facilitated by the activity of able individuals whose ideas, visions, innovations, or discoveries provide a new direction more satisfactory in terms of organization, adaptation, and members' needs. Paradigmatic shift is preceded by the emergence of new ideas based on new logic, and the emergence of new concepts and metaphors.
Both the new ideas and the new concepts cannot be understood within the old paradigm.

The Neo-Marxian Perspective

A Hegelian-Marxian dialectical perspective implicitly inspired some of the new theories on, and approaches to, second-order change in organizations. Kuhn’s theory (1970) of scientific revolutions and Prigogine’s (1984) theory of order through fluctuations are two examples. Marxian philosophy is deterministic. However, the neo-Marxian perspective emphasize nondeterministic aspects. Supporters of the neo-Marxian perspective argue that evolutions and revolutions are natural processes of living systems; however, they are shaped by human thought and action. The neo-Marxian perspective emphasizes the following propositions:

1. That social systems pass through long periods of evolutionary change and short periods of revolutionary change.

2. That evolutionary periods are characterized by incremental changes and improvements in which the system as a whole (in terms of how the system operates, its values, its ideology, its world view, and its power structure) remains unchanged.
3. That social systems, social forms, and ideas contain their own destructive forces; every thesis creates an antithesis that leads to an inevitable clash, and to the creation of a new form and idea, qualitatively different from the former state.

4. That social systems are characterized by inner conflicts between interest groups holding different ideologies; these conflicts are the driving force of the revolutionary change.

5. That the dominant groups or coalitions develop a logical explanation, ideology, and culture to support their dominance, and to preserve the current order.

6. That revolutionary periods are short, occur rapidly and suddenly, and are preceded by inner tensions, conflicts, polarities, and crisis.

7. That through revolutionary periods the system transforms into a higher and better way of organizing in terms of social justice, social security, individual freedom, development, and growth.

8. That the interaction between human actions (voluntarism) and natural evolutionary processes (determinism) creates the tension, polarity, and crisis that lead to revolutionary change.

9. That the process of evolution involves consciousness expansion and increased awareness of people of that process; this
awareness motivates people to take an active role in the evolution of their consciousness.

The Order-Through-Fluctuation Perspective

This perspective is based primarily on the work of Prigogine (1984). The ideas have much in common with those of the evolution and consciousness perspective. However, Prigogine describes the whole process of system transformation, and his theory focuses on energy-exchange processes, not on human consciousness.

Prigogine’s (1984) theory has been applied to explain and understand organizational transformation. Smith (1984), for example, showed how management effort to restore order as quickly as possible, when something goes into chaos, may be dysfunctional. Managers believe that both long- and short-term viability will be augmented by this action. However, it may well be that the most appropriate action for system viability is to encourage the chaos, and thus engage in the emergence of a new order. In analyzing change in educational policies, Iannaccone (1977) differentiates between changes that are incremental and adjusive, and basic changes, cyclical in nature, that involve a complete shift in the education leadership, policies, structure, and world view.
Prigogine's (1984) perspective suggests that social systems will occasionally go into extreme fluctuation and perturbation, and appear to be falling apart. At a specific point the system either stops functioning or jumps to a higher, more complex order. According to Prigogine, the greater the turbulence and the more complex the system, the greater the jump to a higher order.

The Evolution-and-Consciousness Perspective

The evolution-and-consciousness perspective--or, as some call it, the self-organizing-systems perspective--is actually a cluster of highly complicated ideas that draw upon new findings in biology, chemistry, quantum physics, thermodynamics, and brain research. It is an offshoot of general systems theory. Like the order-through-fluctuation perspective, it proposes that evolution is not a smooth process and that it involves periods of crisis and perturbations, and a sudden shift to a new order. However, unlike the former, this perspective emphasizes the voluntaristic aspects of evolution--how people can take, and are taking, an active role in the process. The evolution-and-consciousness perspective is an effort to integrate concepts from open systems, living systems, and evolutionary theories into a more dynamic, nondeterministic model. Maruyama (1963) was among the first to note
that open systems have two different processes of feedback: negative feedback, which promotes self-regulation and equilibrium, and positive feedback, which amplifies deviations through mutual causal processes. The second process provides ever-growing inner conflicts until the system reaches a new escape state. This escape state is qualitatively different.

In summary, the evolution-and-consciousness perspective suggests that human systems are in a constant state of fluctuation, disturbance, change, and development. The evolution process is not incremental and smooth. It involves perturbations that are amplified until they reach a threshold beyond which the system is qualitatively different. Evolution involves the evolution of human consciousness. This process enables people to take an active role in the process of change.

The Growth Perspective

The concept of growth, as typically used in organization theory, refers to quantitative change, a change that occurs over a time period in the organization's size, number of employees and managers, number and size of units, and/or volume of production and sales (Katz & Kahn, 1978). The concept used mainly in the field of planned change to denote qualitative change is development. Whereas growth is an
increase in size, development is a process in which organization members increase their potential and capacity to satisfy their own needs, and to attain organizational goals and purposes. Development is more a matter of motivation, knowledge, understanding, wisdom, and quality of work life than of wealth and standard of living. Development is a learning process; it cannot be given to or imposed on one person by another. The most one can do is encourage and facilitate development. From this perspective, there may be growth without development and vice versa. Further, both types of change are incremental (Ackoff, 1981).

The growth perspective holds that the main purpose of all life, and particularly in the advanced industrial nations, is toward growth, toward higher and more complex levels of individuality and organization, higher level needs and potentials. Evolution proceeds through the decline and death of the old, or what is called destructuring, and the rebirth of higher order structures.

The Futurist Perspective

Futurists study and examine current discoveries, inventions, and developments at the cutting edges of various scientific and nonscientific areas. They try to locate trends, see the whole picture, and forecast the
future, all of which imply dealing with first- and second-order changes. The terms used by futurists to denote second-order change are usually "revolution," "paradigmatic shift," and "transformation."

Whereas the previous perspectives addressed the question of how second-order change occurs and the specific stages of the process, this perspective attempts to deal with the content of the process, with what is changed. Many futurists use the previous perspectives as a contextual framework for understanding reality. However, their perspective is important not only because it deals directly with the content of the transformation but also because of its basic premise that organization transformation is part of a larger transformation process that includes individuals, organizations, cultures, and societies.

According to Toffler (1981), change comes in waves that sweep across society, cutting through class, race, and special-interest groups. The waves are chains of associated trends that reinforce one another, speeding up change and moving society in a new direction. The main components of this new direction are diversity and accelerated change.

Capra (1982) characterizes the traditional world view as the mechanistic-Cartesian paradigm that developed throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This paradigm includes belief in the scientific method as the only valid approach to knowledge and the
notion of the universe as a mechanical system composed of elementary material building blocks. The mechanistic view presents units as having closed boundaries. Change is seen as the replacement of a defective unit by a new unit, with the change having little impact on the larger system.

Capra (1982) claims that a new paradigm is now emerging, the holistic-ecological paradigm, where society is experiencing a profound shift in thoughts, perceptions, and values, all of which form a new vision of reality. The new paradigm emphasizes the fundamental interrelatedness and interdependence of all phenomena, and the intrinsically dynamic nature of physical reality. According to Capra, the transformation that is taking place includes the following value trends:

1. From competition to cooperation.
2. From unlimited expansion to optimal size.
3. From material growth to inner growth.
4. From central power to decentralization.
5. From hard technology to soft technology.
6. From specialization to synthesis and multidisciplinary approaches.

As the transformation takes place, the declining culture refuses to change, clinging ever more rigidly to its outdated ideas; nor will the dominant social institutions hand over their leading roles to the new
cultural forces. But the old forms will decline and disintegrate while the new culture continues to rise.

Naisbitt (1982) analyzed trends and changes in major areas of the United States. Like Capra (1982), he argues that we are entering a new era and that the United States is undergoing major cultural shifts. Another common theme in futurists’ writing that has affected the practice of transformation is the notion that revolutionary change is anticipated by an image of the desired future.

Polack (1973) noted that when the dominant images of a culture are anticipatory, they lead social development and provide direction for social change. By their attractiveness and legitimacy they reinforce and influence decisions that will bring them to realization.

The futurist’s perspective takes an optimistic view of the future of mankind. The main propositions are that we are in the midst of a major shift in culture and habits. We not only can describe the main ingredients of the new emerging paradigm but also can consciously take part in this revolution.

Dolence and Norris (1995) foresaw a paradigm change for higher education resulting from advances in technology. They maintain that the development of new technologies requires institutions to serve larger and more diverse audiences and simultaneously provide new learning
tools that offer vast opportunities for motivating students and designing individualized instruction. They contrasted identifying attributes of Industrial Age and Information Age learning organizations, as shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1. Attributes of Industrial Age and Information Age Learning Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Age</th>
<th>Information Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms, libraries</td>
<td>Laboratories, networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat-time-based education</td>
<td>Achievement-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-centered instruction</td>
<td>Network learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information acquisition</td>
<td>Knowledge navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>Distance-free learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>Perpetual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeout for learning</td>
<td>Fusion of learning and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of learners, learning systems</td>
<td>Fusion of learning systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Adapted from *Transforming higher education: A vision for learning in the 21st century* (p. 58), by M. G. Dolence and D. M. Norris, 1995, Ann Arbor, MI: Society for College and University Planning.

Dolence and Norris (1995) concluded that in the new milieu, information infrastructure, not professors in classrooms, will be the primary delivery mechanism. Higher education will not own the
franchise it provides, and being learner-centered will increase competitiveness.

**Summary of Transformation Theories**

The above cluster of macrotheoretical perspectives takes into account voluntaristic aspects of the evolution of social systems; therefore, they can provide the theoretical basis and framework for the emerging field of second-order planned change and, in particular, the approach called organizational transformation. The value of these macroperspectives is that they identify a broad set of concepts that provide the context in which second-order change takes place. There is also a problem with some of these theories. Critical variables sometimes are not identified, or remain abstract and undefined. Nevertheless, this cluster of theories as a whole adds depth and wide support to the approach of organizational transformation.

**Sustaining Change**

When a change is completed, staff in the organization experience reaching a goal. At this point staff generally feel happy, relaxed, and there is a release of energy. When one achieves a goal, tension is reduced. Staff rarely work harder the day after achieving a major goal;
they may feel better and like their organization more, but they are unlikely to be highly energized. This hangover effect usually occurs after a major goal achievement. The situation is often reinforced in organizations by a change in the structure; after achieving the new state, the change management reverts to operating management, attending to things other than the change. Six months or a year later, the excitement is over; the operation is routine. The decisions that were being made by the development team have been turned over to the operational supervisors. Staff in the organization experience stability but not much challenge, particularly if the tasks under the new state tend to be routine. The attention and energy involved in establishing the dynamic new situation have dissipated and are now placed elsewhere. The result is often a reversion to the prechange, old ways of operating.

If a change has been implemented, how does an organization sustain the change? Beckhard and Harris (1977) advise that when a major change has been accomplished, it is important for the executive management of whatever system that has been changed to maintain an active interest and provide leadership behavior to ensure that the new state does not revert back to the old ways of operating. A variety of mechanisms can be used for consciously taking the temperature of the organization, setting priorities for short-term improvements and review,
and rewarding people for doing this so it is seen as real work rather than as activity in addition to work. All of these procedures can increase the likelihood that the efforts and investments involved in creating the change will pay off for the organization.

The authors cite a dilemma where executive management wishes to reduce the ambiguity and confusion that existed during the "getting from here to there" state. Concurrently, however, energy can be fully mobilized only if conscious attention is given to a continuous process of checking "how we are doing," regarding setting goals and priorities for improving the condition.

**Review of Literature Related to Organizational Change in Education**

There has been a continuing interest in studying and describing the process of change and innovation in higher education. During the 1960s, the studies describing educational change focused on the dissemination of innovations into rational educational systems (Berman, 1981). That emphasis was superseded by attention to the adoption of change and characteristics of adopters. Berman identified these studies as concentrating on the implementation of change within a particular organizational context.
The study of change since 1970 moved from documenting failure, to identifying and analyzing successes, and the management of change (Fullan, 1986). Management of change suggests that those in charge of educational change understand two basic aspects of change. The first is the subjective meaning of change (what change meant personally for each individual). Fullan noted that often innovations were brought into an educational organization without explaining the innovation in terms of what it personally cost each adopter in time or effort. The second basic aspect of change is the objective reality of educational change (how the change affected the social order or structure of the group involved with the change). In addition to the difficulty of managing the subjective meaning of change, Fullan noted that change is rarely as simple as it appears; therefore, consideration must be given to managing the multidimensions of change. Since people react to innovation in different ways, the adoption of an innovation often changed the order of the system in which the innovation was adopted.

The organizational change and development field has traditionally been more micro than macro in orientation, more focused on individual and group behaviors than on organizational processes, more concerned with the tactics of intervention design and conduct than the strategy of changing whole systems. Perhaps this is the result of the strong
theoretical foundations of the field in the behavioral sciences and the orientations of many early practitioners. However, as the field has evolved and matured, there has emerged an increased emphasis on organizational strategy (Mirvis, 1988; Tichy, 1983). Recently, there has been an explosion of interest in linking strategic management and organizational development, with a concomitant interest in processes of organizational transformation, strategic leadership, vision and reframing.

The dominant theories of change in colleges and universities have emphasized their inherent incremental nature. In the past two decades, the open systems theory of change, which bases its assumptions of the desirability of slow adaptation on a biological survival analogy, has been augmented by more recent theories that have dominated research on decision-making and change in educational settings. Colleges and universities are viewed as organized anarchies (Cohen & March, 1974), which have a structure that is best characterized as loosely coupled (Weick, 1976). Both of these characteristics lead to decentralization of decision-making, limited impact of leaders, and localized adaptation within subunits.

These perspectives are descriptive of the historical phase in which universities enjoyed prosperous growth that was facilitated by anarchic orientation to strategy and a higher decentralized structure. According
to Miller and Friesen (1980), when organizations find a strategic path that initially brings them success, they usually tend to stay the course. However, following a successful course over a long period of time creates excesses that turn initially successful orientations into anomalies that cannot be addressed by more of the same or by maintaining the same assumptions about the essential nature of the institution.

A review of current writings about community college organizational change reflects few major paradigmatic shifts or second-order changes. Levin (1994) notes how the community college change literature more often focuses on how societal and economic changes have influenced the institutions than on how community colleges have changed society. Raisman (1994) urges leaders to be proactive rather than reactive in the change process because those who do not direct a planned process of change may become enmeshed in changes they have not chosen. Other authors, such as Brennan, Mugleston, and Perdue (1996), Kesler, Perry, and Shay (1996), Kotter (1995, 1996), and Senge et al. (1999) write about why people resist change and how to overcome that resistance. Implicit in these works are the assumptions that planned change is desirable and leaders plan change.

Senge (1990) provided a blueprint for a learning organization where people expand their capacity to create results, where new and
expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspirations are set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together. Senge cites the following five disciplines necessary for building a learning organization:

1. **Personal mastery:** Learning to expand our personal capacity to create desired results, and creating a culture that encourages all members to develop so that they can achieve their goals and purposes.

2. **Mental models:** Continually reflecting on, clarifying, and improving our internal pictures of the world and noticing how they shape our actions and decisions.

3. **Shared vision:** Building group commitment by developing shared images of the future we seek to create and the principles and guiding practices by which we expect to get there.

4. **Team Learning:** Transforming conversational and collective thinking skills so that groups can reliably develop intelligence and ability greater than the sum of their individual members' talents.

5. **Systems thinking:** Learning a new way of thinking about, describing, and understanding the forces and interrelationships that shape the behavior of systems, to see how to change systems effectively, and to act in tune with the larger natural and economic processes.
Some of the change literature focuses on change to improve the position of the community college in the marketplace. Alfred and Carter (1996) urge community college leaders to stop tinkering and commit to fundamental change. The impetus for this change is the need to remain competitive in the postsecondary market.

Occasionally, change is advocated to enhance the community college's role in improving society. Lorenzo and LeCroy (1994) argue for fundamental change in community colleges so that they may meet more precisely the emerging expectations, attitudes, and conditions of the Information Age. Noting the country's pressing economic problems and such problems as crime, drugs, and lack of employment, the authors believe that the community college's overall goal is to create a culture of responsiveness that more clearly relates its comprehensive mission to these new societal circumstances, which include growing demands to cultivate higher quality interactions based on race, ethnicity, sex, and class.

Rhoads and Valadez (1996) come the closest to presenting a vision of second-order change for community colleges. On the basis of case studies of several community colleges, Rhoads and Valadez develop a portrait of a fictional ideal and democratic community college. This ideal college is characterized by inclusionary and collaborative
administrative processes and a campus climate in which debate and conflict are viewed as essential to an empowered citizenry. There is equality for all, and issues of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation are at center stage. The authors conclude with principles to guide students, faculty, and administrators "concerned with restructuring more democratic and multicultural academic communities." Their first principle argues for promoting greater collaboration and more participatory management processes. The second requires that community college officials create opportunities for others to assume leadership. Third, there should be a culturally diverse faculty, staff, and student body participating in organizational decision-making. And finally, the last principle states that democratic community colleges embrace change as a way of life.

In contrast, Levin (1998) suggests that community colleges are living systems and they act and change in order to express their nature and survive. Community colleges, by their very nature of being nontraditional and untraditional, make and remake themselves. Community colleges alter, adapt and survive and incorporate the new. Levin makes the assertion that the essential nature of the community college, its identity, is embedded in what it does: in its actions and change processes. Thus, the organization's responses to external stimuli,
its adaptation to its environment, the behaviors of its members, and the social and political dynamics in and surrounding the institution are expressions of organization and efforts not only to maintain itself but also to reproduce its identity. In short, the actions of the community college arise from its identity and express its identity. Levin asserts,

If we assume that organizations are living entities, or at least composed of living beings, then as living systems change, movement, even a state of flux, is a given: organizational behaviors are not static, behaviors beget actions, and actions translate into change. Change may be the product of tensions between oppositions, as in Marxist or neo-Marxist theory, or it may be the product of organization maintenance or self-production. Organizations are not static: they change, metaphorically growing, expanding, contracting, and eventually dying. And what they do in all these processes is define and express themselves: by their actions they are known. (Levin, 1998, p. 2)

Levin suggests that community colleges are not necessarily experiencing a "sea of change," a radical transformation of the institution—that what organizational change experts observe as change is in fact what the community college is: an untraditional institution, social as well as educational, with adaptability and dynamism as its foremost characteristics.
Summary

In order to develop a foundation of understanding about the different types of change, this chapter described and characterized planned/managed change, first- and second-order change, and organizational transformation. The transformation theories reviewed provided a theoretical basis and framework for understanding the emerging field of second-order planned change and, in particular, the approach called organizational transformation. The value of these macroperspectives is that they identify a broad set of concepts that provide the context in which second-order change takes place, which is the subject of this study.

Once a change has been implemented, the literature suggests that attention must be given to sustaining the change. Beckhard and Harris (1977) offer the following conditions necessary for maintenance of change:

1. Executive management must pay conscious attention to the continuous transition.

2. Explicit processes or procedures for setting priorities for improvement should be instituted.

3. There must be systematic and continual processes of feedback.
4. The reward system must reward people for time and energy spent on the change processes.

Much can be said about the literature describing innovation in higher education. First, it is voluminous. The size of the literature suggests the importance of the topic for higher education. Second, the literature is overwhelmingly descriptive rather than analytical. Studying why organizations change, how they mobilize for change and what is changed has been the source of much review. One author (Levin, 1998) suggests that change is a defining characteristic of the community college and that change alone is usually neither revolutionary nor deep enough to challenge the values of the organization’s members or constituents. According to Levin (1998),

the community college acts and changes in accord with its identity, and organizational changes elaborate that identity. The actions of the community college indicate its goals, both as a vehicle for social movement and as an individual institution. (p. 3)

While there is tremendous research on organizational change in higher education, there is little involving second-order change. Some authors assert that future efforts in studying higher education need to involve longer time frames in studying change and more interpretive perspectives. This study describes how one community college attempted to transform (effect a second-order change) from a traditional
bureaucratic organization to a high-performance work system. The data was gathered over a prolonged period of 4 years, with the investigator serving as a participant observer throughout the study.
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe how one community college attempted to develop and implement transformational change. More specifically, this research sought to discover the factors and strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process. What are the key elements necessary to implement successful change? Barriers to change may be structural (involving how work is performed, organizational structure, and reporting relationships), cultural (core values, attitudes, and philosophies), or political (involving difficulties in managing conflicts and differences effectively). How does a community college overcome these barriers to change?

This study describes one community college’s efforts to transform from a traditional bureaucratic organization to a high-performance work system characterized by cross-functionally trained work teams, increased employee involvement in decision-making, and shared leadership. Through this study, methods illustrating how the community college built the capacity for ongoing change became apparent. This chapter includes: rationale for use of qualitative research methods for this study; rationale for case study research design; data-gathering methods
used in this study; methods used to enhance the trustworthiness of the results; description of the study site; and methodology used to analyze the data.

**Rationale for Qualitative Research Methods**

The purpose of qualitative research is to develop an understanding of individuals and events in their natural state, taking into account the relevant context (Borg, Gall, & Gall, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985); whereas the purpose of quantitative research is to make objective descriptions of a limited set of phenomena and to determine whether the phenomena can be controlled through certain interventions. Quantitative researchers make assumptions that they can discover "laws" that lead to reliable prediction and control of education phenomena. In contrast, qualitative researchers make assumptions that each individual, each culture, and each setting is unique. Advocates of qualitative research argue that its methods are particularly appropriate for the study of education because they are derived from the social sciences. Both education and the social sciences are concerned with the study of human behavior and thinking in various settings and view research as a means of understanding, informing, and improving practice (Borg et al., 1993; Merriam, 1988).
Qualitative data are rich in description of people, places, and conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures. Research questions are not framed by operationalizing variables; rather, they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity and within their context. Qualitative investigators are concerned with understanding behavior from the subject's own frame of reference. They tend to collect their data through sustained contact with people in settings where subjects normally spend their time.

The literature provides a diverse look at methodologies used in the study of organizational change. The majority of organizational-change studies have been qualitative in nature, involving interpretive methods. Lincoln and Guba (1985) call this interpretive methodology naturalistic inquiry. This research approach is grounded in the following four assumptions:

1. The nature of reality. Realities are multiple rather than singular. Everything influences everything else in the present context. All entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that the possibility of causal relationships is limited.

2. The relationship of the researcher and the researched. The relationship of researcher and subjects is interactive and inseparable. Work with human subjects is complex, in that humans may produce an
effect in anticipation of its cause. Human behavior is context and time-bound.

3. *Generalization.* Generalization is limited by time and context within which the research takes place. Generalization in this case is described as approximating, through words and illustrations, the experience that one might typically find in such a situation as the one described in the case.

4. *The role of values.* The process of inquiry is value-bound, thereby acknowledging the role of researcher’s values in shaping both the process and results of the effort.

Qualitative research methods provide educational researchers the ability to observe human behavior within the context of the environment (Yin, 1994). According to Merriam (1988), qualitative or naturalistic research focused on discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied offers the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge base and practice of education.

Since the purpose of this study was concerned with describing a transformational change process rather than identifying behavioral outcomes or testing hypotheses, qualitative research methods are most appropriate. Through this study, educators will achieve greater
understanding of human behavior and methods with the potential for improving human practices (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

**Rationale for Case Study Research Design**

The qualitative case study design offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding a phenomenon. Anchored in real-life situations, the case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. It offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers' experiences. These insights can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field's knowledge base. Participant observation, interviews, and document review are considered exemplary means for collecting qualitative case study data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Merriam, 1988). Because of its strengths, case study is a particularly appealing design for applied fields of study such as education. Educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice. Case study has proved particularly useful for studying educational innovations (Bodgan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988).
The aim of a case study is not to find the correct or true interpretation of the facts, but rather to eliminate erroneous conclusions so that one is left with the best possible, the most compelling, interpretation.

According to Merriam (1988), the case study can be further defined by its special features. The following four characteristics are essential properties of a qualitative case study: particularistic, descriptive, heuristic, and inductive.

*Particularistic* means that case studies focus on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon. Case studies concentrate attention on the way particular groups of people confront specific problems, taking a holistic view of the situation. They are problem-centered, small-scale, entrepreneurial endeavors.

*Descriptive* means that the end product of a case study is a rich, thick description of the phenomenon under study. "Thick" description is a term from anthropology and means the complete description of the incident or entity being investigated.

*Heuristic* means that case studies illuminate the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon under study. They can bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader’s experience, or confirm what is known.
Inductive means that case studies rely on inductive reasoning. Generalizations, concepts, or hypotheses emerge from an examination of data.

The special features of case study research that provide the rationale for its selection also present certain limitations in its usage. Although rich, thick description and analysis of a phenomenon may be desired, the investigator may not have the time or money to devote to such an undertaking. And assuming that the investigator does take the time to produce a worthy case study, the product may be deemed too lengthy, too detailed, or too involved for busy educators to read and use (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1994). Case studies can also oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs. Qualitative case studies are limited, too, by the sensitivity and integrity of the investigator (Yin, 1994).

Further limitations involve issues of reliability, validity, and generalizability. There is much debate about how to interpret these principles. Every investigator wants to contribute knowledge that is believable and trustworthy. Since a qualitative approach to research is based upon different assumptions and a different worldview than traditional research, it is argued that different criteria be used in assessing qualitative research. The question of internal validity (findings
which are congruent with reality) can be addressed by checking interpretations with individuals in the study site, staying on site over a period of time, asking peers to comment on findings, involving participants in all phases of the research, and clarifying researcher biases and assumptions. Reliability (consistency of findings) can be accomplished by the investigator explaining the assumptions and theory underlying the study, and by leaving an audit trail that describes how the study was conducted and how the findings were derived from the data. With regard to generalizability (external validity), some assume that one cannot generalize from a case study; therefore, they count that as a limitation of the method. Others argue that rather than applying statistical notions of generalizability to case studies, one should develop an understanding of generalization that is congruent with the basic philosophy of qualitative inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The decision to use case study design for this study took into consideration the design’s inherent strengths and weaknesses and the nature of the topic being investigated. In spite of the known limitations, case study design was selected because it supported the most detailed examination of a transformational change process at one community college. The goal of this case study was to provide a descriptive account of one community college’s change process, rather than test for
hypotheses. Through the use of case study design, the investigator was able to reveal and to understand the complexity and dynamics of organizational change within the context of one community college. The investigator in this study was an administrator at the study site for over 12 years, served as a project manager (participant observer) in the change initiative studied, and obtained support and authorization from the executive leadership of the community college to conduct the study. These factors served to minimize the chances of misrepresentation and maximize the access needed to collect the detailed case study evidence. Case studies in education vary in terms of their end product, and it is appropriate for them to be nothing more than intensive descriptions of a program, event, or process. Such descriptions are useful in learning about unique or innovative situations and may form a data base for future research (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In an attempt to reduce the effect of the case study design limitations, the investigator utilized a number of methods to enhance the trustworthiness of the study results, described later in this chapter.

This case study utilized multiple methods for collecting and interpreting data. The utilization of multiple methods of research investigation has been strongly endorsed by a number of prominent researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles &
Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1994). Using multiple methods for collecting data serves to facilitate the generation of information and ideas from a variety of different perspectives. Use of multiple methods is particularly helpful in case studies where the primary research objective is to gain a broader understanding of the subject matter. Since this study seeks to discover broader understanding of the factors and strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process, this technique is appropriate in gaining that understanding.

A feature of qualitative case study data is their richness and holism, with strong potential for revealing complexity; such data provide "thick" (thoroughly documented) descriptions that are vivid, nested in a real context, and have a ring of truth that has strong impact on the reader (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To accurately interpret observed situations and to accomplish the objective of "thick description" in this case study, the investigator incorporated four data-collection methods into the study design.

**Data-Gathering Methods**

The fundamental methods relied on by qualitative researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Merriam, 1988) for gathering information are (a) observations and (b) interviewing.
These two methods form the core for qualitative data gathering. The research design for this study included four methods for gathering and interpreting data: (a) participant observation; (b) unstructured interviews and extended conversations; (c) collection and analysis of institutional records, documents, videotapes, and historical documents to substantiate findings from the observations; and (d) participant review of findings to provide corrections, clarifications, or comments on the accounts reported in the study. Qualitative data are not so much about "behavior" as they are about actions, which carry with them intentions and meanings and lead to consequences (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

This study was conducted over 4 years, which enabled the investigator to observe the institution and its members throughout the entire change initiative. The rationale for using multiple methods and for conducting a longitudinal analysis was to avoid the restrictions on data collection inherent in a shorter time frame and to increase the trustworthiness of the findings.

**Participant Observation**

Participant observation represents a special mode of observation where the investigator is not merely a passive observer. The investigator actually is involved in the social world chosen to study.
Participant observation provides certain unusual opportunities for collecting data from a wide variety of settings and sources. The most distinctive opportunity is related to the ability to gain access to events or groups that are otherwise inaccessible to investigation. Another opportunity is the ability to perceive reality from the viewpoint of individuals inside the study rather than external to it. Immersion in the setting allows the investigator to hear, see, and begin to experience reality as the participants do. This perspective is invaluable in producing an accurate portrayal of the study phenomenon. Also, as a participant observer, the investigator has the opportunity to manipulate minor events, such as calling a meeting of a group of persons involved in the transformational change process (Bogdan, 1972; Bollens & Marshall, 1973; Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

The purpose of participant observation is to develop understandings of complex social settings and relationships. It assumes that an important way to understand social life is to immerse oneself with others in that social arrangement. While participant observation can be and has been used to test specific hypotheses and to examine theory, it is more commonly used to generate theory, to understand specific organizational forms (schools), to generate sensitizing concepts, and to study social change (Bogdan, 1972).
In spite of its acknowledged contributions, participant observation is not without critics. Those who are critical of the approach and reluctant to accept its findings present a number of standard arguments in support of their position. One revolves around the potential bias the observer introduces to the study. Being the sole instrument, the investigator can easily act as a sieve that selectively collects and analyzes nonrepresentative data, thus raising questions of the reliability of the data collected. A related criticism concerns the effect an observer has on the behavior of the subjects in the situation and, thus, on the data collected.

Rather than an abstract discussion on the nature of objectivity, validity, and reliability in the social sciences, the following are responses to these major criticisms. Many proponents of participant observation suggest that in other research methods the researcher acts as a selective sieve also, but the nature of selectivity is not obvious, and therefore seldom discussed. For example, those who are involved in survey research select questions to ask on the basis of their own preconceived notions and constructs of what is important; this way they distort reality by focusing data into a created structure. Further, it is suggested that much of the data collected are products of the social scientists' unique collectively held biases. Social scientists share certain
unproven assumptions, ideologies which are difficult to see as anything but "truth" because they are so enveloped in them. Much of the findings of other methods come from that artificial envelope.

In response to the criticism regarding the researcher's effect on the subjects' behavior, all forms of research manipulate subjects in situations or use instruments that undoubtedly affect behavior as much as an observer who is in the field.

These rebuttals to the critics of the method have pointed the finger back at the critics rather than confront the questions directly. Practitioners of participant observation do recognize the dangers of researcher effect and subjectivity, and suggest that, in varying degrees, they may be susceptible to distortions, as with other methods. However, there are no methodologies to deal holistically with complex social settings and with the dynamics of change. Participant observation appears to be as good as any method yet devised (Bogdan, 1972).

While it is obvious that methodologies exist which permit greater reduction of data with more apparent precision than may reasonably be provided by participant observation, adherents to observational perspectives claim that theirs is a way of dealing with very complex human interactions and settings--possibly the only viable way available to social scientists today (Bogdan, 1972).
It is further argued that, in a sense, all social research is a form of participant observation, because we cannot study the social work without being part of it. From this point of view, participant observation is not a particular research technique but a mode of being in the world characteristic of researchers (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998).

As a participant in the transformation change process, the investigator sought to bring to the work "rigorous subjectivity," which Wolcott (1990) calls a strength of qualitative approaches. Wolcott describes the process of qualitative research as looking not to know but to understand. It was in the spirit of understanding, not knowing, that the investigator approached this study of her own practice. As a participant in the process, the investigator may have risked coloring the interpretation with her own perspective; yet by having been a participant, the investigator brought to the work a contextual understanding that would have been difficult for an outsider to gain.

In conducting this study, the investigator participated, as a project manager, and observed staff and board members in selected formal (regularly scheduled public meetings) and informal settings (private conversations). Staff, representing administrators, faculty, and classified (nonteaching paraprofessionals), were observed on numerous occasions.
Examples of formal settings include:

1. Board of Education meetings (the board consisted of seven nonpaid members, each elected to a 4-year term by qualified voters of the entire community college district). Board members are required to reside within the community college district and cannot be employed by the college during the term of office. Two members are elected to represent the district at large, and five members are elected from geographic areas called zones. The board has primary authority for establishing policies governing the operation of the college and adopting the college’s annual budget. They oversee the development of programs and services that serve the needs of the residents of the community college service district. The board held public meetings on the second Wednesday of each month (the exceptions were those defined by state statute that could infringe on personal or public rights), and work sessions (special meetings called by the board for in-depth consideration of a particular issue, scheduled as needed).

2. Executive Cabinet meetings (President, Vice Presidents, and other selected executive managers met weekly).

3. Labor representative meetings (elected leadership of labor groups and project management team met bimonthly).
4. Process Redesign Project Management meetings (Vice President of College Operations, this investigator as the Executive Assistant to the President, and two change-management consultants met weekly).

5. Process Redesign Leadership Team meetings (18 staff, representing senior management, middle management, faculty, and classified employees, appointed by the President to guide the change process, met weekly).

6. Process Redesign and Implementation Team meetings (10 staff, representing middle management, faculty, classified staff, and students, released from their regular jobs and assigned full-time to the change project, met on an ongoing basis).

Examples of informal settings include: (a) discussions with change-management consultants (individuals hired to guide and provide leadership to the project met on an ongoing basis); and (b) discussions with project participants (Process Redesign and Implementation Team members, selected to participate in the change project, met on an ongoing basis).

Field notes as well as formal meeting minutes were taken during the participant observations. The information gathered during the participant observations was held confidential, and any use of
information gathered during the observations was disguised (all names and titles were removed) in such a way as to protect the anonymity of the individuals and/or groups.

Unstructured Interviews

Unstructured interviews involve a nonstandardized format where the interest is expected to arise from the respondent’s reactions to the broad issue raised by the investigator (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In "open-ended" interviews the investigator asks key respondents for the facts of a matter as well as for the respondents’ opinions about events. The more a respondent assists in providing insights into certain occurrences, the more the role may be considered one of an "informant" rather than a respondent (Yin, 1994). Open-ended questions are designed to elicit broader responses from the interviewees.

This study involved unstructured interviews and extended conversations over 4 years, from 1995 through 1999, with organizational-change consultants, college administrators, faculty, and classified staff. The data were recorded through handwritten notes and were used solely to substantiate or refute information gathered through observation and record and document review.
Record and Document Review

Collecting and analyzing institutional records, documents, videotapes, and historical documentation represents another method of substantiating findings from the observations. Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe records and documents as rich sources of information, in that they are grounded in the context they represent. Records and documents are a stable source of information, both in the sense that they may accurately reflect situations that occurred at some time in the past and that they can be analyzed and reanalyzed without undergoing changes in the interim.

For the purpose of this study, a record is defined as any written or recorded statement prepared by or for an individual or organization for the purpose of attesting to an event or providing an accounting; a document is defined as any written or recorded material other than a record that was not prepared specifically in response to a request from the inquirer (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

During the study, the following records and documents were gathered and analyzed: institutional records generated by the transformational change project that included formal meeting minutes, personal journal notes, official reports, and videotapes of events. The investigator's personal journal notes were used to supplement and
confirm conclusions drawn from formal minutes. Historical documents were also examined for the period of 1988-1998, including: (a) published historical documents and articles, (b) minutes from Board of Education meetings, (c) college catalogs and descriptive brochures, and (d) historical enrollment and fiscal data.

Participant Review

Participant review, also called member checks, is the process of inviting participants to provide corrections, clarifications, or comments on the accounts reported in the study. This process was used as a means of sharing ownership of the study process and empowering participants with a feeling of control over their own words (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

While informal member checks were carried out throughout the study, the completion of the first draft of the study provided a final opportunity to test the credibility of the findings as a whole with participants at the study site. The investigator solicited feedback from participants and other project managers on overall credibility, major concerns or issues, and factual or interpretive errors.
Methods Used to Enhance the Trustworthiness of Study Results

Qualitative researchers are concerned with the concept of trustworthiness when designing studies. The basic issue in relation to trustworthiness is: How the researcher persuades her audiences (including herself) that the findings of the study are worthy of attention. Within functionalist paradigms, the criteria that have evolved in response to this question are termed internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity. However, criteria designed from a functionalist perspective are not appropriate to the framework of qualitative interpretive research. Basic assumptions that guide interpretive design, concerning the nature of reality and purpose of the research process, vary dramatically.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest alternate criteria for establishing trustworthiness. The purpose of these alternate criteria is to provide a system of useful checks and balances to strive for greater balance and fairness. The alternate criteria applicable to this study include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Methods of establishing credibility include prolonged engagement within the research setting, persistent observation to allow the true nature of reality to emerge, triangulation of data sources and methods to
verify results, and participant checks by research participants of emerging research results.

Transferability of research methods or findings to appropriate contexts is promoted through rich (thick) description.

Dependability of research results is enhanced by the presence of accurate and explicit records. This requires meticulous attention to the organization of field notes and documents. A detailed journal outlining data-analysis methods and emerging research design is suggested to support record keeping.

Confirmability of research results is enhanced through the process of using more than one source of data and/or method for obtaining data to enhance the likelihood that results can be confirmed in a variety of instances, sources, or methods.

As a means of maximizing the trustworthiness of this study’s findings, data gathering involved private and extended conversations over a prolonged period of 4 years with organizational-change consultants, college administrators, faculty, and classified staff. Throughout this study, the investigator served in the role of participant observer and organizational member with the role of project manager for the change process. The investigator engaged in persistent personal observation and note taking over the same period at college meetings,
including executive-level meetings. Institutional records generated by the transformational change project were used to draw conclusions that included formal meeting minutes, personal journal notes, and videotapes of events. The investigator's personal journal notes were used to supplement and confirm conclusions drawn from formal notes. Historical documents were also examined for the period of 1988-1998. Finally, participants in this study were invited to correct, clarify, or comment on the accounts reported in this study.

Description of Study Site

To maintain a degree of anonymity, the pseudonym of Valley Community College was assigned to the study site. Valley Community College (VCC) is a comprehensive 2-year community college that is mandated by state statute to offer instruction in vocational and college transfer programs as well as continuing education. The College offers lower division transfer programs and vocational/career preparation and retraining programs. At the time of this study, VCC faced continuing operating challenges in the form of increased enrollment, demographic changes, increasing administrative service demand, and changing technology. These challenges were occurring in an environment of constrained operating funds and an erosion over several years of
service-sector budgets and are described in Chapter IV. Partly in response to these operating challenges, the district voters approved a $43 million construction bond so that VCC could update facilities, equipment, and technology. The college was 35 years old.

The current President took office in 1990, and since that time there had been a complete turnover in leadership at the vice presidential level. In addition, the Vice President for Student Services position was eliminated as a result of restructuring. The investigator in this study had been employed for over 12 years as an executive management employee of the community college. As a participant observer, the investigator held a central role as a project manager in leading the transformational change initiative described in this study, and had open access to meetings and data. The study spanned 4 years beginning in 1995 and ending in 1999. Further description of the study site is included in Chapter IV.

Permission to Conduct the Study

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the President and Vice Presidents for College Operations and Instruction and Student Services at the community college. The investigator met personally
with each, explained the purpose of the study, and obtained written permission to document the transformational change process at VCC.

Protection of Confidentiality

Any use of quotations from the investigator’s observation of college meetings was disguised in such a way as to protect anonymity of the source. The study involved the use of public documents that were recorded in such a manner that subjects could not be identified directly because no one was cited by name.

Methodology for Analyzing the Data

Miles and Huberman (1994) describe three approaches to qualitative data analysis: (a) interpretivism (search for essences that may not transcend individuals, and lend themselves to multiple compelling interpretations); (b) social anthropology (quest for lawful relationships); and (c) collaborative social research (action undertaken in a social setting). This study approached data analysis from the interpretivist’s perspective. Interpretivists of all types insist that researchers are no more "detached" from their objects of study than are their informants. Researchers have their own understandings, their own convictions, their own conceptual orientations; they, too, are members of
a particular culture at a specific historical moment. One type of interpretivism is called phenomenology (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The investigator in this study approached her topic from a phenomenologist’s perspective.

Phenomenologists attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions to ordinary people in particular situations. This approach emphasizes the interpretive understanding of human interaction. Phenomenologists emphasize the subjective aspects of people’s behavior. Through gaining entry into the conceptual world of their subjects, phenomenologists develop an understanding of the meaning the subjects construct around events in their daily lives. Phenomenologists believe that multiple ways of interpreting experiences are available to each of us through interacting with others, and that it is the meaning of our experiences that constitutes reality. Consequently, reality is socially constructed (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

Phenomenologists often work with interview transcripts, but they are careful, often dubious, about condensing this material. They do not, for example, use coding, but assume that through continued reading of the source material and through vigilance over one’s presuppositions, one can reach the meaning of the informant, capturing the essence of an account, what is constant in a person’s life across its manifold
variations. This approach leads to a practical understanding of meanings and actions, which is the purpose of this study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). It is believed that the worth of a qualitative study can be judged by the degree to which it generates description and understanding (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

The decision to study and document this transformational change process occurred after the process had been initiated. The investigator held a significant role in leading the transformational change project and had responsibility for synthesizing data throughout the project. Also, sufficient data were collected to warrant documenting the transformational change process as a case study. Therefore, the process of data analysis was primarily one of document review, and further synthesis. In analyzing data collected, the investigator developed a descriptive framework for organizing the case study (Yin, 1994). The descriptive framework organized data chronologically delineating the various phases of the transformational change process. The phases (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) formed the structure for describing the study. Delineating the various phases chronologically allowed the investigator to trace events over time and to determine any causal relationships (Yin, 1994). Data organized in this manner permitted conditions and corresponding actions to be identified.
that moved the process forward, or in some cases, impeded forward progress (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The process of identifying turning points, and showing how reaching, or not reaching, those turning points played into the conditions affecting the next set of actions taken, was important in documenting the strategies that influenced the outcome of this transformational change process.

In qualitative inquiry, the investigator expects the theory or variables will emerge from the inquiry (inductive data analysis) rather than the investigator beginning with a theory and conducting an analysis in search of empirical data that will confirm (or disconfirm) what was deduced from the theory (deductive data analysis; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The analyses in this study were open-ended and inductive, involving thick description (thoroughly documented data) and constant comparative analysis (comparing multiple sources of data to find connections that support a theme, hypotheses, assertion, or conclusion).

Bogdan and Biklen (1992) define qualitative data analysis as constructing a picture that takes shape as data are collected and parts are examined rather than putting together a puzzle whose picture the researcher already knows. The process of qualitative data analysis is like a funnel: open at the beginning (or top) and more directed and specific at the bottom. The metaphor of a funnel appropriately describes
the data analysis for this study. At the beginning of data analysis there was an enormous amount of data to analyze, collected over 4 years. By organizing data chronologically the investigator was able to identify the factors and strategies that influenced the outcomes of this transformational change process. Through this study, methods illustrating how one community college built the capacity for ongoing change became apparent.

Summary

All research designs can be discussed in terms of their relative strengths and limitations. The merits of a particular design are inherently related to the rationale for selecting it as the most appropriate plan for addressing the research problem. Qualitative case studies are particularistic in that (a) they focus on a specific situation or phenomenon; (b) they are descriptive; and (c) they are heuristic--that is, they offer insights into the phenomenon under study and rely heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources. Qualitative data, rich in description of people, places, and conversations, are not easily handled by statistical procedures. Since qualitative investigators are concerned with understanding behavior from the subject's own frame of reference, they tend to collect their data through sustained contact with
people in settings where subjects normally spend their time. As a result, participant observation and in-depth interviews are considered exemplary means for collecting qualitative data. Qualitative methods are a natural extension of other human activities, such as looking, listening, speaking, and reading. These activities are naturally related to research methods such as observing, interviewing, reviewing documents, and interpreting.

Qualitative case study research design was selected for this study because it represented the best approach for gathering data on a community college that had articulated its immersion in a transformational change process. In addition, the majority of organizational-change studies, according to the literature, have been qualitative in nature and have involved interpretive methods. The purpose of documenting this study was to gain an in-depth understanding, and expand the knowledge base of change processes in education, rather than to test hypotheses.

Participant observation was the major means of collecting data for this case study. The investigator in this study was a participant observer and an organization member assigned the role of project manager for this change initiative. This research method gave a firsthand account of the situation under study and, when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allowed for a holistic interpretation of the
phenomenon being investigated. Participant observation is the technique of choice when behavior can be observed firsthand or when people cannot or will not discuss the research topic. Even so, there may be problems with the data collected. Most acute are the biases an investigator brings to the situation. Overall, however, there is no substitute for the participant observer. To maximize the trustworthiness of the findings and reduce bias, data gathering occurred over a prolonged period of 4 years at one community college. Data gathering involved participant observation, unstructured interviews, extended conversations, and documentary methods, so that the broadest range of information could be gathered. In addition, participants in the study were invited to correct, clarify, or comment on the accounts reported in this study. These data-gathering methods were appropriate procedures to deal with the complex interaction between the topic, investigator, and study site.

The dominant mode of data analysis utilized a chronological approach for describing the results. By chronologically delineating the various phases of the transformational change process, the investigator was able to trace events over time and determine any causal relationships. The phases (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) formed the structure for describing the study. The
analyses in this study were ongoing, open-ended and inductive, involving thick description (thoroughly documented data) and constant comparative analysis (comparing multiple sources of data to find connections that support a theme, hypotheses, assertion, or conclusion).

Studying organizational change in a community college is valuable; it enables educators to better understand, describe, explain and perhaps predict behavior within institutions of higher education. This study provides a detailed account of a change process in one community college and its effort to overcome structural, cultural, and political impediments to change. The presentation of data and study findings in the next chapter first provide a description of the community college’s history. A description of the developments that led up to the study is also included. Next follows a description of key elements in the change process discussed chronologically in three phases: Explore and Plan, Analyze and Redesign, and Implementation. This method of reporting study findings facilitates a holistic view of the study site and enables readers to reach greater levels of awareness and understanding of the reasons for change.
CHAPTER IV: PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe how one community college attempted to develop and implement transformational change. More specifically, this research sought to discover the factors and strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process. What are the key elements necessary to implement successful change? Barriers to change may be structural (involving how work is performed, organizational structure, and reporting relationships), cultural (core values, attitudes, and philosophies), or political (involving difficulties in managing conflicts and differences effectively). How does a community college overcome these barriers to change?

This study describes one community college’s efforts to transform from a traditional bureaucratic organization to a high-performance work system characterized by cross-functional work teams, increased employee involvement in decision-making, and shared leadership. Through this study, methods illustrating how the community college built the capacity for ongoing change became apparent.

This chapter presents an overview of the college’s history, the developments leading up to this study, and the study findings. The
overview provides the reader with a context for why college leaders considered transformational change necessary. In order to document the strategies used during this change process, the investigator used a chronological approach to detail the three phases of the planned change process: explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation. This chronology is presented so that the reader may gain insight into (a) why and how the change process evolved; (b) the strategies used to affect change; and (c) key elements that addressed structural, cultural, and political barriers to change. The information contained in this chapter was derived from qualitative data gathered through prolonged, persistent participant observation, unstructured interviews, and a review of documents and records. A detailed description of the data-gathering methods used in this study can be found in Chapter III.

College History

To maintain a degree of anonymity, the investigator assigned the pseudonym "Valley Community College" to the study site. Valley Community College (VCC) District was founded on October 19, 1964, and is a comprehensive 2-year public community college. State statutes mandated that the college offer instruction in vocational and college-transfer programs as well as continuing education. The college offers
lower division transfer programs and vocational/career preparation and retraining programs. The college district covers a geographic area of 5,000 square miles and serves 300,000 residents. Both rural and metropolitan communities are included within the college's district. The main campus is located on the outskirts of a metro area, and outreach centers are located in several rural communities. The original board and the founding president all had the philosophy that "if we're going to do something, let's do it the best we know how." The founding president is credited with setting the tone for an open style of management at the college. He wanted VCC to be defined as one of the finest community colleges in the United States, and this was a major influence on the founding of the college.

The first school year was 1965-1966, and the college anticipated 1,500 students; 7,694 enrolled. By 1999-2000, VCC enrolled over 40,000 different students. From the beginning, the fledgling college emphasized high-quality instruction by hiring first-rate faculty and by keeping programs as current as possible. Along with the emphasis on excellent teaching came an emphasis on innovation, which rewarded and encouraged faculty for trying new instructional methods and staff for trying to improve the quality of services. Over the years, VCC has been a leader in developing individualized instruction, encouraging faculty to
develop their own teaching materials, and introducing new technologies. Through staff-lead initiatives, the college has also been a pioneer in providing customer service via technology. The emphasis on innovation, on looking to the future, and on looking for new and better ways to deliver instruction and student services has changed the face of many departments within the college over time.

The college's history includes national recognition for many exemplary programs. It has been credited as one of the best comprehensive, technical-vocational community colleges in the country by the U.S. Department of Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, and the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas, Austin. Some of the college's historical strengths are its commitment to student success, its innovative spirit, a tradition of quality teaching and learning, a sense of staff pride in the institution, and a tradition of heroic individualism (Internal Restructuring Document, 1994).

As the college's seventh president, the current president took office in March 1990. His first challenge was to shore up the college's fiscal position. At the time he was hired, the majority of the college's funding came from local property taxes. Although the college won local voter approval of a new, larger property tax base in November 1990, a
sweeping statewide tax-reduction measure was passed by the state’s voters at the same time. The latter left the college faced with its source and amount of funding in jeopardy, while enrollments were increasing at a record pace. In addition, the local economy was shifting from high-paid, low-skilled timber-dependent jobs to low-paid, higher skilled service- and technology-related jobs. The statewide vote marked a turning point in the history not only of VCC, but also of education within the state. Prior to the November 1990 election, education funding was largely a local responsibility. After 1990, funding became primarily an obligation of the state (Moskus, 1997). Even though the majority of funding now comes from the state, community colleges’ statewide are still controlled by their own locally elected seven-member Board of Education.

Moreover, since 1990, there had also been a complete turnover in leadership at the vice presidential level at VCC. The college employed four vice presidents: one for administrative services, one for student services, and two for instruction. In 1997, as a result of restructuring, the vice president for student services position was eliminated and administrative responsibility for student services was reassigned to the instructional area. The remaining three vice presidents included one for administrative services and two for instruction and student services.
In 1999-2000, the college employed 275 full-time contracted faculty, 301 part-time faculty, 426 classified (support) staff, and 73 managers. The college’s faculty and classified staff are each represented by a different collective-bargaining union. The faculty is affiliated with a statewide education association that is part of the National Education Association. The classified staff is affiliated with the AFT/AFL-CIO. The management staff are informally organized and elect a management steering committee to handle compensation and benefit negotiations for the managers, including the vice presidents.

Developments Leading Up to the Study

Since 1990, several college-wide efforts had been initiated to encourage a stronger, more responsive VCC, including shared decision-making, organizational restructuring, team-building/leadership training, and significant investments in information technology via new applications and networking. The executive leadership believed that the essence of a quality organization was a willingness to improve constantly, and never to be satisfied with the status quo. At the time of this study, VCC was facing a number of operational challenges in the form of increased enrollment, student demographic changes, increasing administrative-service demand, changing technologies, and constrained
operating resources. These college-wide efforts and operational challenges are explained in detail so that the reader can develop a historical context for the factors which influenced the executive leadership’s decision that the college needed to become less bureaucratic in responding to these developments.

Shared Decision-Making

Since 1990, Valley Community College had attempted to eliminate top-down decision-making in favor of shared decision-making. The College Council, a broadly representative advisory group to the President on policy issues and issues that have campus-wide significance, was charged by the President with developing a framework for a new governance structure. The College Council, composed of 17 individuals representing students, faculty, classified staff, and management, was chartered to formulate and recommend policy to the President. The President was involved in the development of the new governance framework and endorsed the council’s work. At the same time, the College Council also established a task force on governance charged with the responsibility to develop a shared decision-making model for the college.
During April 1990, the President presented to the College Council a list of guiding principles:

1. Everyone has the right and duty to influence decision-making.
2. Not everyone wants to be involved on every issue, but everyone should be able to become involved on a given issue.
3. Participatory management is not a political process. Having a say differs from having a vote. The overarching purpose of participatory management is to make the best decisions.
4. People who are closest to a problem often have the best solutions.
5. Relationships are more important than structures.

At the same time, the President charged the council with the following responsibilities: "The College Council exists to develop examples, structures, and processes to embody the principle that broad meaningful participation in the decision-making process is essential to VCC’s success."

As part of the charge, the President suggested three specific issues he wanted the College Council to address:

1. Oversee the development of VCC’s internal governance system by establishing commissions, committees, task forces, and/or participatory structures.
2. Establish procedures to ensure that the structures operate effectively.
3. Address issues that are appropriate to a body broadly representative of the campus community. (College Council minutes, April 3, 1990)

The College Council’s Shared Decision-Making Task Force was charged with investigating a variety of governance models and recommending to the President a new model of shared decision-making for the college by January 1991. The task force’s proposed model included two major elements: (a) a philosophy for shared decision-making and (b) a shared decision-making process (Shared Decision-Making Task Force Recommendation to the President, January 1, 1991).

The proposed shared decision-making model included the following:

Valley Community College offers the opportunity to all stakeholders to contribute active, meaningful, and recognized participation to the institution’s process of decision-making and will lead to better decisions and a better understanding of and wider support for those decisions. It is in the best interest of the College because it results in the best decisions, and is most effective:

1. When all stakeholders in the College community have the opportunity to initiate and/or participate in the decision-making process;
2. When all people who will be affected by and have an interest in a decision have the opportunity and responsibility to participate in the process leading to a timely decision;
3. When information pertinent to decision-making is openly shared in a timely manner with all who will participate in the process leading to the decision;
4. When decisions are made at the appropriate level by persons or a group of individuals who have been authorized to make the decision;
5. When individuals involved in a decision-making process have the right to know how their ideas and concerns were addressed in the decision-making process.

Shared decision-making process:
1. Identify the perceived need for a decision.
2. Analyze and define the issue(s), and identify the stakeholders.
3. Identify and involve the person(s) responsible to make and implement the decision.
4. Inform the stakeholders of the issue(s) and the need for a decision.
5. Deliberate and develop a proposal(s) using a participatory or consensus-seeking style with stakeholders present.
6. Evaluate the proposed solution(s) to identify the best decision.
7. Recommend the decision to decision-maker(s).
8. Finalize the decision and announce it publicly.
9. Explain how the stakeholders’ concerns were addressed in arriving at the decision.
10. Implement the decision.
11. Evaluate the decision.

Following the College Council’s adoption of the shared decision-making model on January 14, 1991, most college staff members embraced the concept. However, difficulties with implementing the model surfaced because of different interpretations and expectations of the roles and responsibilities among staff (Cutler, 1991).

Conflict regarding the shared decision-making model emanated from two sources: (a) an operational definition and interpretation of the concept of shared decision-making and (b) concerns on the part of faculty and classified staff that some midlevel managers would not accept or adopt a shared decision-making model. Some people believed
that shared decision-making meant arriving at consensus on all
decisions. Other individuals and groups viewed shared decision-making
as a democratic process whereby each person got to vote on decisions
that affected them. Finally, some people saw shared decision-making as
a consultative process where a manager or decision-maker seeks input
from staff prior to making a decision.

All three of these processes can be interpreted as shared decision-
making that potentially offers stakeholders an opportunity to contribute
in institutional governance. However, depending on how they are
implemented, each of these participative processes may achieve different
results. For example, a democratic decision-making process may
provide everyone an opportunity to participate, but it often results in
winners and losers.

Decision-making by consensus involves everyone equally in the
process, but is oftentimes consuming and cumbersome. Given the large
number of decisions to be made and frequent short timelines for a
decision, a consensus model of decision-making--i.e., one that requires
all staff to agree--may represent an unrealistic model for a community
college.

A consultative model of decision-making vests tremendous
responsibility (and power) in the manager or decision-maker to
recognize the need for a decision, consult with the appropriate stakeholders, and implement a fair and equitable decision. An inherent danger contained within a consultative style of decision-making is the possibility that a manager or decision-maker may ignore input from stakeholders.

All three models were operating at VCC. The Faculty Council utilized a consensus model, the Classified Council operated using a democratic system, and the College Council was primarily a consultative body for the President. Moreover, at the department level a variety of different decision-making models existed. Some managers utilized a consensus process of decision-making, while others operated primarily through consultation. The President had a preference for a consultative model of decision-making (Cutler, 1991).

The Board of Education tried to clarify shared decision-making through a Board Policy adopted in March 1994. Issues and conflicts continued to surface, and in October 1995, the Board convened a work session on shared decision-making to clarify its expectations. The Board invited 30 faculty, classified staff, management, and students to define what part of shared decision-making at VCC was working and what was not and to develop strategies for improvements.
Although VCC provided lots of opportunities for staff involvement, it was viewed by many as dissatisfying. Many perceived a lack of results or benefits from involvement. Staff members complained that their participation did not result in their having any impact on the decisions made. Some staff expressed that they did not feel heard. The President stated, "the college culture places a higher value on relationships than results." Therefore, when conflict emerged, an issue would get dropped unless a solution could be found that all staff supported. Confusion continued about what was meant by shared decision-making. Does shared decision-making mean that everyone shares in the decision? Does shared decision-making mean that staff are asked to provide input but their ideas go ignored? The Board interpreted shared decision-making as staff providing input, but they did not believe every decision needed to be shared with all staff. Some of the strategies identified during the work session for improving the understanding of what was meant by shared decision-making included:

- Create a decision matrix and identify the kinds of decisions, who participates, and the limits and boundaries of those participating in a decision.
- Define the role and authority of leadership, and elements of effective participation (Board, College Council, Vice Presidents, President).
- Label committees as advisory or decision-making.
- Clarify what decisions are mandatory, optional, or strongly encouraged for shared decision-making.
Clarify the definition of shared decision-making that VCC will adopt. (Shared Decision-Making Work Session minutes, October 16, 1995)

At the time of this study, issues and conflicts still existed around implementing shared decision-making at VCC. As a result, these issues played a role in how decision-making was handled during the change process, which is the subject of this study.

Organizational Restructuring

In 1993-1994, the Executive Cabinet, composed of the President, vice presidents, and other executive managers, believed that organizational restructuring was needed in order to create an even stronger and more responsive college environment. According to Bolman and Deal (1991), organizations tend to resist major restructuring as long as possible. But if institutional circumstances change and the organizational structure does not, pressures build that cannot be ignored. The pressures may be caused by changes in the environment, technology, political climate, leadership, or continued growth of the organization. All of these changes had occurred at VCC since its last major restructuring. Members of the Executive Cabinet believed that the time had come for VCC to change to accommodate and adapt to these and other challenges. In May 1994, following a year-long collaborative
process, the President announced an organizational restructuring of the college. In addition to a new organizational structure, an organizational vision was developed that called for new ways of working. As stated in a memo from the President to staff in May 1994:

Organizational restructuring is only the beginning of change at Valley Community College. An organizational vision outlined for the staff requires changes in fundamental values, changes in the way staff work, and in work relationships, and training for all employees. Fulfillment of this vision is a long-term project to which we must dedicate ourselves for years to come. Success in this venture will depend on our combined commitment to intensive ongoing staff training; examining our internal policies and procedures, changing those that hinder service to students; and changing our reward systems to encourage behaviors that support the values of teamwork, quality, and service.

In the same college-wide communication, the attributes for the VCC of the past were contrasted with those of the future:

The Valley Community College of the past was a highly successful organization, thanks to strong community support and the hard work of its employees. There is evidence that in the future not only hard work but also a different kind of work will be necessary for success. The college must change to adapt to a new and highly dynamic environment. It is often the most successful organizations, in the 1960’s, General Motors, IBM, Exxon, etc., that are slowest to change when change is needed. VCC must not make that mistake.

The most important characteristic of the college in the future must be quality. In the past, quality was achieved by hard work and by pouring more resources into a problem or effort. In the future, quality cannot be a function of resources: we must learn to use reengineering and continuous quality improvement to achieve higher
quality at lower cost. We must examine each of our processes to ensure that they are meeting learners' needs. We must work as efficiently as possible.

The VCC of the past had many of the qualities of a bureaucracy. The VCC of the future must instead be a high-performance work system. In place of bureaucratic rules we must establish guiding visions: No more rules should be specified than are absolutely necessary. Whenever we encounter variations from the ideal, we must review the total process to improve it (not establish new rules). Employees will need to be more flexible and adaptive, and learn to work in teams. To support these teams, information must be even more accessible: Data must be shared, and employees must become even more involved in making key institutional decisions. Managers must move away from control toward agenda-setting, coaching, and empowerment of staff. Employees must become more accountable, and the college will continue to strengthen its accountability to its local Board of Education, state-level agencies, and the legislature.

The most important activities at VCC are teaching and learning. All of us must maintain this central focus, and ensure that we provide quality learning experiences. Above all, we must care, about quality instruction, about VCC, about learners, about each other. An institution that provides quality learning experiences in a caring environment has nothing to fear from the future.

Also stated in the new organizational vision was an emphasis on being learner centered:

Valley Community College will be centered on learning, and will assume new responsibilities only when they involve learning. Not all learning occurs in the classroom or lab, but can take place through a number of nonclassroom activities. Most learning will occur through either education or training. Everyone at VCC--students, staff, etc.--must be engaged in learning. The organization must be a learning organization, 'an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future (Senge, 1990)."
Team Building/Leadership Training

The new organizational vision called for an emphasis on team-building and shared leadership. Therefore, beginning in July 1994, resources were allocated to assist employees' in acquiring the soft skills needed to be successful in teamwork--e.g., interpersonal communication, collaboration, conflict resolution, problem solving--and to develop leadership skills. These opportunities were offered for enrollment to all employees on a voluntary basis.

Investments in Information Technology

In 1987, VCC implemented an automated touch-tone telephone registration system. In 1993, the college added self-service computer kiosks to provide students with access to information on available classes, class schedules, the location of campus events, and the status of their financial aid. In 1994, students began accessing their grades through the touch-tone telephone system. More recently, VCC developed a fiber-optic wide-area network that serves the college's internal communication needs and provides ready access to the Internet.
Existing Operating Challenges

At the time of this study, VCC faced continuing operating challenges in the form of increased enrollment, demographic changes, increasing administrative-service demand, and changing technology. These challenges occurred in an environment of constrained operating funds resulting from an anticipated change (beginning in 1996-1997) in the state funding formula to provide for funding equalization among the state’s community colleges. Equalization was a method used by the state to impose a revenue freeze on relatively well-funded colleges like VCC while lower-funded college caught up. Awaiting equalization, VCC leaders were reluctant to use its funding for recurring expenditures that could not be sustained in the long term. This strategy created tensions in colleges, like VCC, that had associated higher quality with more full-time staff and expansion of programs (Moskus, 1997). Partly in response to these operating challenges, the district voters approved a $42.8 million construction bond so that VCC could update facilities, equipment, and technology. A description of each of the operating challenges is provided.
Increased Enrollment

In the past 8 years, VCC's total annual unduplicated head-count enrollment increased 19%. The community college each year serves over 40,000 different students with an annual FTE of 11,968. Since the college's enrollment growth is primarily in part-time students, head count is the best indicator of increased enrollment.

Demographic Changes

Valley Community College experienced shifts in enrollment from primarily full-time to primarily part-time, from younger to older students, and from noncredit to credit, especially in the area of lower division transfer-credit offerings. Increased enrollment occurred among Hispanic/Latino and African American populations (although accounting for 8% of the total college population), traditional-age students (18-21), women, and dislocated workers.

Increasing Administrative Demand

Student expectations were changing, and satisfying these expectations required the delivery of quick and efficient services. Students were seeking support services that afforded greater convenience and were not limited to a physical place or time of day. Staff members
were expressing frustration by having to work extra hours to buffer
students from inefficient and unnecessary processes. VCC was also
experiencing increased rules from state and federal reporting agencies
and greater accountability to taxpayers and the accrediting agency.
Concurrently, VCC was aware that the higher education marketplace was
becoming increasingly competitive. The staff anticipated that in the
near future the college could face increased competition for students
from traditional higher education and commercial providers, especially
those delivering instruction through the Internet.

Changing Technology

With its emphasis on technical education and training, VCC was
sensitive to changes in technology. In the previous 10 years, an
electronics revolution had occurred in local industries related to
automobiles, heavy equipment, and aviation; computer-assisted design
and manufacturing had transformed industry; and new technologies
generally threatened to outstrip the college’s ability to keep up in such
fields as health, business, and communications. Internally, VCC moved
to a new software system for administrative applications, with attendant
change and disruptions. Computers and other forms of advanced
technology were playing a central role in students’ future personal and
professional lives. According to a 1996 student survey, 65% of the VCC students owned computers, had increasingly sophisticated computer skills, and expected to have access to the latest computer technology.

Executive Retreat

VCC had been recognized for innovation and for providing high-quality services to students and the community. Community demand for educational services from VCC was expanding. However, the current funding picture showed little or no increase in continuing revenues (including state funding and local property taxes). Because college staffing resources were stretched to their limit, the college was unable to improve or maintain current service levels without radical change in how it conducted business. The Executive Cabinet, composed of the President, vice presidents, and other executive managers, concluded that it must improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its internal processes to meet the college's continuing operating challenges and move from a bureaucratic organization toward a high-performance work system as envisioned in the President's "Restructuring Document" of 1994. At an Executive Retreat in August 1994, in response to anticipated budget constraints, increased demands from students and staff for better customer service, increased competition, and increased work demands
resulting in stress on employees, the President appointed the Vice President for College Operations and this investigator, the Executive Assistant to the President, to identify and explore methods that could help the college address these operating challenges. The immediate goal was to identify an approach that would involve staff in defining ways to improve student/customer satisfaction, improve employee job satisfaction, and enhance the use of technology, while containing costs.

Given VCC’s culture of participative decision-making, the executive leadership felt that broad-based staff participation was necessary in order for the change effort to be embraced cooperatively. Finding an approach for change that would work in a college with a history of loathing conflict, valuing relationships over results, and yielding to one-vote vetoes was challenging.

This major transformational effort spanned more than 4 years. The purpose of this study is to document the approach used and to identify the factors and strategies the community college employed to modify the organization’s structural, cultural, and political systems in order for a change of this magnitude to be successful. In order to document the strategies used during this change process, a chronological approach details the three phases of the planned change process: explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation.
Explore and Plan Phase

Project Management Team Formed

In January 1995, the college began the Explore and Plan Phase by forming a Project Management Team comprised of the Vice President for College Operations, this investigator, as the Executive Assistant to the President, and two organizational-change consultants. The project managers' role was initially to explore the feasibility of utilizing process-redesign tools and the methodology defined below to aid the college. Later the role expanded to include: identifying internal and external resource requirements, designing and leading key meetings, establishing work plans and schedules, providing leadership support to various team activities, facilitating communication among project participants, controlling completion of work tasks, managing project budgets, managing consultant contracts, reporting progress of projects, and identifying new policy-change requirements.

Process Redesign Defined

For several years, VCC had endorsed the concept of "Total Quality Management" (TQM). TQM methods assume the status quo as the basis for improvement and also assume that current processes are
reasonably close to student/customer expectations. TQM uses technology incrementally. Many administrative departments had successfully used TQM methods to reduce costs and improve effectiveness by streamlining selected functions within their departments. The college staff had been trying to improve the quality of services, while faced with fewer resources. However, the college executive leadership felt more dramatic measures were needed to address the immediate operating challenges while moving toward realizing the restructuring goal of becoming a high-performance work organization.

Since 1994, the college had been providing all its staff with the opportunity for training in team-oriented, high-performance work organizations. One of the most critical aspects of a high-performance work organization is its ability to redesign its work processes for maximum productivity and human effectiveness. Process-redesign methods, unlike TQM, were known to facilitate higher levels of performance improvements that eliminated organizational boundaries and redesigned work processes cross-functionally.

According to Hammer and Champy (1993), reengineering (process redesign) means "starting over." It does not mean tinkering with what already exists or making incremental changes that leave basic structures intact. It does mean abandoning long-established procedures
and looking afresh at the work required to create a service and deliver value to the customer. It involves going back to the beginning and inventing a better way of doing work.

A project rationale and overview communication provided VCC staff with the following explanation in August 1995:

Process redesign is the innovative rethinking of how work gets done and services are delivered. Process redesign results in radical change of core college processes. Simply stated, a team of staff members (almost always from different departments) involved in a process will examine that process from the perspective of the students/customers and their needs. To accomplish this, team members are provided with training, analytical tools and facilitation support that enable them to learn about customer needs and to evaluate and improve work methods. The process redesign team then redesigns the process to accomplish the desired outcomes in a way that delivers better service more effectively and more efficiently. A hallmark of process redesign is the use of technology in creative ways to make possible great gains in service and efficiency. (Internal memo, August 1995)

Role of Consultants

During the Explore and Plan Phase, external consultants were hired to: (a) educate members of the college’s executive cabinet, Board of Education, and selected staff about the concepts, methods and benefits of process redesign; (b) help identify and evaluate the college’s core processes, facilitate the selection of processes to be redesigned and develop a project plan to guide the college’s efforts; and (c) assess the
current state of information technology at the college and the readiness of the Computer Services Department to support future redesign projects and the resulting redesigned processes.

The hiring of external consultants was controversial within the college. The controversy resulted from some staff perceiving that the cost was wasteful and unnecessary, particularly at a time of constrained operating resources. Some staff argued that "the skills and knowledge about redesign methods already existed within the college." However, executive leadership expressed that if this were the case, "why had the desired changes not taken place before?" The executive leadership requested and the Board of Education approved the use of consultants when a unique knowledge or set of skills were needed that were not resident among the staff and in areas where the college did not want to staff for these skills on an ongoing basis. As stated by one executive, "college staff are the process experts and the consultants are the methodology experts." Although the initial project would be consultant intensive, future projects were to become self-managed--i.e., managed by staff. Therefore, the college contracted with consultants for their immediate knowledge and skills and also for the license to continue to use their methods for staff to lead future redesign projects. The executive leadership endorsed a phased approach that was model-driven
rather than discovery-driven (principles, models and concrete examples from other colleges would be used to accelerate staff thinking about better alternatives).

Following the Explore and Plan Phase and for subsequent phases, a team of consultants was retained to provide overall project guidance; facilitate change management (attending to the human processes involved in bringing about change) and communication; assist with executive decision-making; develop management communications and planning; and train teams on applying methodology, team-oriented group process, and problem solving.

Process-Redesign Assessment and Awareness Training

Between April and June 1995, the Project Management Team conducted a preliminary assessment to determine the feasibility of redesigning work processes and conducted a two-day awareness training for 25 individuals from the Executive Cabinet, union leaders, selected staff, and board members.

The preliminary assessment involved talking with managers and staff about redesign and identifying the processes that could be redesign candidates. A communication sent from the Project Management Team to possible participants in process redesign indicated the following:
The Executive Cabinet has been exploring the possibility of launching a project to redesign some college processes. The Executive Cabinet has been concerned for a long time about the pressures that college staff are under—particularly (classified) support services staff—to "do more with less." The Executive Cabinet is committed to providing an opportunity with one-time resources for a major effort to redesign some selected processes in order to improve the quality of these services while also improving efficiency and cost effectiveness. In addition, a goal is to move responsibility for processes to the people actually doing the work. In fact, a major component of process redesign is the participation in the redesign process of those who actually do the work. We see this as the next logical step in realizing the President's May 1994 Restructuring Vision. (Memo to staff from the Project Management Team, April 21, 1995)

In late June 1995, two days were devoted to awareness training sessions for the purpose of learning about the use of process-redesign tools in a college environment. The sessions were designed to enable participants to develop a common understanding of process-redesign concepts and methods so that they would be able to provide informed input as the college proceeded to explore the potential for utilizing this approach. During the training sessions, the participants performed a readiness analysis for Process Redesign at VCC that identified helping and hindering factors to change. Helping and hindering factors were organized under the themes shown in Table 2.

These factors were eventually used by the Process Redesign Leadership Team (formed in October 1995) for evaluating past
TABLE 2. Helping and Hindering Factors to Process Redesign at VCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helping factors</th>
<th>Hindering factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External factors</td>
<td>Cultural resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Negative historical baggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>Concerns about job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond opportunity</td>
<td>Process redesign viewed as a trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>Lack of understanding or knowledge of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of financial and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diminishing human resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unsuccessful attempts at change and developing change-strategy approaches for the future. This process is described in greater detail later in the study.

Information Technology Assessment

The Project Management Team viewed an assessment of the available information technology as essential to developing an understanding of whether the college’s current technology platform was capable of supporting changing work processes. During the late spring and summer of 1995, the college contracted with external consultants for the assessment. The assessment focused on describing the technological environment and identifying the level of technological investment,
training, and redeployment that would be required to implement
redesigned work processes.

In conducting the assessment, 55 staff, primarily high users of
technology, were interviewed. From these interviews a list of
opportunities in the areas of policy, process, automation, and
organization were identified. The assessment took 3 months, and the
consultants recommended that in order for the Computer Services group
to effectively support ongoing process-redesign efforts, technology
services and resources must be better organized. Key steps toward
reaching this goal included:

1. Establish and maintain a customer focus and redesign
Information Technology functions to better provide for user needs.

2. Define and communicate information technology services to
be provided.

3. Align and coordinate information technology resources across
campus; articulate and commit to a campus-wide information technology
strategy with support from leadership.

4. Apply new technologies to support new campus functions as
determined by the redesign process.

Following the assessment, a Technology Support Planning Team
was formed to implement information technology improvements and to
develop recommendations on how to maximize the use of the college’s resources in order to provide the best possible computer technical support services to the college.

Process Evaluation and Assessment

Valley Community College executive leadership did not want to engage in a haphazard change effort without clear goals or directions. Instead, they decided to undertake a systematic evaluation process to identify those areas where the needs and opportunities for change were greatest. During the summer of 1995, VCC’s President appointed a Process Evaluation and Selection Team (PEST) to identify the college’s core processes and make a recommendation about which process(es), if redesigned, would provide the greatest benefits to improve customer service, increase efficiency, and at the same time relieve staff work pressures. The PEST team was comprised of seven employees (five managers, one faculty member, and one classified staff member).

The PEST team identified opportunities for improvement in six core process areas: (a) facilities and support; (b) grants and contracts; (c) personnel and payroll; (d) planning, budgeting, and financial processes; (5) procurement; and (6) services to students. A process profile was developed for each that contained: (a) process definition;
(b) a process map; (c) current process costs; (d) key findings, including employee readiness assessment for change; and (e) opportunities (quick wins) and treatments for change. In addition to the process profiles, the team developed selection criteria to use in identifying the core process to redesign first. The selection criteria included:

1. Improve customer service.
2. Improve efficiency.
3. Positive impact on VCC's success factors (e.g., funding, student enrollment and retention, student outcomes, community support, retention of employees).
4. Improve employee job satisfaction, culture, and work environment.
5. Use technology as an enabler.
6. Ease of obtaining measurable results.
7. Implement within 1 year with significant results.
8. Staff interest and readiness for change.
10. Highly visible to VCC and the community.
11. Bond facility opportunity.

As part of its work, the PEST team administered a staff-readiness assessment survey in August 1995 to employees in all core process areas
to evaluate employee readiness for change. The results of the survey overwhelmingly indicated that employees were ready for change, with 85% of the respondents agreeing that improvements were needed in support services, 92% agreeing that there was a better way of organizing and performing work within the college, and 82% agreeing that improved work processes would bring greater job satisfaction and better customer service. However, 67% of respondents expressed indifference and/or discouragement about previous change efforts. It was evident that future change efforts would need to have the sustained support of executive leadership for staff to be willing to participate.

The PEST team’s work took 5 months, and in December 1995 the services-to-students process was recommended to the Process Redesign Leadership Team as the first redesign project. This process was recommended because it ranked highest in meeting the above process-selection criteria. The PEST team found that services to students: (a) was a highly visible process affecting over 37,000 students/customers each year; (b) had more than eight different student categories with different objectives, information, and intake functions; (c) lacked consistent, integrated, and seamless delivery of service; (d) demonstrated uneven application of information technology; (e) had fragmented departments and programs that caused students to be bounced among
service providers before getting the answers they needed; and (f) reflected a high level of employee readiness for change.

In addition to identifying the core processes, and recommending the services-to-students process for redesign, the PEST team also identified opportunities for significant improvements in the nonselected processes that could be accomplished quickly (quick wins) with little to no additional resources. For an improvement to be considered a quick win, it had to meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Has a person with the authority and desire to do it who is willing to take the risk.
2. Eliminates non-value-added tasks.
3. Has few steps involved.
4. Has minimal budget impact to implement.
5. Is an interim step to an ultimate outcome.
6. Results could be visible very soon.
7. Has minimal complications.

One member of the PEST team stated that "Process Redesign will become a way of life at VCC." Another said, "we need to find a way to build change into the institution." These statements were consistent with the organizational vision communicated by the President to staff in May 1994:
To continue to be a strong, effective community college, everything the college does must be rethought, and every staff member needs to consider how to perform his/her job in new ways that are more efficient and effective.

The PEST team continued to work 2 months beyond its initial charge to more fully develop the scope of the services-to-students redesign and to act as a subteam of the Process Redesign Leadership Team to develop the overall approach for redesign of services to students; develop goals, measures, and targets; identify the needed skill sets for redesign team members; and create plans for gathering baseline measures.

Leadership for Process Redesign

While the Process Evaluation and Selection Team was busy identifying and evaluating the core processes, in September 1995, the President appointed an 18-member Process Redesign Leadership Team to communicate strategic direction and vision for all redesign projects. Individuals were selected because they best met the following criteria:

1. They have a legitimate leadership role.
2. They are credible and influential.
3. They are able to see and support the broad goals of the college and can see beyond their own department’s needs and functions.
4. They are innovators.
5. They have a track record of working well in groups and with processes.

6. They want to apply process redesign successfully.

7. They are good sensors of opinion and climate within the college.

8. They are knowledgeable about areas of the college where process redesign was being considered.

The 18 individuals chosen to serve on the Leadership Team represented senior and midlevel management, faculty and classified staff from a wide range of functions and diverse interests. Given VCC's culture of participative decision-making, the executive leadership felt that broad-based staff participation was necessary in order for the change effort to be embraced cooperatively by the rest of the organization rather than challenged confrontationally or simply resisted passively, whether due to cultural blockage, bureaucratic momentum, or political reaction (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992). While a large and broad-based coalition was critical for success in VCC's culture, it often meant that decision-making took longer. The team met weekly for almost a year and then reduced the frequency of their meetings to bimonthly and then once per term. The Leadership Team served as a focal point for planning the transformation effort, identifying which services to target for
improvement, and developing the parameters and scope for the change effort. The Leadership Team played a pivotal role in securing the necessary resources for the change project.

The members of the Leadership Team defined themselves as a group of dedicated, influential, pro-student/customer, pro-staff working together collaboratively to achieve a degree of significant change that cannot be accomplished by individuals working on their own.

The team served as an informed, representative group of employees who sponsored the redesign project. They provided awareness, visibility, and understanding for the need for change college-wide. The Leadership Team's work was guided by an organizational-change consultant whose role was to train and facilitate effective group process in order for meaningful change to occur. Of the many accomplishments of the Leadership Team, the following are described in detail because of their significance in promoting successful change: (a) endorsed the roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority related to the process redesign project; (b) developed a vision for process redesign; (c) developed performance goals and measures; (d) evaluated why past change efforts had been unsuccessful and generated ideas for what to do differently in the future; and (e) developed strategies to promote successful change.
Roles, Responsibility, and Decision-Making Authority

The Leadership Team was assigned the following roles and responsibilities:

1. Communicate strategic direction and vision for redesign.
2. Select processes for redesign.
3. Define process scope limitations (e.g., boundaries).
4. Determine internal and external resource requirements.
5. Monitor overall project progress.
6. Adjust project approach as needed.
7. Evaluate and recommend new operating policy changes.
8. Review process-change proposals and make recommendations to the Executive Cabinet.
9. Set performance standards for each process.
10. Develop and implement change-management strategies.
11. Sponsor campus-wide communications.

Concurrent with the formation of the Process Redesign Leadership Team, the VCC Board of Education was attempting to clarify its expectations on shared decision-making so that internal issues and conflicts resulting from different interpretations could be resolved (referenced earlier in the developments leading up to the study). In an attempt to avoid the decision-making confusion that existed college-
wide, the Project Management Team developed a decision matrix to allocate work responsibilities. The first step was to construct a grid; the types of issues or decisions that needed to be taken were listed on the left-hand side of the grid, and the parties who might play some part in decision-making were identified across the top of the grid. The Project Management Team then assigned each party one of the following four behaviors for each issue/decision: responsible, approval/veto authority, consulted, and informed (Beckhard & Harris, 1977; Beckhard & Prichard, 1992). Also, the Project Management Team developed a statement of roles and responsibilities for all parties involved with the project. The decision matrix and definition of roles and responsibilities were presented to the Process Redesign Leadership Team for endorsement. In addition, the Process Redesign Leadership Team developed its own ground rules for decision-making within the team. In October 1995, the Leadership Team agreed to the following ground rule on team decision-making:

Our team decisions will be by consensus, defined as everyone has had an opportunity for input, feels they were heard and understood, and can support the decision. After our team makes a decision, members will support that decision outside the team. (Leadership Team Operational Guidelines, 10/95)

This ground rule worked so long as everyone agreed. However, when there were divergent views, the team struggled to find common
ground. The first test occurred when the team attempted to reach agreement on its mission statement for process redesign at VCC. Some team members saw the mission as including instructional processes, and others felt the mission should be limited to administrative and student service processes. Conflict erupted and blocked progress because of the team's inability to reach consensus. As stated by one team member,

I believe that to strive for consensus should be the ultimate goal; however, achieving a full consensus has proven in many cases to be impossible and unnecessary in making quality decisions. The support for a team decision is vital. It is important that the process not be undermined by a few members with opposing opinions. If a few individuals are adamant about an issue, I believe that it is in the best interest of the team to address their concerns and to work towards consensus, but it is unreasonable to think that every individual member must agree on every issue before the team can move forward.

On January 19, 1996, in an effort to resolve the mission-statement conflict, the team affirmed their desire to make decisions by consensus (initial definition), and agreed to the following methods for how they would strive for consensus by:

a) restating the definition of consensus, b) polling members to test for agreements, c) identifying the focus of disagreements, d) devoting time necessary to reach consensus on important matters, e) working on resolution proposals outside of the full team. (Leadership Team Revised Operational Guidelines, 1/19/96)

A subgroup of the Leadership Team was formed to examine the conflicting views and facilitate the development of a mission statement.
Conflict continued within the team, and although attempts to resolve the mission issue had been ongoing since November, 1995, no resolution was in sight. In February 1996, a subgroup of the Leadership Team was formed to evaluate and consider revisions to the decision-making ground rules in an effort to resolve the continuing issues surrounding consensus.

On March 1, 1996, training consultants were hired to provide interest-based negotiation training to assist team members in the acquisition of conflict-resolution skills. On March 15, 1996, another subgroup of the Leadership Team was formed to develop a discussion framework for the mission statement. On April 5, 1996, the Leadership Team identified the following problems with its consensus model of decision-making:

1. One person can block a decision.
2. Team members feel pressured to give up their belief in order to move forward.
3. Team members have been viewed as not living up to the ground rules on supporting decisions outside of the group.
4. The relationship between the Leadership Team and collective bargaining has been challenging.
5. Team members are still learning skill processes for resolving conflicts and making difficult decisions.
6. Employee representatives (labor union representatives) have felt that they had an integrity-related duty to continue to hold out for the interests of their constituents when they felt these interests were at odds with the prevailing views of the team. (Leadership Team Minutes on Ground Rule Refinement, 4/5/96)
As one observer stated in April 1996,

The team needs to come to an agreement on an operational definition of consensus. The team has become entangled in a consensus debate every meeting. Currently, consensus means everyone must vote yes on all issues, which is an extreme definition for consensus and most would agree, not the correct one for this group.

In striving for a decision-making model that the Leadership Team would support, the following interests were identified by the team members:

1. Identify an approach that encourages disagreement and examination of all interests.
2. Make decisions in a reasonable amount of time (length of discussion) and in a timely way.
3. Identify an approach which does not make people feel coerced to abandon their beliefs.
4. Identify an approach which results in all members supporting the team and the team’s decision which is critical to fulfilling the team’s mission of leading successful process redesign. (Leadership Team Minutes on Ground Rule Refinement, 4/5/96)

The training consultants returned on May 10, 1996, to assist the team in developing additional tools in facilitating consensus decision-making. Their focus was to assist the team in identifying a method of decision-making that would not result in deadlocking and to ensure that decisions, once made, could be supported outside the group. The tools developed by the team included the following:

We will strive for consensus (initial definition) by using the following tools:
1. Before the team comes to a deadlock, visually write up the areas of agreement that the team does have.
2. Visually identify points of clash.
3. Give everyone a set time to present views by going around the room versus random discussion.
4. Poll everyone, not just the people with the most interest.
5. Ask if everyone has been heard, then poll, then allow the minority to speak again but don’t continually restate.
6. When the team deadlocks, use options to delegate issues to a group that represents divergent points of view—then come back with variety of interests, etc., framed so the entire team engages in discussion (questions at hand, positions, interests, options discussed). (Leadership Team Minutes, 5/10/96)

The team was asked to consider a voting option for making decisions; however, agreement could not be reached. The consultants suggested that the team use these new tools to see if they were helpful in reaching decisions. Following the meeting, several team members expressed frustration over the team’s inability to make decisions in a timely manner and that the consensus issue remained unsolved.

At the team’s June 14, 1996 meeting, the training consultants facilitated more discussion in an attempt to resolve the decision-making ground-rule issue. Points of agreement and areas of clash were reviewed. After some discussion, the team agreed to consider making decisions by a majority vote only after all other methods had been
exhausted. The team agreed to add another tool to those developed in May:

7. Vote. After we have used the above tools for reaching consensus, if we are unable to reach consensus, we will vote. A decision is made when 75% of those members present vote in support of a decision. In instances where decisions are reached by voting, we will relax the requirement of member support outside the meeting. (Leadership Team Minutes, 6/14/96)

Although the context for the 9-month debate had been the Leadership Team’s Mission Statement, the central issue was developing a decision-making model that yielded decisions. On July 12, 1996, after a review of the history of discussions surrounding the mission statement, and acknowledging that planned change at VCC could use different approaches for different areas, agreement was reached on the Leadership Team’s Mission Statement:

To lead the evaluation, redesign and successful implementation of fundamental strategic change in the college’s administrative and student services core processes to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of our students/customers now and in the future. (Leadership Team Minutes, 7/12/96)

The entire team acknowledged the importance of making decisions and modeling for the college how to deal with conflicting ideas so that forward movement could occur. Since prior attempts at implementing change had failed because of dissent, the development of
a decision-making model that resulted in actual decisions was useful. Valley Community College's culture historically valued affiliation, loathed conflict and supported one-vote vetoes. More information on why past change efforts failed is provided later in this study.

**Process Redesign Vision**

One of the Leadership Team's responsibilities was to develop a compelling vision for process redesign at VCC. The team was responsible for creating vision statement in writing that would represent the ideal the college was trying to achieve as a result of the process-redesign effort. The criteria developed by the team for defining a good vision statement included the following:

1. Explicitly summarizes our fundamental agreement about the direction for the changes we are making.
2. Inspires unity and sustained commitment to the long-term aims of the change effort.
3. Makes our intended end results clear, understandable, and meaningful for stakeholders.
4. Provides a concise image of where we are heading without specifying exactly how we will get there. (Leadership Team Minutes, 12/1/95)

The team began their efforts through a brainstorming session and then appointed a subgroup to refine and recommend the actual vision statement that later was adopted on February 9, 1996 by the full team:

As a result of successful process redesign at Valley Community College:
Staff members look forward to coming to work, feel ownership and pride in their work, enthusiastically participate in the ongoing improvement of the services they provide, are appreciated for their contributions, and have energy left over at the end of the work day.

All staff care about and promote each other's success.

The needs of staff, students, and customers are met reliably and efficiently by processes designed and self-managed by employees with continuous user feedback.

New work processes eliminate fragmentation, duplication, waste, and frustration.

Students/customers want to come to Valley Community College to meet their learning needs because:

- Our processes and individual staff efforts enable students/customers to meet their unique educational goals as easily and quickly as possible.
- All staff care about and promote the success of our students/customers.
- The college's administrative efficiency contributes to affordable educational costs.

Our environment is exciting, dynamic, friendly, supportive, and helpful, and is widely perceived as such.

Members of our community understand and appreciate the contribution the college makes to the quality of life for all who live in our service district.

Valley Community College is nationally admired for its innovation in administrative process and information about our process redesign activities is widely sought.
Performance Goals and Measures

Institutions need to show staff how new approaches have helped improve performance (Kotter, 1995). In other words, they need to demonstrate that the changes have a positive effect, and are not just change for the sake of change. To demonstrate the positive effect of any changes, once implemented, VCC's Leadership Team put considerable effort into developing specific and quantifiable performance measures to track the effect of each implemented recommendation. For each performance measure, the desired outcome was identified, the means for measuring the effect, the tools for measurement, and the person(s) who had responsibility for tracking measurement. In many cases the absence of baseline data resulted in data collection to create benchmarks, prior to any changes, so that it would be possible to measure the impact of any changes and whether the changes were moving the college in the right direction. The Leadership Team emphasized that measuring and benchmarking was an ongoing process and that VCC needed to follow through on these processes to meet the desired outcomes.
Evaluation of Past Change Efforts

During the Leadership Team meeting on January 19, 1996, the organizational-change consultant provided an orientation on change management (attending to the human processes involved in bringing about change). The following examples were cited by the consultant as common reasons for failed change in organizations:

Common Reasons for Failed Change:
1. Goal Problems: Unclear, conflicting or hidden goals.
2. Leadership Uncommitted: Lack of clear, visible commitment from senior leaders.
3. Inadequate Resources: Underestimation and underallocation of time and money.
4. Missing Rewards: No incentives for change.
5. Lack of Ownership: Insufficient participation and resulting lack of commitment by those who need to make it happen.
6. Inadequate Communication: A lack of knowledge required to understand and support the change.
7. Fragmented Approach: Attempting to change just one part of a system when there are many interdependencies with other parts.
8. Rigidity: Lack of means to evaluate and adjust the approach.
9. Lack of Training: Failure to develop skills needed to be competent in the new environment. (Leadership Team Minutes, 1/19/96)

Next, team members were given an exercise for analyzing past unsuccessful change efforts at VCC. The purpose of the exercise was to assist the team in becoming more knowledgeable and, as a result, more successful in leading organizational change. Through analyzing past
change efforts at VCC, the team was told that they would identify: (a) patterns, errors, and omissions; (b) clues on what could have been done to effect change successfully; and (c) how to avoid being unsuccessful in implementing future change. Team members were instructed to work individually to complete the exercise and to select a change effort that had not been successful within the past 2 years. The example of change was supposed to satisfy the following criteria: a change with which most people would agree, one that did not meet all of its objectives, that was partially successful, or that could have been approached differently. After choosing an example, each individual was asked to answer the following questions about the unsuccessful change effort:

1. Why was the change attempt initiated?
2. What were the objectives?
3. What levels and groups were affected?
4. What levels and groups were to be affected by the change?
5. Who was committed to the project? Why?
6. Who had concerns about the project? Why?
7. How was the project to be evaluated?
8. How did it end? With a bang or a whimper?
9. What were the key reasons the project failed to achieve its goals?
Following this activity, team members shared their examples of unsuccessful past change efforts at VCC:

1. Hub: Creation of a one-stop central information center for students.
2. Electronic Reader Board: Broadcast of critical class information on channel 12 (television) from the HP 3000 (mainframe computer).
3. Leadership Styles: Adopt non-adversarial participative management style and follow unifying principles.
4. Enrollment Management Team.
5. OCCSIS ("Oxis"): Create a statewide community college information system.
6. Automatic Employee Payroll Direct Deposit: Enroll all employees in the automatic bank deposits for paychecks.
8. Organizational Reorganization: Restructuring to clusters of departments.
9. Academic Advising Program: Establishing a person to advise both credit and non-credit programs.
10. Departmental Reorganization: Unification of the Business Development Center and Business and Industry Services into one department. (Leadership Team Minutes, 1/19/96)

Then the consultant divided the team members into three groups and asked each group to identify the common reasons for failed change among a set of these examples and to make suggestions for what to do differently next time.

Each group presented their responses and later organized them into the themes shown in Table 3.
TABLE 3. Correcting Past Failures: Common Intervention Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common reasons for past change failure at VCC</th>
<th>What to do differently next time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top down</td>
<td>Use a structured approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked leadership</td>
<td>Ensure adequate resources to carry out the change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural limitations</td>
<td>Communicate more effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked planning</td>
<td>Assess (measure) outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td>Train staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked follow-through</td>
<td>Reward new staff behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this activity, the consultant provided information on the principles of organizational change and described three times when change occurs: (a) in times of threat, (b) when people are well informed and can plan for the future, and (c) when those involved are so in tune with the future that they can work towards change readily and easily.

The consultant reviewed illustrations of positive and negative responses to change. She stated,

no matter whether a change is originally seen as positive or negative, when people's expectations are significantly disrupted, the end result is resistance. The way people manifest their resistance differs according to how they view the change.

People who originally perceive a major change to have positive implications follow a separate path of resistance than those who see it as
negative from the outset (Conner, 1992). The consultant described the phases people go through when they originally embrace a change as positive (positive response to change), only to resist it later:

1. *Uninformed optimism* (certainty): the honeymoon period when participants have naive enthusiasm based on insufficient data.

2. *Informed pessimism* (doubt): when participants realize that a great deal of what they were promised will not come to pass and they have to accept circumstances for which they are unprepared. This is a stage of second thoughts. Depending on the individuals’ tolerance to pessimism, they will either persist or check out. If individuals check out, the change process ends.

3. *Hopeful realism* (hope): surfaces as the pessimism tapers off and individuals begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

4. *Informed optimism* (confidence): as more and more concerns are resolved and individuals become more confident that the change will occur.

5. *Completion* (satisfaction): the realization of the change effort.

An illustration depicting the phases people go through when they perceive change to be positive is provided in Figure 1.

When describing negative responses to change, the consultant referenced the work of Dr. Elisabeth Kubler-Ross (1969), who had developed a model for how people evolve through a series of stages as they confront their own mortality or that of a loved one. She stated that the Kubler-Ross model has proven applicability to the work world as well as to the clinical environment (Conner, 1992). Negative response to change was defined as occurring when people initially resisted the change, only to accept it later. She described a continuum of passive
and active emotional responses that people experienced before a change
could be fully accepted (Conner, 1992):

1. Stability: precedes the announcement of the change. It
represents the present state, or status quo.

2. Immobilization: The initial reaction to a negatively perceived
change is shock. Reactions may vary from temporary confusion to
complete disorientation. The impact of the change is so alien to a
person’s frame of reference that it is often hard to relate to what is
happening.

3. Denial: an inability to assimilate new information into the
current frame of reference. At this stage, change-related information is
often rejected or ignored.

4. Anger: frustration and hurt, often manifested through
irrational, indiscriminate lashing out at those in close proximity—i.e.,
friends and family.

5. Bargaining: negotiating to avoid the negative impact of
change. Bargaining takes many forms, e.g., requests for deadline
extensions, reassignments. This point in the process signals that an
individual can no longer avoid a confrontation with reality.

6. Depression: Resignation to failure, feeling victimized, a lack
of emotional and physical energy, and disengagement from one’s work
are likely symptoms. Although an unpleasant experience, depression can represent a positive step in the acceptance process. At this point, the full weight of the negative change is finally acknowledged.

7. Testing: Regaining a sense of control helps people free themselves from feelings of victimization and depression. This is accomplished by acknowledging the new limitations while also exploring ways to redefine goals so that it is possible to succeed within a new framework.

8. Acceptance: People begin to respond to the change realistically; however, acceptance of the change is not synonymous with liking it. People become more grounded and productive within a new context.

An illustration depicting the phases people go through when they perceive change to be negative is provided in Figure 2.

She explained that employees would be distributed along either the positive or negative response-to-change continuum and cycle back and forth on the continuum throughout a change effort.

Because of the previous discussion about unsuccessful change efforts at VCC, teams members raised questions and engaged in a discussion about how to address resistance to change in the future. One
team member asked, "How will the Leadership Team know when to take resistance seriously, or when it's only a stage of negative response?"

The consultant responded, "There is no real way to answer this question. It will be up to the team to make the best decision in how to proceed in light of the resistance." She added, "as team members you should expect strong resistance and remain cohesive and support one another."

A concern was raised that staff will be in the visioning stage during the height of the denial/depression stage. The consultant emphasized the importance of informing the staff as soon as possible.
about the change desired, so that most resisters will have passed that stage. Several team members voiced concerns regarding staff apathy towards process redesign. The consultant suggested that Leadership Team members visit department meetings to discuss process redesign in order for more people to understand its purpose.

One team member stated, "from my observation, when change has previously happened at VCC, it has been accomplished by stealth. Whenever a more formal change process has been attempted, the effort failed."

The consultant stated that from her observation, the following reasons, inherent in VCC’s culture, had inhibited the successful implementation of change in the past:

1. Unwilling to make clear decisions regarding change.
2. Allowed dissent to stop change.
3. Gave up too soon.
4. Involved lots of people without results or benefits from involvement. (Leadership Team Minutes, 1/19/96)

The consultant stated that when involved in major organizational change, you can enhance resilience if you:

1. Understand the basic mechanisms of human resistance.
2. View resistance as a natural and inevitable reaction to the disruption of expectations.
3. Interpret resistance as a deficiency of either ability or willingness.
4. Encourage and participate in overt expressions of resistance.
5. Understand that resistance to positive change is just as common as resistance to negatively perceived change and that both reactions follow their own respective sequence of events, which can be anticipated and managed. (Leadership Team Minutes, 1/19/96)

The consultant then referenced the work of Havelock (1969), a social-interaction researcher who had proven that a receiver's position in the social setting has an effect on the adoption of an innovation. "Laggards" (or the last individuals to accept an innovation), representing about 10-15% of the workforce, were usually isolated from the mainstream of interpersonal relationships. "Innovators," on the other hand, were on the opposite side of the social spectrum, with many contacts inside and outside the local social structure. "Opinion leaders" were a small number of key influential individuals whose prestige set the norms for the group. Their support (or nonsupport) of the innovation would determine the success of adoption, because "early majority" adopters make their decisions based on contact with the opinion leaders and "late majority" adopters make their decisions based on contacts with "early majority" adopters.

Figure 3 illustrates the diffusion of innovation by people over time.
Next, the consultant referenced the work of social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1958), who classified a change process into three phases: the present state, the transition state, and the desired state. Figure 4 illustrates Lewin's (1958) three phases of a change process. The present state was described as the status quo, an established equilibrium that continues indefinitely until a force disrupts it. The transition state was described as the phase when individuals disengage from the status quo. Bridges (1991) refers to this state as the "neutral zone" (p. 37). This
period is characterized by low stability; perceived high levels of inconsistency in the environment; high emotional stress; high, often undirected energy; situations in which control becomes a major issue; past patterns of behavior that become highly valued; and conflict increases. During this period, individuals develop new attitudes or behaviors that lead to the desired state. To attain change, individuals must pass through the uncertain, uncomfortable phase of the transition state.

Keeping major change alive is only possible when the pain of the present state exceeds the cost of the transition state.

Finally, the consultant introduced a change formula, adapted from the work of Beckhard and Harris (1977), for thinking about the resistance process:
Change = (D x V x F) \rightarrow R

D = dissatisfaction with the status quo,

V = vision of a more desirable future state,

F = knowledge of practical next first steps, and

R = resistance/fears.

Effective communication was cited by the consultant as essential for increasing D, V, and F. As communication increases, resistance/fears decrease, thereby creating an environment that can change. Examples were given for how to encourage D, V, and F:

1. D: Get people to think ahead: Where will the college be 10 years from now if we don’t change now?

2. V: Have people think of examples of other organizations that are doing things a better way. We can personalize this for the affected people by asking, what’s dissatisfying to them now and what do they want in the future? An example of how to accomplish this would be to schedule a series of 4-hour meetings of all the affected people. Have a large group orientation and then divide into small groups and ask the following questions: What’s working well? What’s not working?

3. F: Develop the next steps after evaluating the data received from D and V.
Following the presentation, Leadership Team members suggested the following change strategies for VCC.

1. Keep positive communications at all levels of the process in dealing with survival-type negative responses.
2. Avoid negative communication such as citing threats and negative data.
3. Reinforce pride from past accomplishments while at the same time recognizing the future need to adapt and change.
4. Conduct site visits, and have team members be responsive to individual staff concerns.
5. Seek input and be concrete with your vision.
(Leadership Team Minutes, 1/19/96)

It was also noted that the first process redesign project needed to be as positive as possible because it will influence future process redesign projects.

**Strategies to Promote Successful Change**

In July 1996, during a joint meeting of the Leadership Team and Students First! (Services to Students) Redesign Team, the organizational-change consultant reviewed the characteristics of successful change efforts:

1. Dissatisfaction with the status quo.
2. Understanding of the need for change.
3. Clear goals.
4. Positive expectations.
5. A vision of a more desirable state.
6. Frequent communications about change plans and progress.
7. Opportunity for participation in planning for change.
8. Reduction of barriers to change.
9. Skill training.
10. Clear roles for the transition.
11. Visible top-management support.
12. Rewards and recognition to support desired changes.
13. Reduction of risks.
14. New role model behavior.
15. New paradigms. (Leadership Team Minutes, 7/26/96)

The following documents, which had previously been developed by VCC, were distributed: Helping and Hindering Factors identified on June 26, 1995, during a Readiness Assessment for Process Redesign at VCC; and Common Reasons for Past Change Failure at VCC and What to Do Differently Next Time, developed by the Leadership Team on January 19, 1996.

The consultant divided the participants into four subgroups to organize the various items into themes and then to report back to the full group. Following this exercise, new subgroups were formed to develop tactics and strategies to support the successful implementation of the Redesign Team’s recommendations. The subgroups developed 47 tactics and strategies that were summarized as follows:

1. Ensure sufficient resources--VCC must invest in technology support and commit to addressing that shortcoming.
2. Maintain continuous and constant clear communication with the campus.
3. Anticipate critical areas of resistance--VCC has done a good job in anticipating potential resistance. The employment security agreement is a good example.

4. Provide employee training to acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to function successfully in a dynamic team-based environment.

5. Be willing to modify policies to reflect new ways of doing work. We need to question and rethink why things are done in a particular way.

6. Enlist commitment from executive leadership to remove barriers. (Leadership Team Minutes, 7/26/96)

**Recommendation to Proceed to Next Phase**

The Explore and Plan Phase took one year and involved creating opportunities for college staff to develop an understanding of process redesign methods, identifying and evaluating the core processes within the college, building a case for why change was needed, and determining whether there was sufficient opportunity to warrant proceeding with this approach.

After reviewing the Information Technology Assessment and the work of the Process Evaluation and Selection Team, the Process Redesign Leadership Team and members of the Executive Cabinet concluded that process redesign was a change approach that would be successful at VCC. Process redesign was considered the most favorable and promising approach for making the needed changes in a way that allowed widespread participation, intelligent elimination of work,
increased customer service, and support for the college's value system. Process redesign philosophy supported the following core values of the college:

1. Empower college staff who actually do the work to own the work.

2. Concentrate on the student/customer first and improve services to students.

3. Encourage innovation, creativity and risk-taking.

4. Encourage meaningful, fulfilling work and discourage non-value-added activities.

5. Rely on teamwork.


7. Discourage hierarchy and an authoritarian style of management.

At the conclusion of this phase, the Executive Cabinet submitted a recommendation to the VCC Board of Education to proceed with redesigning the college's core administrative processes and to begin with "Services to Students." The recommendation took into consideration that VCC had reserved one-time monies for college-wide projects that would provide a long-term payoff in terms of increased productivity and efficiency, and improved student/customer service. It was determined
that process redesign had the potential to yield substantially more benefit than its initial investment. In February 1996, the Board of Education approved redesigning the services-to-students work processes.

**Analyze and Redesign Phase**

Overall the Analyze and Redesign Phase took 1 year. It involved all the labor relations activities and the evaluation of work processes, development of change recommendations and implementation planning.

**Labor Relations Developments**

The Project Management Team recognized that early union involvement was essential to ensure the support and cooperation of the unions, and to encourage employees to participate willingly in the change process. At the initial meeting of the faculty and classified staff union leaders, management-employee group leaders, and Project Management Team in June 1995, process-redesign change methods were reviewed and union leaders’ interests and concerns were discussed. The Project Management Team explained that the Executive Team (President and Vice Presidents) had decided that change was necessary and that process-redesign methods represented the most favorable and promising approach for making the needed changes in a way that allowed
widespread employee participation, intelligent elimination of work, increased customer service, and support for the college’s value system. Rather than impose specific decisions about project focus, participants, or conditions, the Executive Team wanted the employees to set the direction and determine the changes that would produce the desired results:

1. To improve and enhance the teaching and learning environment;
2. To contain and/or reduce operating costs while improving quality, effectiveness and scope of services to students and other customers of the college;
3. To improve the efficiency of college processes;
4. To relieve the workload stress on employees.

(Project Rationale and Overview, 8/1/95)

Union and management-employee group leaders expressed that if process redesign resulted in more meaningful work for employees, then it would be supported.

At the conclusion of the initial meeting, the attendees agreed to meet on a regular basis to review project progress and plans, and to identify and address concerns of represented employees. These meetings were called Union/Management Collaboration Strategies Meetings. Over the life of the project, the union/management group leaders and the Project Management Team met on a regular basis to identify and resolve labor-related issues. Some of the issues included (a) providing
employment security, (b) identifying compensation and working-condition areas that required negotiation, and (c) initiating a process to define future work roles and relationships that included the development of labor relations principles. The development of employment security agreements occurred during the Analyze and Redesign Phase of the change process and is described next. However, the initiation of a process to define future work roles and relationships did not take place until the Implementation Phase and is described later in the study findings.

Employment Security Agreements

When employee jobs may be affected by transformation efforts, it is especially important to communicate the vision while also communicating the institution's commitment to fairly treat employees who will be affected by the change (Kotter, 1995). In February 1995, the college's organizational-change consultant recommended to the Project Management Team that the college adopt an employment security policy so that employees could participate in process redesign without worrying about adverse employment or economic consequences for themselves. She indicated that other organizations had found that having an employment security policy was a critical success factor.
Since it was believed that employees performing the work were in the best position to suggest improvements, the Project Management Team agreed to develop an employment security program that would provide protection to employees whose jobs could be eliminated as a result of work restructuring or redesign. The goal was to ensure that employees feel safe and motivated to suggest improvements without fear of losing their employment. In June 1995, the Project Management Team approached the union and management-employee labor leaders about the college’s desire to offer some form of employment security to employees. The Project Management Team released the following internal communication to all employees:

Valley Community College's major goal of process redesign is to improve the efficiency of processes so that staff are released to do work that isn’t getting done or not being done well, thereby improving services to students. Jobs may change dramatically, but it is not our goal to eliminate staff through process redesign. (Process Redesign Weekly, internal staff communication, 7/21/95)

The organizational-change consultant suggested that a feasibility study be conducted before proposing an employment security policy to the Board of Education, to ensure that the policy would be economically responsible. Specifically, the evaluation would need to indicate that any reductions in the number of staff could be accomplished through retirements and attrition--hence, not requiring layoffs. Project managers,
faculty and classified union leaders, management representatives, and the Process Redesign Leadership Team supported the concept of employment security. During the summer of 1995, the Project Management Team commissioned a study of anticipated employee retirements and attrition.

In determining what the college could responsibly offer as employment security, the Project Management Team collected and analyzed the following personnel and student-enrollment data:

1. Number/percentage of employees leaving by group and year.
2. Reasons for leaving by employee group and year.
3. Reasons for leaving by employee group.
4. Reasons for leaving by year.
5. Employee age data (tables and graph).
6. Student enrollment (history and projections).

Study results indicated that projected employee retirements and normal attrition could make layoffs unnecessary, assuming that displaced staff could be successfully redeployed to other open positions, including new positions. The Project Management Team concluded that with the implementation of process redesign changes over the next 2 or 3 years, there would be sufficient retirements and voluntary separations to allow for redeployment of displaced employees:
1. Historically, voluntary separations and retirements each year are sufficient to allow flexibility to retrain and place employees who might be displaced by process redesign. Over the last 5 years, an average of 18 classified staff, 2 managers, and 7 faculty leave each year for voluntary reasons other than retirement.

2. While voluntary separations are decreasing slightly each year, analysis of age data leads to the conclusion that annual retirements in all three groups likely will increase over the next 5 years. Currently, an average of 3 classified staff, 2 managers, and 7 faculty retire each year.

3. Process redesign will position the college to be able to provide high-quality services and to support continued high levels of enrollment with fewer resources. Since we expect a gap between continuing revenue and expenditures for the foreseeable future, the college might need to make layoffs separate from process-redesign efforts. However, one of the goals of process redesign is to prevent the downward spiral of layoffs, decreasing services and decreasing enrollments that often accompany budget problems. (Internal Study Results, August 1995)

Between February 1995 and January 1996, the Project Management Team, at the direction of the Executive Cabinet, consulted with labor representatives and worked with the Board of Education to develop an employment security policy, ensuring that employees whose jobs were eliminated as a result of process-redesign changes would be offered alternative employment at VCC. At a board work session on January 20, 1996, the board directed staff to write a general policy statement on employment security. The Executive Cabinet
recommended an employment security policy for the process-redesign project to VCC's Board of Education in February 1996. The board adopted the following employment security policy unanimously on March 13, 1996:

The board encourages the participation of employees in process improvement projects designed to enhance the quality of college services. We believe employees will be more open and creative in redesigning processes in which they are involved if their own employment security concerns are minimized. Therefore, the administration is directed to develop a program to provide a responsible level of employment security for employees whose jobs are eliminated through redesign. (Article 6, Section C, Board Policy 040)

Following the board's action, separate memorandums of agreement were developed, negotiated, and adopted by the faculty union and classified staff union in March and April 1996. A similar employment security agreement for management employees was negotiated and adopted in July 1996. In January 1998, the classified staff union agreement with the college was revised in order to make the employment security agreement for classified staff similar to the agreements between the college and the faculty and management employees. The agreements adopted contained language pertaining to the following conditions:

1. No negative financial impact to the employees impacted by the process-redesign efforts.
2. All issues must be resolved prior to changes in work assignments or duties.

3. A commitment to problem resolution in a timely manner.

4. A commitment to place the issues of the union and management at a high priority.

5. Use of the existing contractual dispute resolution process.

6. Communication methods between the parties involved.

Prior to November 1998, the agreements had not been operationalized because no changes had occurred in job status due to process redesign. However, as the college prepared to implement the change recommendations, procedures for operationalizing the employment security policy and agreements were developed, negotiated, and later adopted in 1998. How the agreements were operationalized is described later in the Implementation Phase.

Marshaling Resources for the Redesign Project

In late 1995 and early 1996, the Project Management Team worked to marshal the necessary resources for the redesign process, which came to be known as the Students First! (SF!) redesign project. First, a request for proposal was issued inviting proposals for consulting services to train and lead the redesign team's work. Next, conversations
with, and site visits to, other higher education institutions undergoing redesign efforts convinced the Project Management Team that the dedicated commitment of a team of individuals over a period of time was critical to success. They decided to create a team of employees to conduct the redesign, and to secure release time for their participation. The Project Management Team recommended and received approval from the Process Redesign Leadership Team to use the following criteria for redesign-team membership:

*Desired Redesign Team Skill Sets*

*All Team Members:*
- Open minded
- Creative
- Willing to dedicate intensive work time and effort
- Skilled in group processes (communication, collaboration, meeting management, conflict resolution
- Common sense
- Expertise/familiarity with student service processes
- Pro-Valley Community College
- Willing to challenge, question
- Able to build trust
- Pro-student/customer
- Outcome orientation
- Positive, optimistic
- Good humored
- Logical reasoning
- Decide based on facts and data versus person
- Considerate of others
- Sense of urgency
- Excited about change
- Respected, credible with coworkers
- Good working relationships
- Open and honest
• Able to constructively disagree without getting personal
• Well-developed computer-use skills
• Able to see the big picture
• Organizational skills

Balance of Skills:
• College experience and new blood
• Analytical and intuitive
• Practical and visionary
• Future owners and old guard
• Balance between management, classified staff, and faculty
• Balance between in-house knowledge versus external knowledge
• Problem-solving skills (TQM)

Individual Team Member Expertise and/or Technical Skills:
• Student(s)
• Student Information Systems expert who understands technical and human side of process
• Financial Transaction knowledge and experience
• Student Services outsider from Instructional Services
• Assessment
• Orientation/Advising knowledge with broad external/internal perspective
• Admissions expert with comprehensive knowledge of "as is" process from start to finish
• Student records expert with comprehensive knowledge of "as is" process from start to finish
• Financial Aid expert with general knowledge of intake and regulatory knowledge
• Continuing Education expert
• Team Leadership. (Project Description, 2/2/96)

Using the above criteria, the Project Management Team identified candidates to serve on the team based on their personal characteristics in addition to functional expertise. The 10 members identified and recruited, in cooperation with managers and staff from the impacted departments, to serve as the SF! Redesign Team represented seven
departments, and were composed of 2 faculty, 4 classified staff, 3 managers and 1 student. The Process Redesign Leadership Team approved the list of nominees to serve on the SF! Redesign Team. The Project Management Team provided funding to each team member’s department to hire replacement staff, provide overtime to remaining staff, or in some cases reassign existing staff to cover the regular work assignments of the team members.

At the same time, the Project Management Team identified facilities, computers, administrative support, and outside consulting and advisory services to support the work of the SF! Redesign Team.

Preparation of the Students First! Redesign Team

By March 1996, the members of the SF! Redesign Team were ready to begin their work. Their objectives, as defined by the Process Redesign Leadership Team, were as follows:

2. Understand the student/customers’ requirements.
3. Provide creative alternatives in redesign.
4. Recommend required process changes.
5. Develop detailed implementation plans.
6. Work with the existing organization to adopt the new process.
7. Identify and report resistance to change.

8. Inform affected departments of project status.

To prepare for redesign, the SF! Redesign Team first underwent team-building training, in which they developed a vision, mission, and ground rules or guiding principles. In addition to ground rules, members of the SF! Redesign Team also developed some guidelines for effective work regarding agenda, preparation, process, and timing of their work. The SF! Redesign Team also underwent intensive training, provided by consultants, in process-redesign methodology, tools, and techniques during their weeks together.

Research and Analysis Process Used by the Students First! Redesign Team

The SF! Redesign Team underwent a systematic and rigorous research and analysis process to develop their change recommendations. The research and analysis process served to validate issues related to services to students that the SF! Redesign Team was already aware of, to provide baseline information for tracking improvements resulting from implementing their recommendations, and to allow for more comprehensive analysis of issues related to services to students than had previously been conducted at VCC. After the team-building and
training described above, the team’s research and analysis work proceeded in the following seven stages:

1. Research design: The team considered various alternatives for gathering information and decided on those best suited to their objectives.

2. Data collection: The team gathered information using the following techniques: (a) input sessions to hear the perspectives of employees involved in conducting processes about what worked well and what needed improvement, and a second series to hear their perspectives on initial findings (131 employees representing 38 departments participated in these sessions); (b) an input session with students to learn of their needs, concerns, and satisfaction levels; (c) a statistically significant phone survey conducted by an external Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) to identify student needs and satisfaction levels; (d) customized questions on the annual ACT student survey to learn about students’ evaluation of specific services; (e) site visits to other community colleges within the state to learn of their approaches to improving services to students; (f) guest visitors from community colleges involved in process redesign to learn of their efforts; (g) site visits to local businesses with reputations for excellent customer service to learn about their practices and innovations; (h) site visits to VCC’s
Outreach Centers to learn about serving students in locations other than a main campus; and (i) development of process maps illustrating the tasks performed in each of the major services-to-students process areas, including information dissemination, financial transactions, enrollment services, and support services.

3. **Data analysis:** The team analyzed each of these sources of information to establish common themes regarding the need for and alternative approaches to improving services to students.

4. **Development of preliminary recommendations:** The team developed preliminary recommendations, based on their data analysis.

5. **Testing of preliminary recommendations:** The team reviewed their preliminary recommendations with groups of employees in affected areas to better understand the implications and feasibility of the recommendations.

6. **Refinement of preliminary recommendations:** The team refined their preliminary recommendations, based on the additional input received from employees, and developed for each recommendation a detailed description of the current situation, desired situation, proposed solution, and action plan for implementing the proposed solution.
7. **Communication of findings and recommendations:** The team developed a report to communicate their findings and recommendations to the VCC community.

The team added their creative energy and out-of-box thinking to their numerous data sources to develop innovative solutions. This research and analysis process is illustrated in Figure 5.

In addition to this research and analysis process, the SF! Redesign Team attended to several other responsibilities to ensure the success of the project:

1. Regular progress reports to the Process Redesign Leadership Team.

2. Progress reports to the VCC Board of Education.

3. Development of communications for distribution within the campus community.

4. A series of advertisements for the student newspaper.

5. A series of open houses that any student or employee could attend to share their views with the SF! Redesign Team.

6. Communicating with the Process Redesign Leadership Team about change-management issues as they arose or were anticipated.

The SF! Redesign Team devoted 18 weeks to their work, from the beginning of their training in March 1996 to the issuing of their
FIGURE 5. Students First! Redesign Team research and analysis process.
report in July 1996. With the conclusion of their research and analysis process, the members of the team returned to their regular job assignments at VCC. However, many of them went on to play an ongoing role as coaches for the implementation of specific recommendations, as members of an Implementation Planning Team, and as advocates for, and teachers about, redesign in their own work environments.

Recommended Changes

The SF! Redesign Team made 12 recommendations for radically improving services to students. These recommendation fell under the broad categories of (a) service delivery; (b) information dissemination; (c) financial transactions; (d) enrollment; (e) advising, counseling, and career development; and (f) support and diversity services (see Table 4).

Implementation Planning

A critical error for organizations undergoing transformation is the failure to remove obstacles to the new vision. Obstacles can take the form of inappropriate organization structures, compensation or performance appraisal systems that are not consistent with the new
TABLE 4. Students First! Redesign Team Recommendations for Improving Services to Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>Develop a one-stop approach to providing information and delivering enrollment, financial, and advising services to students. Create a new organizational structure that utilizes cross-functional teams to deliver services to students. Students will receive services at a centrally located Students First! Center and other college locations. The new structure will be supported by a coordinated system for the dissemination of information and the delivery of services in a variety of formats to both students and employees. In addition, managed college-wide advising teams, a comprehensive career and work information center, and strong alliances with support services will strengthen the students' experiences and ensure their success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Information Dissemination | Coordinate the collection and distribution of information available via cable television, College Wide Area Network (WAN), student database, printed materials, and telephone. An "information support team" working closely with the Students First! Center will be responsible for ensuring that information pertaining to student administrative transactions, instructional programs, facilities, and services is easily understood, consistent, accurate, and accessible by both students and employees.  
  
  **Cable television:** Make full use of the capabilities available on cable Channel 12.  
  **College Wide Area Network (WAN):** Establish a coordinated, on-line information system accessible to all employees and students, regardless of location.  
  **Printed materials:** Ensure that information about services to students in the class schedule, student handbook, college catalog, and student services department brochures, is consistent and easily understood by students and employees. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information Dissemination | Student database: Integrate student database information to reduce duplicate entry and maintenance of multiple databases. Provide all employees with easy access to student information.  
Telephone: Integrate and make full use of the capabilities of Lane’s phone systems. Routinely revise the automated phone scripts so that students have better access to services and information and can use the systems more effectively. |
| Financial Transactions | Modify the billing statement. Create an improved statement of charges and credits that is clear, understandable, and detailed.  
Review student charges, payments and adjustments, and cashiering. Regardless of the location of service provided, employees will be able to transact charges, payments and adjustments directly to a student’s account. Move the cashier function to the Students First! Center so that it is in closer proximity to other services to students. Provide students with access to their appropriate records via an account on the WAN.  
Revise policy for extending credit. Students with a current account balance will be allowed to register and charge other services at any time. Students with noncurrent account balances will be required to pay cash for any services until the account balance reverts to a current status. Internal collection of delinquent accounts will be emphasized in order to minimize referrals to external collection agencies and bad debt write-offs.  
Change Federal Student Loan processing. Create a Student Loan team in the Students First! Center to administer the entire process for the Federal Perkins Loan and Federal Direct Stafford Loan. Determine options for servicing Perkins Loans in order to address the loan default rate. |
| Enrollment | Develop a standard admissions application and streamline admissions processing. Utilizing self-service capabilities with the WAN and simplified on-line entry of the master files and/or admissions information, develop one user-friendly data-entry format and standard admissions form accessible to all employees and students. Recommend an examination of the inconsistent information and requirements of programs with selective or limited admissions.  

Broden the new student information session. Create incentives to improve student attendance at new-student information sessions in order to enhance student success and retention. Provide alternative ways to deliver information describing new student processes and related policies and procedures.  

Increase access to and revise administration of placement tests. Reallocate resources to expand the location, hours, and availability of employees for administered placement tests. Continue to research the feasibility of computerized placement testing. Investigate opportunities to increase WAN access to testing information and study materials.  

Advising, Counseling, and Career Development | Establish a revised college-wide advising system. Create advising teams composed of counselors, advisors, and instructional faculty and staff to deliver program information and advising and career development services to academic clusters (including outreach and community learning centers), Support and Diversity Services, and the Students First! Center Team. Expand program orientation sessions to include participation of all advising team members. |
### TABLE 4. (Continued)

| Advising, Counseling, and Career Development | Create a Career and Work Information Center (CWIC). Consolidate career and job-related services (i.e., Career Information Center, Job Placement Center, Federal Work-Study) and include representation from Cooperative Education and Training and Development. Co-locate all services so that they can share resources and jointly contribute to student success. |
| Support and Diversity Services | Create a Support and Diversity Services Team. Students will be served at multiple points of entry to the College. In addition to receiving customized service and support, students can access advising, full enrollment services, and referral for other college services. |

vision, and perhaps most dangerous of all, bosses who have not bought into the new vision (Kotter, 1995).

To anticipate and address such obstacles, following the endorsement of the recommendations by the Executive Leadership Team (formerly called the Executive Cabinet), the Project Management Team formed an Implementation Planning Team in August 1996. The charge of the Implementation Planning Team was to study each recommendation thoroughly and identify its implications in terms of resource requirements, changes in human resource practices, collective bargaining contracts, employee training, technical support, service impact, staffing impact, external support, and other implications.
Several members of the SF! Redesign Team served on the Implementation Planning Team, joined by others with human resources and technology expertise. The Implementation Planning Team work took 2½ months to complete.

The Project Management Team considered a key strategy to empower others to act on the Students First! vision was a day-long in-service training session for over 200 employees involved in delivering service to students throughout the college. At the in-service training session held on August 21, 1966, employees had the opportunity to learn about (a) the new Students First! vision in a relaxed and informal setting geared to a variety of learning styles, (b) relevant workplace innovations at other community colleges and organizations, (c) new skills, (d) collective bargaining implications, and (e) VCC’s overall strategy for responding to a changing world. VCC’s executive leadership also believed that this learning opportunity would be helpful in addressing potential employee resistance that could prove dangerous to realizing the new vision.

Implementation Phase

For the management, faculty, and classified staff working in the impacted departments, the Students First! (SF!) in-service confirmed that
their work world was going to change. With this realization, many employees questioned how the changes would affect them personally. The in-service served as both a catalyst for employee acceptance, as well as resistance. The largest resistance was voiced by some midlevel managers who viewed the changes in process and work roles as a loss of status and power; whereas most classified (support) staff viewed the changes as liberating, allowing them more latitude in providing services and decision-making when assisting students.

On November 4, 1996, the Executive Leadership Team (ELT; former Executive Cabinet) gave general approval of the implementation planning proposal with the expectation that the plans would evolve and require adjustments. The ELT also released $300,000 reserved for Year 1 of implementation and agreed to support $650,000 for Year 2 of implementation. This study follows implementation for a little over 2 years.

Counterimplementation Forces: Resistance Surfaces

When the first signs of manager resistance surfaced, the Project Management Team attempted to clarify their concerns and find a common ground that all employees could support before moving forward. The Project Management Team’s approach was interpreted by
the members of the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams as a willingness by the Project Management Team to compromise their efforts. As stated by one team member,

I feel like the managers don’t think that anyone, other than them, are smart enough to figure out the new processes. Letting the managers take over [lead] the process rather than have them represent one resource available along with the classified and faculty is a recipe for failure. Process redesign principles and methods call for involving all staff in the development of the new processes. It’s not that managers can’t be involved--their involvement is critical; however, it’s just that they have to understand, they don’t have all the answers and other staff can also contribute in identifying solutions.

Following the SF! in-service training session, the managers of the impacted departments and others sympathetic to their concerns asked for a meeting with the Project Management Team. Their concerns related to a lack of involvement in developing the recommendations and the lack of a defined role in implementing the recommendations. In response to the managers’ request, Project Management Team scheduled a meeting with the managers to identify and discuss their concerns. In scheduling the meeting, the managers were told that "prior to moving forward, the Project Management Team will need to meet with the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams to negotiate any changes recommended to the approach they have proposed."
Although 3 of the 10 redesign team members had been managers, some managers expressed that insufficient opportunity was given for their input into the recommendations. Some managers expressed that their views shared during general-input sessions should have carried more weight than views expressed by classified (support) staff. One manager represented the concerns as follows:

For people [managers] accustomed to working with ideas, concepts, and planning, the general-input sessions [offered by the SF! Redesign Team for staff input] were not received as real involvement [by the managers]. Without clear involvement, the strong message is that managers have no valuable input until everything is planned and decided. Then they [managers] can work in some new and yet-to-be-determined role to see that it [the recommendations] all happens. If the managers do not have valuable information to contribute during the planning phases of this project, then I seriously doubt we have a valuable role in the implementation of this project.

Several managers expressed frustration that some of the recommendations were for improvements they had previously tried to implement without success. They attributed their lack of prior success to a lack of executive management support. The managers stated that there was a need to be more inclusive now that the SF! Redesign Team’s work had been completed. The managers believed that more employees needed to be brought into the project in order for the changes to be implemented. They expressed concern that the SF! Redesign Team members had acquired new skills and expertise that enabled career
advancement, and some felt that the redesign team selection process had not been open or fair.

Following the meeting, the Project Management Team prepared a "draft" summary of the managers' concerns and perceptions. Managers were asked to review, refine and correct any misstatements of their concerns. In November 1996, the managers agreed to the following summary of their concerns:

1. **Concerns about Project Scope.** Regarding the project definition and boundaries, the Student Services managers feel that:
   a. From the outset, the project was designed in such a way that it was perceived to subdivide the Student Services unit.
   b. To have such a subdivision was at odds with past practices in Student Services, which has always problem-solved as an integrated, inclusive group.
   c. This subdivision also excluded parts of Student Services (i.e., Learner Support Services and Student Life), which they felt were inextricably involved in the activities that were going to be evaluated and redesigned (i.e., enrollment, retention).
   d. The exclusion of Learner Support Services and Student Life created a fear that these service groups might, under a new design, be precluded from providing enrollment, retention and financial services.

2. **Concerns about Involvement.** Regarding the process to date, Student Service managers feel that:
   a. Managers in general were not sufficiently represented in the composition of the SF Redesign or Implementation Planning Teams.
b. The opportunities for involvement (e.g., the input meetings, meetings held with managers after the proposals were developed, the process simulation) were not as meaningful or as satisfying as desired, given that the managers were used to dialogue, versus just giving input or listening.

c. As a result of the above, the managers perceive that they have not had a significant role in SF! and they worry that their historical and potential contributions as leaders and idea promoters will not be recognized or utilized.

3. Concerns about Methodology and the Resulting Redesign. The managers identified what they see as serious problems with the study’s approach and resulting solution recommendations, specifically:

a. Learner Support Services and Student Life (also known as Multicultural Student Activities, Student Support Services, and Special Projects) were defined outside the scope of the SF! project.

b. Therefore, representatives from these areas were not included on the SF! Redesign or Implementation Planning Teams.

c. Likewise, the study did not entail gathering and analyzing information about these services.

d. However, the SF! redesign recommendations (July 1996) appeared to include significant proposals for changing the organizational structure in these areas (i.e., creating a new organizational unit called "Support and Diversity Services" led by a "Process Owner Manager" and comprised of "teams").

e. The SF! Redesign Proposal also caused some bewilderment by providing only a subset of the Learner Support Services and Student Life Activities in the list of functions to be handled by the proposed Support and Diversity Services Team.
f. Further, confusion has developed in reaction to the SF! Redesign Implementation Proposal (October 1996), which now limits the scope of changes related to Support and Diversity Services to the effective delivery of enrollment and advising services; however, the Implementation Proposal:

- Did not present any modifications to the organizational structure chart that had been presented in the SF! Redesign Recommendations (July 1996) and

- Did develop a revised action plan that still called for the formation of a Support and Diversity Services Team.

4. **Concerns about the Proposed Change.**

   a. There wasn't a clear, single unified vision for what the new services and work environment would be like.

   b. Some confusion exists over the proposed new organizational structure and whether it is locked in concrete or open to some modification.

   c. Although an attempt has been made to provide a role for many people, as proposed there are too many titles (i.e., advisors, coaches, sponsors, implementation coordinators, etc.) and it is very confusing.

   d. Overall, the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Reports present complex and sophisticated information that is not easily communicated to and understood by staff.

5. **Questions about Implementation Roles.** The managers expressed considerable apprehension about how the new roles and process would be brought into existence while providing ongoing service and running current operations.

   a. At this time, there are no Services to Students managers on the proposed SF! Implementation Coordinating Team.
b. It appears that the plan calls for SF! Implementation Coordinators to begin work immediately while Process Owner Managers are not selected until spring.
- This suggests that managers could be without decision-making authority over and during the initial change processes taking place within their own service areas.

c. Managers also indicated that the implementation plans and roles leave uncertainty regarding the relationship that is supposed to occur between the in-place managers and the process owner managers, as well as the proposed SF! Implementation Coordinating Team.

d. Managers want to support staff leadership and involvement in change but they want to be involved themselves as leaders since they still hold accountability for the service delivery of their units.

6. *Special Considerations.* The managers were very complimentary of the work of the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams and stressed their desire to send a positive message to the team members regarding:

a. The availability of creative ways to move ahead if we are all willing to be open, involved, collaborative and optimistic.

b. The need for any proposed revisions to recommendations, implementation plans, or roles, to be supported by all the key stakeholders

c. The need to agree on how to proceed and begin to do it as soon as possible because any further delay in implementation could demotivate key participants and general staff.

(Internal Document, November 1996)
In response to the manager's concerns, the Project Management Team stated that there were no hidden agendas, no attempt to manipulate staff. There was no intention to displace either the managers or team members involved as the college moved forward to have the recommendations implemented. However, there was every intention to maintain a collaborative consensus style of decision-making. All the participants were asked to give the benefit of the doubt to one another and be as trusting as possible. The Project Management Team acknowledged that lots of confusion existed about the implementation roles, especially for the proposed SF! Implementation Team. The Project Management Team agreed to work toward resolving the confusion.

In order to better understand and then address more specifically the concerns of the managers, the Project Management Team scheduled a series of meetings between September 1996 and January 1997 involving project managers, the Vice President for Student Services, managers of the impacted services, and the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams. The meetings focused on defining the concerns and seeking solutions that all parties could live with prior to moving forward. Initially, the Vice President for Student Services had chosen not to serve on the Project Management Team. Instead, she
served as a member of the Process Redesign Leadership Team. As soon as the Student Services Managers began to voice their concerns about lack of involvement and their future role, the Vice President asked to be added to the Project Management Team. The Vice President demonstrated a predilection to accommodate the managers. She said,

my style is to accomplish things through my managers and I am not going to change my style now. I expect my managers to take charge and carry this change project forward. That’s why I want the Implementation Teams to be led by my managers.

She advocated strongly for turning the implementation of the recommendations over to the managers rather than involve classified (support) staff in leadership roles. Her stance resulted in the union’s leadership and classified staff expressing that the principles of redesign were being violated.

Finding common ground among all employees on an implementation approach took 3 months. The issues primarily centered around who would lead implementation. After reviewing the managers’ concerns and providing an opportunity for the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams to respond and state their own concerns, in December 1996, the Project Management Team facilitated the groups in jointly developing implementation principles and values. The purpose for developing the principles and values was to serve as a
framework to guide implementation. The principles and values jointly developed were:

1. Acknowledge that we exist to serve students. Students are our customers. Our mission is to facilitate their learning experience.
2. Commit to reallocating and realigning available resources in order to transform our services to students to meet current and future needs.
3. Move rapidly and deliberately toward implementing all the SF! process-redesign changes in order to provide enhanced service to students, to improve job satisfaction, to utilize employee talents more fully and to meet future service demands while working within the operating budget.
4. Maintain momentum in moving deliberately toward a workplace in which teams of staff share responsibility for cross-functional work flow.
5. Encourage leadership and clearly defined roles in decision-making in all employees.
6. Define responsibility and accountability as essential components of everyone’s job.
7. Make changes in staff job responsibilities with:
   a) appropriate involvement of college bargaining;
   b) the objective of creating "whole," satisfying, meaningful and worthwhile jobs;
   c) respect for the desirability of a healthy balance between personal and work lives;
   d) fair treatment in terms of opportunity and compensation;
   e) the protections provided for in the employment security agreements;
   f) compliance with legal requirements.
8. Provide staff and teams with continuous training and coaching to develop the new capabilities they will need in order to fulfill increased responsibilities.
9. Create a safe climate for employees to learn and try out their new skills.
10. Develop and clarify the role of managers as coach, facilitator, problem-solver, trainer, resource provider, goal setter, feedback and recognition provider to frontline staff and team members as these employees develop the skills to be assigned more responsibilities.

11. Recognize and accept that as employees become more self-directed, managers will be increasingly available to perform more strategic functions related to long-term planning, visioning, communication and creating a seamless system among college departments and units.

12. Apply on an ongoing basis the approaches that have been adopted during process redesign to find new and better ways to provide services to students, including:
   a) cross-functional processes;
   b) staff representation;
   c) commitment to follow-through;
   d) reliance on facts and data;
   e) technological innovation.

13. Value and expect innovation, creativity and participation in organizational change in all employees. (Internal Document, 12/96)

In January 1997, a new implementation approach was recommended by the Project Management Team and endorsed by the managers and the members of the SF! Redesign and Implementation Planning Teams. The new implementation approach called for 11 implementation teams to be formed, each assigned responsibility for overseeing the implementation of a different recommendation. Each team would be composed of a convener and a minimum of seven staff participants. The teams were expected to convene all the parties necessary to implement all recommendations simultaneously. The new
approach did not provide for any release time from staff’s current work assignments while participating on a team. The new approach also called for the formation of an Oversight Team to lead, manage, and coordinate the work of all teams.

In contrast, the initial SF! Implementation Planning Team’s approach had called for three staff to be identified and released from their regular assignments full time for 2 years to serve as Implementation Coordinators. The Implementation Coordinators’ role was to coordinate groups of staff working on (a) implementing six of the recommendations as pilots and (b) implementing clusters of other recommendations.

The new implementation approach at first appeared to be a good compromise; however, once the approach was placed into practice, the participants quickly called the approach flawed. Without the structure of coordinated leadership, as one participant stated, "it makes no sense to use a silo approach to bring about a redesign of processes to one that is meshed and seamless." The formation of the Oversight Team was delayed. As a result, there was an absence of coordination across the various implementation efforts, resulting in a lack of integration of the work processes. A goal of redesign was to integrate work processes...
across traditional department boundaries so that students would receive more convenient, streamlined services.

One participant stated,

the groups are not integrating their processes even though the redesign plan was created in such a way that this would happen. There is now no mechanism to ensure integration and new ways of working in a redesigned integrated fashion. If the 11 groups continue to proceed down their separate roads at the current rate, by the time the Oversight Team figures out a good management structure, the project groups will be exhausted and our results will not bear much relationship to the envisioned integrated plan.

The President of the Classified Union stated,

VCC’s culture is so conflict averse that it creates conflict. That may sound rather odd, but I believe that our current culture is still alive and not so well. VCC’s culture needs and has to change because the future success of SF! depends on our ability to change and change quickly. The end running and lobbying to shift SF! away from its design purpose and goals has to stop.

He went on to comment on the irony that the labor representatives are so supportive (compared with managers) of this project, when from the classified staff perspective, they have so much potential for gain or loss depending on the success of the project.

It is not unusual during a redesign project for there to be conflict, according to Champy (1995); during redesigning processes, the managers often have the most difficult time changing. He also commented that the "new culture will have to remain strong to keep the
old one from coming back." Good cultures take energy to cultivate and maintain, but bad ones do not. Weedy gardens are as low maintenance as machine-type structures. Cultures that squash disagreement are easy to launch. No one likes to be disagreed with, but equally, no one likes to admit it (Champy, 1995).

In February 1997, an Advisory Committee was convened by the Project Management Team to help define the role and responsibilities of an Oversight Team. However, by the time the Advisory Committee met, they recommended that the Project Management Team return to the initial recommendation of hiring three implementation coordinators to serve as the oversight team. The Project Management Team accepted their recommendation and polled all staff for nominations for the positions. Nominations were gathered, staff were interviewed, and two managers and one classified staff member were appointed.

In March 1997, the President, in a surprise announcement, merged Student Services and Instruction, eliminating the position of Vice President for Student Services. Prior to his announcement, the President did not consult with the Project Management Team to determine what impact, if any, his decision would have on the implementation of the redesign recommendations. The justification for the merger was cited as better integration of student services and instruction so staff could easily
plan and implement projects together. In a written communication to
the campus, the President said,

it [the merger] will unify faculty in one unit, increase
attention to student needs in academic decisions, ensure that
academic needs are addressed in student services decisions,
and enable the college to support students’ in-class and
out-of-class growth holistically.

The student services managers were shocked and outraged. They
expressed anger over a decision of this magnitude being made in
isolation, without feedback or input from any of the people or groups
affected by the decision. The President maintained his decision. The
Vice President for Student Services was given 6 months’ notice. Due to
the lengthy leadership transition, it was difficult for staff and new
leadership of the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services to
work together until midsummer 1997.

Concurrently, the three individuals chosen as implementation
coordinators were unable to get released from their regular jobs and
begin their project coordination role until May 1997. By May, 11 teams
had been working for 5 months. Some teams welcomed the
coordination and leadership offered by the coordinators; others did not.
As the coordinators attempted to bring the teams together, there were
counterefforts by some teams to resist their leadership and maintain
autonomy. Attempts were made to question the coordinators’
competency. Some individuals, who were not selected as coordinators, were resentful and challenged the fairness of the selection process.

By August 1997, the Project Management Team was unsure how to proceed. Implementation was not progressing at the velocity essential for its success, and over time there had been some movement away from the design principles and implementation recommendations (Internal Memo, 8/97). The Project Management Team initiated and reacted to several forces to try and move the project forward. The Project Management Team itself was being reconfigured to reflect the new organization structure between Student Services and Instruction and was giving increased attention to listening to the many individuals who voiced ideas about how to proceed. It became increasingly clear that it would be helpful to have an "outsider" opinion on the situation to get an objective assessment. Since periodic assessment by consultants was built into the original project design, the Project Management Team decided to commission the consultants who had led the redesign phase to conduct an assessment on the progress of implementation at that time. Simultaneously, the Project Management Team continued their own internal dialogue on how to "jump-start" implementation.

The consultant review and assessment took place in late August 1997, and the consultants met with the Executive Leadership Team in
early October 1997 to discuss their findings and recommendations. In summary, the recommendations indicated that decisive action was needed if the college wanted to achieve success. The college was charged with allowing too much process to take place in lieu of action. In addition, executive management was charged with spending too much time trying to accommodate dissenters rather than maintain a vision for the project. Based on the report findings, along with input from other sources, the Project Management Team decided to energize the project by focusing on five projects for accelerated implementation. One of the five projects selected was the initiation of the integrated one-stop service-delivery concept called the SF! Center. The one-stop service center integrated the work traditionally performed by admissions, student records, some financial aid transactions, student accounts, and cashiering supported by extensive information technology. An SF! Center Launching Team was formed (comprised of three managers and seven classified staff) and charged with promoting one-stop and student self-service approaches to service delivery by defining services specifically, detailing process steps, and defining required technology, skill requirements, training curricula, and training plans.

The balance of this study focuses on describing the implementation efforts for this recommendation. Phase-in plans for
implementation were developed by the SF! Center Launching Team and approved by the Project Management Team by January 1998. The SF! Center opened in March 1998, staffed by trained volunteers, is explained later in the section of this chapter entitled "Pilot New Work Roles."

Conflict between project participants (managers, faculty, and classified staff) continued throughout the winter, spring and summer of 1998 and threatened to halt implementation. Staff became polarized around separate visions for the project.

As conflict among project participants escalated, the Project Management Team in July 1998 hired another consultant to (a) assess and facilitate the reestablishment of norms that dealt with disagreement and (b) to repair and strengthen the critical working relationships needed for successful implementation of the redesign recommendations. The consultant interviewed 14 staff members in order to better understand the issues. In her findings, she stated, "there is agreement on two themes: ruptured relationships and a need for leadership." A universal perception among participants was that the values, principles and goals of the redesign project had not been clearly communicated by executive leadership. As a result, project participants were fighting over different perceptions of the intended outcome for the project. All staff agreed that they wanted the institution's leadership to sort out some key
strategic decisions and then to provide staff with clarification. For example, to what extent was the college really going to embrace a team-based work environment. The consultant stated in her written report,

In every kind of organization, from traditionally managed to high-performing team based, strategic direction is set at the executive level. At VCC, disagreement and ultimately damaged relationships have come from issues that cannot and should not be settled at lower levels of the organization. (Consultant’s Report, 8/98)

There was tremendous agreement between staff members who thought they were in great disagreement. Everyone believed in the concept of integrated services. They disagreed on what it looked like but not the goal. The consultant also reported,

additionally, it was unsettling to classified staff that several of the managers appear to still use a command and control style of leadership when the expectation is that VCC is moving to a coaching style of leadership.

The consultant went on to say,

there are tough decisions that need to be made in order for the project to move forward. These decisions include: Who will be responsible for the SF! Center? Will the institution move to a team-based management approach? If so, what will the organization structure be? What is the role of managers in that type of organization? Who are the process owners? What does integrated service mean? What is inside the boundaries of an integrated service and what is outside? Regardless of the answer to the first question, it seems prudent that the Executive Leadership Team be responsible for making this kind of strategic decision. Even high-performing teams make only those decisions that are within the context of their charter. The Project Management Team is not in the position to set
institutional strategies, only implementation strategies (rather, it is the role of the Executive Leadership Team). (Consultant’s Report, 8/98)

The consultant facilitated a 2-day retreat in August 1998 to develop working agreements, agree on behavioral norms, and practice "dialogue" skills (Senge, 1990) in an attempt to improve working relationships between the SF! Project participants.

Following the retreat, the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services announced,

the new organizational structure which needs to be in place as a result of the SF! Project will be developed and implemented by July 1, 1999. This means that we need a temporary arrangement. It is time for the Implementation Coordinators to reintegrate into the existing structure. (Internal Memo, 9/98)

The approach taken by the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services was that structure would follow process. Therefore, the existing organizational (management) structure straddled both old and new worlds simultaneously. As a temporary measure, an interim leadership team was formed for the SF! Center; members of this team were the Director of College Finance, Director of Financial Aid, Director of Admissions, Director of Counseling, and the interim service team leader. The Vice President stated that she chose a team rather than appoint one person in order to continue progress toward a team-based system. She stated, "the interim leadership team is expected to model
team behavior and bring their different strengths and resources to the project."

In order to mainstream the project into the regular operations of the college, the composition of the Project Management Team changed in January 1999 to include only the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services and the Vice President for College Operations (this investigator's role as a project manager ended in January 1999). Both Vice Presidents' had staff affected by the implementation of the redesign recommendations.

Staff Training and Development

Concurrent to addressing the resistance and conflict among project participants, the Project Management Team worked on sponsoring staff training. According to project management, "staff need to possess the skills and knowledge that enables them to successfully function in a dynamic team-based environment." Training that addressed all aspects of team interaction (communication, group problem solving, group decision-making, conflict resolution, and collaboration), technical knowledge, and customer service was considered essential. In addition, the Project Management Team stated,

senior management needs to ensure that time is specifically dedicated to training activities, and participation in training
is integral to both the staff and team's responsibilities and performance. A structure must be developed that supports the delivery of training with a focus on the use of internal resources.

Several years earlier in spring 1994, the college president had created an Organizational Development Action Team (ODAT) in support of his organizational restructuring vision (referenced earlier as a development leading up to this study). ODAT was allocated resources to develop annual staff-training opportunities that addressed the skills needed for implementing the President's restructuring vision (teams/teamwork, coaching skills for managers, process-improvement tools/techniques, meeting-facilitation skills and conflict-resolution skills). In an effort to keep training costs to a minimum and reduce dependence on outside consultants, ODAT was also charged with creating a cadre of staff to serve as trainers and problem solvers for departments. Thirty VCC staff (faculty, classified, and management) were selected for participation in the train-the-trainer cadre. The train-the-trainers were provided ongoing professional development on adult-learning theory and practice sponsored by the American Management Association, mediation training by a local mediation consultant, communication and collaboration training by a local consultant, and Zenger-Miller (commercially packaged leadership-training curriculum) certification. The staff trainers also custom-designed curriculum in the areas of
problem solving, customer service, change, conflict resolution, and leadership. In addition, ODAT secured approval from the President for a dedicated staff-learning time each Wednesday during the academic year from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. Staff members were given release time to participate in the training activities.

In June 1995, the Project Management Team began collaborating with ODAT on sponsoring training initiatives that would prepare staff for workplace changes brought about by the SF! work redesign. Since ODAT's training plans closely resembled what was needed to support the SF! redesign project, the Project Management Team asked ODAT to identify--in their published brochure the "Learning Times: Learning Opportunities for Staff"--the workshops that would prepare staff for new work resulting from the SF! changes. Staff members who completed the identified workshops earned an SF! certificate. The certificate served as verification of completion of the core competencies necessary to be successful in the new SF! workplace. The certificate also enhanced staff ability to compete for newly designed positions as they became available.

By developing staff skills concurrent with implementing the recommended changes, the Project Management Team believed that staff
fears would be diminished while at the same time preparing them to assume the emerging team-based work.

In addition to the general team-based training, the Project Management Team asked ODAT to develop new curriculum and training for piloting the new work roles described later in this study.

**Future Work Roles and Relationships**

In August 1996, following the redesign team’s recommendations, the Classified Staff and Faculty Unions’ leadership expressed that the members of the redesign team had been constrained from thinking creatively by the college’s traditional hierarchical organizational structure and existing work roles and relationships when recommending a new organizational structure. The unions’ leadership asked the Project Management Team to table the recommended organizational structure until new work roles and relationships could be defined for the college. The Project Management Team agreed and sought approval from the Executive Leadership Team to form a joint management-labor committee with representatives from the Executive Leadership Team, classified staff union, faculty union, and Management Steering Committee. In authorizing the work of the joint management-labor
committee, the Executive Leadership Team issued the following statement:

During the SF! Process Redesign, team members worked without the benefit of a clear definition of what was desired and what was permissible in terms of future work roles and relationships. This may have limited the options recommended and has caused uncertainty about how to implement the proposed changes. (Future Work Relationships Summit, Process Proposal, 1/6/97)

The joint management-labor committee began work in January 1997 with the goal of developing a shared vision of future work roles and relationships, a process that took 16 months. The effort was facilitated by a labor relations and human resources consultant. As stated by the group, "The objective of this work is intended to establish clear, basic expectations about how VCC staff interact with one another and the desired characteristics of future work processes, systems, and roles."

The following was presented to the Board of Education in April 1998, and signed by the parties in May 1998, adopting:

1. Guidelines for interpersonal and institutional interactions (Values and Behaviors; see Appendix A).

2. Principles governing the conduct of labor relations (Labor Relations Principles; see Appendix B).

3. Descriptions of future work systems (The Roles of Manager and Team Member; see Appendix C).
4. Descriptions of work change models and tools to help the college understand and plan change (see Appendix D).

Pilot New Work Roles

As mentioned earlier, the Project Management Team and the SF! Center Launching Team asked ODAT to develop a new curriculum and training specifically for piloting new work roles in the SF! Center. The curriculum was part of a larger plan to provide a 6-week training/internship for staff to experience working in a one-stop, team-based, integrated service center. The Project Management Team believed that, through this experience, staff members would have greater acceptance and gain understanding of new work roles before being asked to apply for permanent positions. The plan also accelerated the opening of the integrated service center staffed by trained volunteers. The 6-week training/internship was offered on a voluntary basis to full- and part-time staff who (a) expressed an interest in learning about and experiencing integrated service delivery; (b) currently worked in a department (instructional, student services, or administrative services) providing services to students; (c) used technology to access and provide information and services; and (d) could occasionally work flexible hours on evenings and Saturdays. The call for volunteers successfully
recruited a large number of staff who wanted the opportunity to participate. Every staff member who met the criteria was provided with the opportunity. Consecutive training opportunities were offered to accommodate as many groups of 8 to 10 staff members who volunteered. Each staff member's regular job was back-filled for 6 weeks. The training period for the first group began 2 weeks prior to the new center's opening in March 1998.

The opportunity involved an intensive 2-week "classroom" training session taught by staff trainers (content and materials developed by curriculum developers and content experts from various departments), followed by a 4-week "hands-on" internship working in the new SF! Center. The first group of trainees developed a team spirit that each subsequent group tried to match or exceed. They called themselves "Pioneers" and, following their internship, sponsored a graduation ceremony for the next group of trainees who were about to begin their internship. Each subsequent group chose a name--Crusaders, May the Fourth Be With You (training began on May 4), Energizers, Fab Five (fifth group), Dream Team--and sponsored a unique graduation ceremony for the next group. Some groups wrote lyrics and performed songs; others wrote poems. Each group offered words of advice to the next group and testimonies on how much they had learned and
appreciation for the opportunity to serve students in a more comprehensive way. The following are some statements made by trainees:

This last 6 weeks has been the best time of my working life. I want to share highs and lows of my experience. Words cannot express the highs I’ve experienced from training to hands-on, real-life, live service. This 6 weeks has been a natural high for me. I’ve succeeded in something I believe in with total support from leadership. The classroom training was intense. We learned processes and we were overwhelmed. We set goals as a team, established strategies, and measured goals attained. For all of us to do our jobs well, it was very important that open communication be maintained. We couldn’t do this on our own. We depended on the individual departments for help.

What an honor! What a reward to participate in this culture-changing event where individuals are given the opportunity to work in an environment of shared responsibility and group ownership for results.

SF! had faith in us. Believed in us. We built bonds. SF! fosters innovation, delegates responsibility with accountability to the lowest practical level, and encourages people to take initiative in their work.

As a group finished their internship, they evaluated the experience. The evaluation was used to refine the training and improve the experience and information technology tools for the next group of trainees.

In order to satisfy the number of staff who wanted the experience, the training/internship continued until the permanent team was selected in November 1998. Between March and November 1998, a total of 55
staff were trained representing 26 different departments from around the college.

As trainees cycled out of the center, they returned to their regular assignment with new skills and tools to serve students better. Each group referred to itself as a "teamlet," a subset of the larger team, which was comprised of all those who had been trained. The groups scheduled reunions over lunch and after work to maintain the bond and support for each other and the project's vision. One vision of the SF! Project involved providing more services wherever the student first made an inquiry, whether that was an instructional department, the student services center, outreach center, a telephone, kiosk, or the Internet. One benefit for having trained so many staff from different departments was the beginning of the realization of that vision.

The training/internship plan enabled VCC to ensure that all staff who wanted to have the opportunity to participate could participate and allowed for an accelerated opening of the integrated services center while other staff developed a new work description and management and the classified staff union bargained compensation.
Pay-for-Skills Work-Description Development and Adoption

While the training and internship was occurring, a work description for the permanent SF! Service Representatives was completed by a subgroup of the SF! Center Launching Team. The subgroup was comprised of one manager, three classified staff, a labor relations consultant, and a change-management consultant. Their work laid the foundation for a new style of work description referred to by human resource practitioners as wide-banding. Traditional work descriptions involve narrowly defined tasks that staff perform. However, the wide-banded work description considered by the subgroup is characterized by the following attributes:

1. Results-oriented versus task-oriented.
2. Identifies required competencies, both technical and behavioral.
3. Team-based in terms of shared accountabilities.
4. Lists cross-functional and multiskilled responsibilities.
5. Promotes recognition and utilization of individual differences in expertise.
6. Consistent with results of the VCC Future Work Roles and Relationships outcomes, including values, expected behaviors, roles and team-development continuum.
7. Endures (remains valid) in the face of continuous improvement of work processes, tools, employee knowledge and skills.

8. Sufficiently broad to apply to a variety of work environments (not just the SF! Center on the main campus).

9. Provides an exemplary model for other, future job descriptions at VCC.

10. Inspires and attracts highly skilled and high-performing staff.

11. Specifies opportunities for growth and development.

12. Provides a clear and realistic job preview for potential team members.

13. Describes the core processes involved in achieving the results expected.

14. Generally describes the success indicators and measures by which the team's work will be evaluated.

15. Allows for a pay-for-skills approach to team-member development and compensation.


17. Reflects our desire for the college to be a learning organization.

18. Reflects VCC's mission and strategic goals.
19. Reflects the vision, principles, and values of the SF! project.

20. Emphasizes efficiency, effectiveness and quality.

Working with the above attributes, the subgroup began defining the new work description in February 1998. They completed the work description in June 1998. The following is an outline of the new work description, developed by the subgroup:

1. Title
2. Objectives
   a. Mission
   b. Vision
   c. Values and Behaviors
3. Results Expected
4. Core Processes
5. Work Environment
   a. Team Services
      i) Service Orientation
      ii) Quality Service
      iii) Integrated Services
      iv) Process Orientation
   b. Team Approach
      i) Collaborative Approach
      ii) Shared Responsibilities
      iii) Shared Accountability
      iv) Team Self-Management
      v) Constructive Relationships
      vi) Empowerment
      vii) Creativity and Innovation
   c. Team Development
      i) Employee Development
      ii) Team Development
      iii) Skill-Based Competencies
      iv) Evolution of Team Services
      v) Continuous Process Improvement
      vi) Performance Management
6. Core Competencies and Progression Sequence.
Once completed, the subgroup presented the work description to the SF! Launching Team and received their approval to present it to the Project Management Team. The Project Management Team gave their approval. With support from the change-management consultant, the SF! Center Launching Team provided training on innovative classification and compensation systems to the management and classified staff union bargaining teams. Personnel Services notified the classified staff union of the intent to bargain wages, hours, and working conditions and bargaining began in July 1998.

The management negotiating team issued the following statement:

We think it is important to view SF! as a "pilot" project and focus our efforts on providing the project with the support and infrastructure to give it the best chance for success. While it would be foolish to ignore the learning that results from the SF! experience it is not the intent of the Executive Leadership to establish a restructuring model for the college-wide classified (staff) compensation system through the negotiation. The SF! work system design was based on High Performance Work System principles. Included in these principles were the concepts of team management of processes and a skill development concept that allow team members to become fully proficient in the performance of all tasks in their process area. We desire to come to an agreement on a pay system that supports these SF! design principles. (Internal Memo, 9/98)

In September 1998, the classified staff union approved a special (incentive) compensation/progression agreement for the SF! Service Representatives to receive pay-for-skills compensation. At the same
time, language was approved that operationalized the Employment Security Agreement for staff who would be displaced by the SF! implementation. The Joint Bargaining Team (management and classified staff) acknowledged that the concepts of pay and progression being applied to the SF! project were experimental and very different from the existing classification system. In a September 28, 1998, memo to classified staff and managers, the Joint Bargaining Team acknowledged,

It was the intent of the parties in reaching this agreement to provide a structural basis for SF! that supports the objectives of the work design while remaining sensitive to the interests of all VCC classified employees.

Specifically, the agreements satisfied the following objectives:

1. Established a compensation system that appropriately valued the desired SF! service results and SF! competency requirements while maintaining a balance with the valuation system used in the remainder of the classified staff bargaining union.

2. Established a compensation system that supported and encouraged employee skill development.

3. Provided skill-development opportunities in a timely manner to ensure that opportunities for advancement are appropriately available.

4. Developed a process by which an employee displaced by the movement of functions into SF! can continue to work productively for the college without financial loss.
5. Provided for the movement of the displaced employees as quickly as possible into established positions within the college without impacting the rights of laid-off employees.

Select Permanent Workers and Implement Employment Security

The adoption of a compensation/progression agreement paved the way for the permanent team to be hired. Seven new positions were created by eliminating seven existing positions. Individuals employed in the eliminated positions were given the opportunity to apply for the new positions. The seven permanent SF! Service Representative Team members were hired in November 1998. Two permanent staff were displaced as a result of their positions being eliminated and their not being selected for the new SF! Service Representative positions. Following the Employment Security Memorandum of Agreement, in both cases, permanent vacant positions were offered and accepted by the displaced individuals. The Employment Security Memorandum of Agreement provided the following protections for employees whose jobs were eliminated or reduced as a result of the implementation of SF! Process Redesign:
1. Meaningful work (temporary job assignment) will be provided to a qualified displaced employee at their current pay rate within a generally equivalent work environment.

2. A vacant permanent position will be given to a qualified displaced employee rather than being posted or offered to someone on the layoff/recall list if it is within the same job family or if it is in another job family for which there are no senior employees on layoff/recall who can be placed.

3. Employees working under this Agreement must either accept temporary job assignments that are deemed to be in the "generally equivalent" work environment or be laid off.

4. Employees working under this Agreement must accept a vacant permanent position which is offered to them in agreement with the terms of the current contract or be laid off.

5. Employees choosing layoff will no longer be covered by the terms of this Agreement effective with the date of layoff.

6. An employee in a temporary job assignment with a pay level less than his/her current pay level will receive any cost-of-living adjustments made to the salary schedule.

7. An employee covered by this Agreement who accepts a vacant permanent position with a pay level less than his/her current pay level will continue to be paid at his/her current rate.

8. An employee who has accepted a temporary job assignment who is unable to perform the essential functions of such job will return under the protection of this Agreement.

9. Displaced employees will have the option to participate fully in the Displaced Worker Program offered by Training and Development as a portion of their temporary job assignment. (Internal Memo, 9/98)

With the implementation of the integrated frontline service SF!

Center, all frontline services for admissions, records, financial aid and
student cashiering were moved to the SF! Center. After these functions permanently transferred to the SF! Center, the Financial Aid Office service counters closed and the student cashiering windows formerly in College Finance also closed. All general-inquiry telephone lines previously answered by Admissions, Records, Financial Aid, and Cashiers were directed to the SF! Center. Although the college is a long way from declaring the entire SF! change project a success, it is possible to celebrate the implementation of the integration of frontline service.

Lots of work still remains in order for the entire vision for the SF! Center to become operational. The vision calls for forming three technical teams that support the SF! Center and one-stop concept. These technical teams (enrollment, financial, information) will be formed by the traditional departments (Admissions, Records, Veterans, Financial Aid, and Student Accounts), which will redesign their work flow to process all off-line work in support of the service team. The implementation activities will be ongoing for years to come. Also, the development of the virtual service delivery is dependent on the acquisition of software that supports Web-enabled service delivery.

Other recommended changes were either partially or totally implemented while the SF! Center was being formed. For example, the Career and Employment Services Center was formed by integrating career- and job-
related services (i.e., Career Information Center, Job Placement Center, Federal Work-Study), including representation from Cooperative Education and Training and Development. Students now explore career options, make employment connections, and link school and work—all in one location. Examples of other recommendations being implemented include formation of academic advising teams, improvements to student orientation, on-line admissions applications, etc.

I conclude this study with the words of one veteran participant: "despite all the pain, compromises, and what we did not accomplish, there is still energy and belief, among the staff, in what we are trying to do." As Mintzberg and Waters (1985) state, "realized strategies are a blend of what is intended with what emerges in practice" (p. 257).

Summary

Valley Community College's executive leadership knew change was needed. Community demand for services was expanding while revenues remained constant, and staff resources were stretched to their limit. Given these and other circumstances, the college was unable to improve or maintain current service levels without radically changing how it conducted business. However, the executive leadership did not want to engage in a haphazard change effort without clear goals or
directions. Instead, VCC's executive leadership decided to invite staff to undertake a systematic evaluation process, utilizing process-redesign methods, to identify those areas where the needs and opportunities for change were greatest. Given VCC's culture of participative decision-making, the executive leadership felt that broad-based staff participation was necessary in order for the change effort to be embraced cooperatively by the rest of the organization rather than challenged confrontationally or simply resisted passively, whether due to cultural blockage, bureaucratic momentum, or political reaction (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992). The following overarching principles guided the redesign project:

1. Translate the college's mission, vision, and goals into results using new and strengthened cross-functional linkages.

2. Ensure the focus of the redesign is on process rather than traditional organizational structures.

3. Service providers have the authority, responsibility, and accountability to disseminate accurate information and to make decisions.

4. Design processes so that service requests are processed once at the point of origin.
5. Provide technology and training to enable easy access to timely and accurate information.

6. Measure what you want to accomplish.

The executive leadership endorsed a consultant-intensive, model-driven, phased approach (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) in order to accelerate staff thinking about better alternatives. The project spanned 4 years and implementation is ongoing. The President decided the college needed to transform from a hierarchical, bureaucratic organization to a high-performing work system in order to become more efficient and effective.

The Process Redesign Project Management Team, formed to provide leadership and oversight for the project, identified critical success factors that were essential in creating an environment that could support change within the college. These critical success factors fell within the areas of executive support, communication, information technology, labor relations, human resource practices, training/organizational development, measurement and assessment.

1. **Executive support**: Sustained support and commitment to change was vital to the success of implementation. The Executive Leadership Team ensured that sufficient resources, continuous and clear communication, strategies to address potential resistance, and a
willingness to modify policies were in place. The team made redesign a campus-wide priority by emphasizing improved services to students and committing resources appropriately. Finally, the Executive Leadership Team was responsible for ensuring that momentum was maintained by reducing or eliminating barriers to implementation. This included the endorsement of policy or philosophy changes that were initiated in support of the recommendations.

2. Communication: Communication played a key role in ensuring that the college community received regular reports on the progress and successes of implementation.

3. Training: The college ensured that time was specifically dedicated to training activities, and participation in training was integral to both the staff and team’s responsibilities and performance. Training that addressed all aspects of team interaction, technical knowledge, and customer service was offered.

4. Human resource practices: Prior to the creation of teams, VCC developed job descriptions that accurately reflected all team-member skills and responsibilities. In addition, evaluation criteria that incorporated team and individual performance were established. Personnel Services played a key role in facilitating and initiating VCC’s
progression to a team-based structure for the services-to-students organization.

5. Labor relations: The executive leadership proactively approached addressing staff concerns related to collective-bargaining contract issues and employment security. In particular, the active involvement of staff group representatives during redesign and implementation served both staff and the college in ensuring a smooth transition to a team-based organization.

6. Technology: The investment of resources in technology and related staffing ensured that all staff possessed innovative tools to deliver services to students.

7. Measurement and assessment: Performance measures were established that ensured the college realized the intended improvements from its investment. Baseline performance measures were established in order to measure the effectiveness of process changes.

The VCC staff stated that they encountered their share of hardships and setbacks in the first major change effort in the form of rumors, passive and active resistance, fear of failure, and many others. While it was impossible to avoid all the potential hazards of a major change effort, the VCC staff managed to prevail sometimes, and fail at other times. Some staff members state that progress has been made
toward changing the work roles and relationships within the college and progress has been made toward realizing some of the elements of a high-performing work system. However, other staff members state that the college's accomplishments have fallen short of the radical change it sought, and they cite the college culture as being too formidable an opponent.

The next chapter will discuss the study results and implications for higher education practice as well as future research.
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The social, economic, and political conditions of the 1980s and the 1990s forced organizations to react or to risk stagnation or decline. These forces of change show no signs of diminishing and continue to occur at a rate most managers and employees find frustrating and difficult to manage. The educational environment has been equally battered by changing achievement expectations, competition for diminishing clientele, decreased funding sources, technological advances, and employee needs. Changes in the external environment are forcing educational institutions to make changes in the way they create and deliver educational services.

This chapter provides an overview of the research conducted and includes a summary of the study and discussion of major findings. Implications for higher education practice are presented, as well as recommendations for future research.
Thesis Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe how one community college attempted to develop and implement transformational change. More specifically, this research sought to discover the factors and strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process. The research sought to identify the key elements necessary to implement successful change. Barriers to change may be structural (involving how work is performed, organizational structure, and reporting relationship), cultural (core values, attitudes, and philosophies), or political (involving difficulties in managing conflicts and differences effectively). In this research, ways in which a community college can overcome these barriers to change were examined.

This study describes one community college's efforts to transform from a traditional bureaucratic organization to a high-performance work system characterized by cross-functionally trained work teams, increased employee involvement in decision-making, and shared leadership. Through this study, methods illustrating how the community college built the capacity for ongoing change became apparent.
Research Design and Methodology

Qualitative case-study research design was selected for this study because it represented the best approach for gathering data on a community college that had articulated its immersion in a transformational change process. In addition, the majority of organizational change studies, according to the literature, have been qualitative in nature and have involved interpretive methods. The purpose of documenting this change process in one community college was to gain an in-depth understanding, and expand the knowledge base of change processes in education, rather than to test hypotheses.

Participant observation was the major means of collecting data. The investigator in this study was a participant observer and an organization member assigned the role of project manager for this change initiative. This research method gave a firsthand account of the situation under study and, when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allowed for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being investigated. Participant observation is the technique of choice when behavior can be observed firsthand or when people cannot or will not discuss the research topic. Even so, there are the biases an investigator, who is also a participant, brings to the situation. Overall, however, the inside view provided outweighs any acknowledged
bias on the part of the participant observer. As a method of reducing bias and maximizing the trustworthiness of the findings, data gathering occurred over a prolonged period (4 years) at one community college. Data gathering involved participant observation, unstructured interviews, extended conversations, and documentary methods so that the broadest range of information could be gathered. In addition, participants in the study were invited to correct, clarify, or comment on the accounts reported in this study. Taken together, these data-gathering methods enabled the researcher to deal with the complex interaction between the topic, investigator, study site, and other participants.

The dominant mode of data analysis utilized a chronological approach for describing the results. By chronologically delineating the various phases of the transformational change process, the investigator was able to trace events over time and to determine any causal relationships. The phases (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) formed the structure for describing the study that spanned from 1995 to 1999. The analyses in this study were ongoing, open-ended and inductive, involving thick description (thoroughly documented data) and constant comparative analysis (comparing multiple sources of data to find connections that support a theme, hypothesis, assertion, or conclusion).
Summary of Study Results and Findings

Valley Community College leadership and staff invested much energy, enthusiasm, and resources to make fundamental changes in their internal systems and to build the capacity for ongoing change necessary to realize their goal of becoming a high-performance work organization. Five years have passed since the college executive leadership decided internal changes were necessary in order to become more adaptive and responsive to changing external conditions. In January 1995, the college executive leadership launched efforts to build the capacity within the institution to support a staff-led change initiative. Rather than engage in a haphazard change effort without clear goals or directions, the VCC executive leadership decided to undertake a systematic evaluation process to identify those areas where the needs and opportunities for change were greatest. A phased approach (explore and plan, analyze and redesign, and implementation) was chosen that was model-driven rather than discovery-driven in order to accelerate staff thinking about better alternatives.

The college staff spent the first year exploring methods, planning for change, and defining the scope of the project (limited to services to students); the second year involved analyzing the current situation, identifying opportunities for change, redesigning internal systems, and
planning for implementation. Once the change project entered the implementation phase, this study focused specifically on staff efforts to implement the integrated "one, stop" frontline service recommendation. Prior to the implementation phase, external consultants and an internal executive project management team provided structure and support to staff and leaders of the project. However, once implementation began, the project was turned over to the midlevel managers, classified staff, and faculty of the impacted work groups. Staff members who took an active role in attempting to implement the recommendations voiced concern over the sudden lack of support and executive leadership. The change in executive level support was in part due to the President’s decision to merge student services with instructional services, resulting in the elimination of the Vice President for Student Services position. From the time of the restructuring announcement, 6 months elapsed before the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services fully assumed her new role. During the transition, resistance grew among staff members who interpreted the lack of visible executive leadership as a withdrawal of legitimacy for the project. Dissenters viewed the void in leadership as an opportunity to introduce their own change vision, which, if implemented, would have resulted in less overall institutional change. Three (permanent staff) implementation coordinators were
released from their regular assignments for 2 years (a) to ensure that the overall goals of the recommended changes were accomplished, (b) to ensure that the values and principles of empowerment and participation were advanced through the Students First! (SF!) implementation, and (c) to provide an environment that encouraged the distribution of leadership and maximized participation during the implementation process. Unfortunately, by the time the coordinators assumed their role, implementation had been underway for 5 months. Also, the coordinators lacked the authority to effectively address behaviors directed at sabotaging the project. In the absence of strong executive leadership, staff members within the project became polarized around different visions (conflicting interests) for the change project. In an effort to re-establish working relationships among staff, and restore forward motion for the project, in January 1998, the Vice President for Instruction and Student Services became actively involved in setting a direction. By this time, staff had been attempting to implement the recommendations for 1.5 years with little success. The direction taken resulted in diminished results over what had been proposed by the SF! Redesign Team. The Vice President stated that she did not feel the culture was ready for the type of changes that had been proposed by the SF! Redesign Team.
At the conclusion of this study, implementation had been underway 2 years and some of the original change recommendations had been fully implemented, albeit in significantly modified form. A permanent team of staff was hired to work in the "one stop" service center, and the classified staff union approved a special memorandum of agreement authorizing a pay-for-performance compensation package for the new SF! Center Service Representative positions.

With the implementation of the integrated "one-stop" SF! Service Center, all frontline services for admissions, records, financial aid and student cashering (previously separate departments within the divisions of student services and college operations) were moved to the SF! Center in November 1998. After these functions permanently transferred to the SF! Center, the Financial Aid Office service counters closed and the student cashiering windows formerly in College Finance also closed. All general-inquiry telephone lines, previously answered by Admissions, Records, Financial Aid, and Cashiers, were directed to the SF! Center.

Although the college is a long way from declaring the entire SF! change project a success, staff members did celebrate the implementation of the integration of frontline services. Work still remained in order for the entire vision for the SF! Center to become operational. The vision
called for forming three technical teams that supported the SF! Center and one-stop concept. These technical teams (enrollment, financial, information) were formed by the traditional departments (Admissions, Records, Veterans, Financial Aid, and Student Accounts) redesigning their work flow to process all off-line work in support of the service team. The implementation activities will be ongoing for years to come. Also, the development of the virtual service delivery is dependent on the acquisition of software that supports Web-enabled service delivery.

Other recommended changes were implemented in part or total while the SF! Center was being formed. For example, the Career and Employment Services Center was formed by integrating career- and job-related services (i.e., Career Information Center, Job Placement Center, Federal Work-Study), including representation from Cooperative Education and Training and Development. Students now explore career options, make employment connections, and link school and work—all in one location. Examples of other recommendations implemented include formation of academic advising teams, improvements to student orientation, and an on-line admissions application.

In order for the full benefits of the SF! Redesign Team’s change recommendations to be realized, additional staff development is necessary to better prepare staff to deal more effectively with dissent
and the management of conflict. However, until dissent is no longer rewarded within the college by yielding to dissenters’ wishes, there is little hope that it will cease to be a formidable opponent to future change efforts. It is questionable whether the changes that have been adopted can be sustained by the college.

This study illustrates how complex and time consuming it is to modify patterns of behavior and internal systems that reflect the culture of an organization. In order to support cultural change, the college leadership invested heavily in developing the perspective and skills in staff to assume new roles within the organization. However, although VCC approached transformation in an integrated, structured manner, the executive leadership still found sustaining momentum very difficult in a culture that placed a higher value on affiliation over results, loathed conflict, and utilized a model based on participative decision-making by consensus.

With any change there is resistance, even when the changes are perceived as positive. The resistance experienced during the implementation of the change recommendations resulted in many delays. The lost momentum resulted in modifications to recommendations that limited the results realized. The college did realize some improvements from its transformational change initiative. The question remains, could
the college have realized more results if the culture had been less
conflict adverse and more open to interventions that would have reduced
the impact of conflict?

Originally this investigator set out to discover the factors and
strategies that influence the outcome of a transformation process. The
investigator was interested in determining the key elements of
implementing successful change, and specifically the methods to
overcome structural, cultural and political barriers to change. The study
revealed seven elements that increase the likelihood of successful
change: a recognized need for change, motivation based on the needs of
students and the best interests of the staff and faculty, strong leadership,
a college culture open to change, external factors pressing for and
supporting change, the perception that the changes are positive and
relevant, and voluntary staff participation.

These factors influenced the outcome of the transformational
change project; however, they did not guarantee success. The
investigator discovered that it was impossible to reduce the complex
change process to a neat set of rational guidelines. Participants
experienced the change not only rationally but also affectively. The
investigator’s own paradigm shifted from looking at change as a rational
sequence of events to a complex interplay between rational forces and
nonrational affective processes. From this study, it became evident that understanding the personal domain of the change process was essential in making planned change successful.

The study suggests that during a change process, people feel uncomfortable in new roles, mourn the loss of old ways, and long for concreteness and certainty to replace the ambiguity and uncertainty of the situation. Even successful changes create new problems. To change an institution, staff need not only understand the change process but also change their perception of themselves and their relationship to the world. In short, they need to see themselves as subjects rather than as objects. How participants viewed themselves in relationship to the change made the difference in whether they promoted or inhibited the development of the change.

Staff can effect change if they are empowered (a) to become agents of change rather than targets of change, (b) to see the possibility of new realities, and (c) to see themselves in a new perspective. The data from this study suggest that people's view of themselves can change and is most likely to change in an environment of freedom and an approach that emphasizes potentialities. Change and freedom are tightly linked. Change is integrated in an environment of freedom--the freedom to alter situations by reinterpreting them and, by so doing, to
see oneself in a new perspective. In this study, the college’s executive leadership championed a process that supported staff in creating their own models to realize a vision and become authors of the change. Through the change process, some participants developed a belief in themselves and their ability to make a difference; others did not.

Such factors as recognized need for change, external pressures and continued support for change, and a transformation that was seen as positive also had a significant impact on the changes that were implemented. The staff who began to see themselves as agents of change were perhaps those most open to change in the first place. However, results of the study suggest that recognizing the ambivalence and ambiguity that comes with change, establishing collaborative relationships, and gaining a sense of control are important aspects in the implementation of change.

In closing, the challenges of initiating change are far easier than the challenges of sustaining change (Senge et al., 1999).

**Discussion of Study Results and Findings**

This study was initiated with the belief that there are identifiable rational factors and strategies that promote successful change. This study revealed that, indeed, certain factors and strategies are essential to
create the capacity for change within an organization; however, unless these strategies include the support and commitment of executive leadership and significant attention to the human side of change, they will not lead to sustainable change.

Transformational change is about learning. Learning and change processes are part of each other. Change is a learning process and learning is a change process (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992; Handy, 1990). According to Beckhard and Pritchard (1992),

a learning mode only occurs when an organization’s top leaders understand the process, see learning as something to be valued, and are prepared to commit themselves personally to it. The learning process involves:
1. Unfreezing oneself from currently held beliefs, knowledge, or attitudes.
2. Absorbing new or alternative attitudes and behavior.
3. Refreezing oneself in the new state. (p. 14)

The organization does not just do something new; it builds its capacity for doing things in a new way, and thereby it builds capacity for ongoing change. This capacity for change involves both a shift in people’s values, aspirations, and behaviors and a shift in processes, strategies, practices, and systems. It is not enough to change strategies, structures, and systems, unless the thinking that produced those strategies, structures and systems also changes (Senge et al., 1999).

Considering all that VCC did to increase the organization’s capacity to change, there still were no assurances that change would
occur. As Kotter (1995) points out, "change efforts are messy and full of surprises" (p. 67). The best any college can do is build on its successes and learn from its mistakes.

VCC certainly encountered its share of hardship in its first major change effort; these difficulties included rumors, passive and active resistance, fear of failure, and many others. While it was impossible to avoid all the potential hazards of a major change effort, VCC managed to preempt some by learning from others’ experience and planning carefully. VCC leadership has continued the learning process by recording lessons learned in this change effort so as to apply them in subsequent efforts. The lessons learned during this transformational change effort, have been organized in two categories: (a) what the college perceives it "did well," and (b) what the college would "do differently."

Lessons Learned: What the College Did Well

This study revealed the importance of having the support and commitment of executive leadership and focusing on the human side of change as fundamental factors influencing the outcome of a change initiative. Capacity for change was developed within the college by providing executive leadership support and modifying/developing
internal systems in the areas of information technology, labor relations, human resource practices, training/staff development, measurement and assessment.

Executive Leadership Support

Executive leadership's sustained commitment and support is vital to the success of implementing change. Executive leadership must ensure that sufficient resources, continuous and clear communication, and strategies to address potential resistance are in place. Executive leadership is also responsible for ensuring that momentum is maintained by reducing or eliminating barriers to implementation. This includes the endorsement of policy or philosophy changes that are initiated in support of the change recommendations. This does not mean that executive leadership has to do everything themselves. On the contrary, they need to develop and empower a coalition of leadership throughout the organization to champion and serve as role models for the change process. According to Kotter (1996),

the key to creating and sustaining the kind of successful twenty-first-century organization is leadership, not only at the top of the hierarchy, with a capital L, but also in a more modest sense (l) throughout the enterprise. (p. 175)
Specifically, areas of VCC executive leadership support included:

1. **Sufficient resources:** A change initiative must be supported with funding and the necessary relief of staff from existing responsibilities. In doing so, VCC made the change initiative a college-wide priority by emphasizing improved services and committing sufficient resources appropriately. Resources invested by VCC included the dedicated time and energy of many individuals within the organization to work on formulating change recommendations, implementation, training for staff whose jobs would change, adequate technology support and programming time, funding for the acquisition of new technology or upgrade of existing technology, and funding for external resources--e.g., consultants--and surveys, as required.

2. **Continuous and clear communication:** This is an area in which VCC acknowledges it could have done better, even though the executive leadership provided regular communication using a variety of formats. Throughout the change initiative, continuous and clear communication was provided to the campus community concerning what changes were occurring, why and when they would occur, and how the changes would impact staff. In spite of these efforts, the Project Management Team often had to take time to address rumors, misunderstood motives, and misguided agendas. To keep members of
the campus community informed about the project, the Process Redesign Leadership Team and Project Management Team offered visits to department staff meetings, open forums for employees and students to join and share their thoughts, announcements in campus publications, E-mail messages and bulletins, input sessions, and other means of communication. One such example occurred prior to beginning implementation, when the executive leadership sponsored a day-long in-service training session for employees involved in delivering services to students. At the in-service session, employees had the opportunity to learn about the new vision and recommended changes in a relaxed and informal setting geared to a variety of learning styles. It was essential for executive management to maintain and communicate trust in individuals representing all levels of the organization to make decisions about how to conduct the work of implementation. However, due to the lack of consistent leadership during implementation, executive management neglected to share information widely and work collaboratively with staff; as a result, trust levels suffered. Suggestions for what VCC would do differently are included later in this chapter.

3. *Anticipating potential resistance:* VCC fostered a culture of innovation by rewarding successes and acknowledging failed attempts as learning opportunities instead of setbacks. The executive leadership did
an excellent job of anticipating where potential resistance to change might occur; however, they had difficulty demonstrating that self-serving resistance to change would not be tolerated. Staff concerns over perceived adverse consequences of the change, fear of change, and insecurity about loss of power and influence became powerful motivators that seriously impeded implementation. VCC acknowledges that this is an area it needed to handle differently.

4. Willingness to modify policies: Both explicit and implicit policies regarding training, cross-training, work hours, job assignments, technology, and communication were addressed during implementation. The executive leadership engaged the college community in support of modifications in technology and personnel functions that were necessary to support implementation. VCC executive leadership needed the staff's commitment to changing the way work would be performed; however, they lacked a clear model for how the future workplace at the college would be different. To enable VCC staff to pursue planned change confidently and successfully, executive leadership, together with labor representatives, established clear, basic expectations about how VCC staff would interact with one another and the desired characteristics of future work processes, systems, and roles. In addition, staff were
offered the opportunity to pilot the new team-based work roles before applying for the positions on a permanent basis.

**Information Technology**

The investment of resources in technology and related staffing at VCC helped to ensure that staff functions were supported as the college transitioned from old to new work processes. It was important that a support structure was created that provided for both the development and maintenance of the college's computer systems. Concurrently, it was essential that assessments occurred of current and future technology capabilities to support various service-delivery methods, particularly student self-service, and ensure that college-wide technology needs were not compromised. VCC accomplished this early in the planning phase by commissioning an information technology assessment that yielded a plan and steps for realizing the needed improvements.

**Labor Relations**

In VCC's union environment, a proactive approach to addressing staff concerns related to collective bargaining contract issues, and employment security was important. The active involvement of employee group representatives in implementation was intended to, but
did not always, serve both staff and the college in ensuring a smoother transition to a team-based organization.

In this study, the community college adopted an employment security policy and negotiated memorandums of agreement with its employee groups in order for employees to participate in the change initiative without worrying about adverse employment or economic consequences for themselves. Through these policies the college provided assurances of employment security rather than job security. Staff were openly informed that when jobs were changed or eliminated, as a result of changes initiated, their employment with the college would be continued. Displaced employees would be offered additional training in order to develop the skills needed to perform the new work that emerged. Staff were also informed that any changes to jobs would be governed by union contract.

**Human Resource Practices**

Prior to the creation of teams, VCC developed work descriptions that accurately reflected all team member skills, responsibilities, and a related compensation and incentive system (changes in pay systems). In addition, evaluation criteria that incorporated team and individual
performance were established. Human resources played a key role in facilitating and initiating the progression to a team-based structure.

**Training/Staff Development**

VCC learned that one of the great challenges of institutional change was unlocking the potential wisdom of individuals and groups. Collaborative learning skills for groups and teams were viewed as essential to success. This was true for teams at every level in the institution. In order for this to happen, staff needed to possess the skills and knowledge that enabled them to function successfully in a dynamic team-based environment. Training that addressed all aspects of team interaction, communication, collaboration, group decision-making, conflict resolution, leadership, technical knowledge, and customer service was provided. VCC ensured that time was specifically dedicated to training activities and a structure was in place that supported the delivery of ongoing training. A dedicated learning time was established once a week on Wednesdays from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., and staff were provided released time and encouraged to attend. Participation in training was viewed by the executive leadership as integral to both the staff and SF! team’s development of the essential skills needed in the new work environment.
Training programs in and of themselves do not change a college’s patterns of behavior. As VCC found, an organization needs to ensure that the training offered can be used within the existing organization; otherwise, participants will find that the excitement engendered by a good training program only leads to frustration when they get back on the job only to see their new skills go unused in an organization in which nothing else has changed. When this happens, people end up seeing training as a waste of time, which undermines whatever commitment to change a program may have roused in the first place.

There were occasions during this change initiative when individual staff received training only to experience that their new skills could not be utilized or were not valued within their intact work group. VCC learned that training was more valuable when offered to all staff from an intact work group than to individual employees.

Measurement and Assessment

Performance measures help people to see whether something new is working. Cultures change after people’s actions have been successfully altered, after new behavior produces some group benefit for a period of time, and after people see the connection between the new actions and the performance improvement. Therefore, institutions need
to show people how the new approaches have helped improve performance. In other words, they need to demonstrate that the changes have a positive effect, and are not just change for the sake of change itself. To demonstrate the positive effect of its change recommendations, once implemented, VCC’s SF! Redesign Team put considerable effort into developing specific and quantifiable performance measures to track the effect of each implemented recommendation. For each performance measure, it identified the desired outcome, the means for measuring the effect, the tools for measurement, and the person(s) who was responsible for tracking measurement. Here are two examples:

1. To measure and demonstrate the positive effect of changes in a student’s ability to complete financial transactions at the original point of service, VCC set a specific target of increasing the number of points of service from 2 to 10 by July 1998.

2. To measure and demonstrate the positive effect of creating one standard admissions form for all types of students, intended to increase the efficiency of the applications process for both students and employees, VCC set a specific target of decreasing processing time per application from 25 minutes to 15 minutes by July 1998.

However, there can be long delays (a few months or even years) between adopting new approaches and realizing tangible results. VCC
found that it was important to demonstrate results quickly in order to maintain interest in and momentum for the transformation. VCC's SF! Redesign Team was attentive to potential "quick wins" throughout their research and analysis work. The SF! Redesign Team defined a "quick win" as a recommendation that met one or more of the following criteria:

1. Involves a person with the authority, desire to make the change, and is willing to take the risk.
2. Eliminates non-value-added tasks.
3. Involves few steps.
4. Involves minimal budget impact to implement.
5. Acts as an interim step to an ultimate outcome.
6. Promises to become "visible" soon.
7. Involves minimal complications.

In addition to developing 12 major recommendations for improvements to services to students, the SF! Redesign Team developed a list of 8 quick wins. For example, it recommended that the Admissions phone number be removed from the billing statement, reducing unnecessary calls to Admissions and student frustrations with being transferred to the billing department, all with minimal investment. VCC implemented this and other quick wins over a 6-month time frame.
to demonstrate the positive effects of the transformation effort, and to maintain enthusiasm for the project. When quick wins were realized, they were communicated as signs of success. The following example was entitled "Quick Wins Help Students Succeed" and appeared in the 1997 Winter Class Schedule:

Remember the thorn in the paw that stymied the lion, king of the jungle? Small things make a big difference. At VCC, a series of small but meaningful changes are underway in services to students called Quick Wins. Check it out: [Quick Wins were listed here]... These small changes should pull a thorn or two from your paw. With that out of the way, you can get on with what you're here for: a quality, affordable education. Quick Wins are short-term improvements identified by Students First!, a project to keep services responsive using process redesign methodology. A redesign team has identified long-term, phased-in changes as well. (1997 Winter Schedule of Classes)

Lessons Learned: What the College Would Do Differently

The college's executive leadership acknowledged that although they did much right in building capacity for change, there were areas, if addressed differently, that might have better facilitated the intended changes' adoption by the staff. The following six strategies, considered in hindsight, might have reduced staff resistance and streamlined implementation at VCC. These six strategies are (a) providing a support system for change agents, (b) preparing staff to participate in change,
(c) helping managers understand their new roles early in the process, (d) communicating more clearly and consistently, (e) managing conflict differently, and (f) maintaining consistent leadership throughout the project.

Providing a Support System for Change Agents

Change agents function as heretics and are generally more tolerant of risks than other staff. Art Kleiner (1996) defines heretics as "people who take a stand in a way that challenges conventional wisdom, but who remain loyal, in their own mind, to the organization they are challenging" (p. x). He adds, "organizations may shun the 'heretics' but without them it is much harder to adapt to a changing work environment" (p. x). Because of their role in leading change, change agents are often viewed by some staff as threats to the status quo. In an effort to minimize the change agent's impact, some staff will deliberately try to reduce their effectiveness by spreading rumors or questioning their motives or authority. Change agents are essential to any organization that wishes to change. Therefore, it is important that a support system be developed that nurtures these individuals and helps them feel valued and supported.
Preparing Staff to Participate in Change

Individual and organizational development are inseparable, and the goal of organizational development must therefore be the sustainable development of both individuals and organizations through ongoing processes aimed both at meeting organizational goals and at giving meaning to the human experience. Many disappointments in this change initiative may be traced to ineffective participation. Participative competence is essential if participative efforts are to result in beneficial outcomes for individuals and organizations.

VCC struggled between its desire to involve staff in meaningful decisions that would shape their lives and doubted the staffs' capacity to participate in the same decisions. One cannot conclude, based on any reasonable review of the literature regarding participation in organizations, that simply involving staff in decision-making will produce positive benefits for either those involved or the organization as a whole. This study suggests that a lack of preparation for participation by managers and staff may have accounted for the mixed results in this change initiative.

Staff must gradually develop, through firsthand, group-based learning experiences involving significant, real issues, and development of the skills and courage needed to be active and knowledgeable
participants in change. These learning experiences must be voluntary; doors can be opened for staff, but they must walk through them themselves. The exact form and content of these learning experiences should be the priority of executive leadership to define. Once learned, these new competencies must be supported by organizational arrangements and processes that value and use the contributions staff prepare themselves to make.

Helping Managers Understand Their New Roles Early in the Process

Managers need support for moving to new roles. As a result of an assessment of the project in July 1998, the consultant reported a need for individual managers to be provided with training in the skills for leading in a highly participative organization (facilitation, coaching, bringing out the best in others, leading change), as well as individual development plans and coaching. At a minimum, the managers at VCC should have been assigned measurable outcomes they were responsible for achieving so that they felt more valued and necessary for the success of the project. (Consultant’s Report, 8/98)

Unfortunately, several managers felt threatened by the concept of sharing leadership, and rather than supporting staff, they marginalized them with little consequence for their behavior.

When attempting transformational change, all levels of management must be involved or else the change will be virtually
impossible. Several authors cite the likelihood of resistance being found in the middle levels of management because of fear of loss of power and fear of not having enough to do, of boredom, or of uselessness (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992; Champy, 1995).

During implementation, VCC executive leadership discussed an intervention designed to assist managers in adopting new work roles; however, the intervention was not implemented. Executive leadership suspects that had the intervention been implemented, middle management might have understood the importance and value of their new role and therefore been more accepting. The intervention involved sponsoring a "Work System Design Study Mission." The purpose of the study mission was to provide managers with an opportunity to:

1. Visit organizations that had already transitioned to a high-performance work system and observe their work in operation.

2. Learn about the change process and results from people who have participated in the process and gain ideas for application to VCC.

Communicating More Clearly and Consistently

Although VCC considered the level of communication about the project as something they did well, there were times when gaps in the available information resulted in heightened anxiety among staff. As a
way to avoid this problem, assigning a staff person to the role of managing the communication flow and internal public relations for the change initiative was seen as something that would be helpful.

Managing Conflict Differently

Highly affiliative organizations struggle with knowing when to heed the resistance and when to forge ahead. During this initiative, more often than not, the executive leadership heeded the resistance and lost precious momentum that ultimately cost the initiative in the level of change that actually occurred. Deciding ahead of time that resistance is a natural outcome of any change process and identifying methods that diffuse resistance rather than infuse it are important. It is important to reward the types of behavior that are wanted within the organization. If resistance is rewarded by giving in to dissenters, then resistance will continue and more than likely grow.

Fear and anxiety are challenges for sustaining change, because they develop after some progress has been made in implementing the changes. Effective leaders learn to recognize growing fear and anxiety as indicators of progress, and they learn how to acknowledge and deal with it, both within themselves and within others.
Maintaining Consistent Leadership Throughout the Project

VCC believes that if leadership had been consistent throughout the change process, it would have been easier to maintain a constant vision or picture of the future. Consistent leadership would have helped to clarify the general direction, motivate people to take action, and coordinate the actions of different people. Consistent leadership might have reduced the opportunity for power plays and end running that some staff engaged in during the change in Vice Presidential leadership.

Study Implications and Recommendations

Implications for Higher Education Practice

The study findings suggest that changes in structure and procedures (while they might be excellent indicators that a change has taken place) are difficult to carry out and do not produce much change in behavior (exemplars and models) until there has been a genuine shift in the underlying assumptions and values (myths and metaphors). Organizational change requires leadership strategies that emphasize interpretation of organizational values and meaning rather than emphasize organizational restructuring and administrative control.
Managing meaning is a considerably more slippery endeavor than traditional models of leadership would suggest (Simsek & Louis, 1994).

Management is a set of processes that can keep a complicated system of people and technology running smoothly. The most important aspects of management include planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving. Leadership is a set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Leadership defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles. This distinction is absolutely crucial because successful transformation is 70% to 90% leadership and only 10% to 30% management (Kotter, 1996). Yet, historically, organizations have placed more emphasis on management than on leadership.

Effective leaders are capable of reframing the thinking of those whom they guide, enabling them to see that significant changes are not only imperative but achievable. Yet the challenges facing these leaders go beyond determining what needs to be done differently. They must also address how to execute these decisions in a manner that has the greatest possibility for success. Leaders must keep in mind that the accuracy of decisions alone can never compensate for poor implementation.
The study findings suggest that disagreement is an inevitable byproduct of bringing people together. The successful leader must have the skills to transform individuals with differences, conflicts, and communication breakdowns into a committed, unified, and productive team. Leaders need to be skilled at:

1. Creating environments that lead to positive change.
2. Raising difficult issues.
3. Converting defensiveness and blame into insight and agreement.
4. Staying focused on problem-solving and collaboration.
5. Avoiding unproductive discussions.
6. Fostering creativity and innovation.

By analyzing case studies, Torbert (1989) concludes that, rather than life-cycle changes or organizational crises determining organizational transformations, such transformations may be caused by a strategic leader capable of articulating a vision of the future and transforming the system to make a reality of the vision. Torbert’s work is pointed toward the need for the intentional development of transformational leaders and the effective use of such leadership in organizations.
From this study it appears that to be a transformational leader in higher education requires a major talent for leading organizational change, skill with people, and a dedication to intellectual life, as well as an ability to speak and write well, to disseminate and sell ideas and new ventures. There is a tremendous need in higher education for the development of leadership that can both lead and sustain change.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study contributed to an understanding of transformational change in one community college setting. Applying these same research methods to other sites would add to the knowledge of change strategies utilized in other community colleges. Additional research is needed in order to compare and contrast the strategies identified in this study. The lessons drawn from this research may be relevant to community colleges that are confronted with similar challenges; however, only through additional research can the relevancy be determined for other community colleges.

What makes the literature on organizational change so confusing is that so much of it is presented free of context. To the protagonists (actors or observers), change can always seem strategic. By locating change research in context, practitioners can begin to contrast it with
change that is more or less significant. Although much of the
organizational development literature seems to have dealt primarily with
changes at middle level or below, often these have been depicted as if
they were strategic. But there is a difference between being strategic
and possibly having strategic consequences. To be really understood,
therefore, any change has to be viewed holistically and contextually as
well as retrospectively (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992).

Depending on an organization’s history, its inner and outer
context, the level of change required, and the balance of visionaries,
planners, and learners in the organization, the practitioner is faced with
different challenges. It is important that research move from theoretical
perspectives that delineate the complexity of change to practical models
which can facilitate the understanding and management of this
complexity.

Absent from the literature are longitudinal studies involving an
organization’s ability to sustain changed practices. Research on success
or failure at sustaining change could lend useful insights into the change
strategies employed. Additional areas for research include:

1. How does an organization get past the ideas and on to the
strategies?
2. How does an institution enlist the support of faculty and staff and minimize resistance?

3. How does an institution overcome the countless obstacles that get in the way of change? How can leaders honor the culture and mission of educational organizations, yet still work to transform them?

Finally, are community colleges truly living systems that act and change in order to express their nature and survive, as characterized by Levin (1998)? If so, what unique strategies and leadership styles are called for to support change and innovation within a living system?

Conclusions

The completion of this study marked both an end and a beginning of change at Valley Community College. If one subscribes to the notion that change is a process and not a destination, it never ends. Regardless of how successful a project may be this year, there are always the new challenges brought by the next year.

Concluding statements emphasize that successful transformational change initiatives must go beyond the mechanics and ensure the development of the skills and capacity of the institution and its stakeholders to change continuously. Organizational change and individual change are synonymous and complementary, and when
approached together consciously, provide the potential for a synergistic reinforcement of one another that can produce truly significant and lasting changes in the thinking, feeling, and sense-making of individuals as well as the practices, structures, processes and arrangements of organizing.

To compete in the future, we need to develop and tap the potential of all organizational members. Technical training and exposure to total quality methods is a part of this process; but the only way to retrieve the value of employees' knowledge is to create systems that support people in finding their voice and sharing the wisdom they possess.

Senge et al. (1999) refer to organizations as entering a new domain of leadership development when we stop thinking about preparing a few people for "the top" and start nurturing the potential for leaders at all levels to participate in shaping new realities. There is no real option. The re-creation of industrial-age enterprises can only happen through countless actions of thousands, indeed millions, of people. (p. 568)
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APPENDIX A: VALUES AND BEHAVIORS

Work Roles and Relationships

Questions and Answers

What are the objectives of this work?

This work is intended to establish clear, basic expectations about how Valley Community College (VCC) employees interact with one another and the desired characteristics of future work processes, systems, and roles.

Why is this important?

Recent negotiations and difficulties in the Students First! implementation process have highlighted a need to develop and adopt some fundamental behavioral expectations (both interpersonal and institutional) that will govern all VCC activities.

What are the outcomes of this work?

The outcomes of this work are:
1. Values and Behaviors that establish expectations for all VCC employees.
2. Labor principles that are derivative of the Values and Behaviors and describe behavioral expectations for all union-management interactions.
3. An explicit description of the desired future roles of managers and team members.
4. A transition support structure to facilitate and ensure adoption of the principles and concepts referenced above.
5. Work roles and decision-making change models that can be used for change planning and assessment purposes.
How was the work done?

This work was done by a joint management-labor committee, facilitated by an experienced labor relations and human resources consultant. The input of union and management leadership was sought and utilized in the development of these outcomes. Decision-making regarding work product was by consensus of team members.

How does this work tie in to other VCC initiatives?

This work is supportive of other initiatives such as the Strategic Learning Initiative, Students First!, and the Strategic Planning effort. Alignment has been ensured through maintaining a continual dialogue with team members involved with the other ongoing initiatives.

What is the status of the work?

Agreement has been reached on all of the elements described above. What remains is for the labor-management team to establish a detailed plan to facilitate adoption of the principles and concepts across the campus. This will include communications and commitment-building activities.
Valley Community College

Values and Behaviors

We believe in *respect for all people and their capabilities*—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We Do:</th>
<th>We Don’t:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interact with others as colleagues at all times</td>
<td>• Treat people rudely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sincerely listen to and consider others’ points of view</td>
<td>• Harass each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value diverse points of view</td>
<td>• Talk down or up to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and support processes and systems that ensure that the</td>
<td>• Treat people disrespectfully because of gender, ethnic origin, sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity of employment at Valley belongs to all people, regardless of gender, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, class background, religion, or age</td>
<td>orientation, class background, religion, or age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reward results and positive behaviors</td>
<td>• Argue closed-mindedly with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value input regardless of a person’s level or job</td>
<td>• Manipulate or play &quot;dirty tricks&quot; on each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work through disagreements openly and civilly</td>
<td>• Ignore input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructively confront negative behaviors</td>
<td>• Treat people in different classifications as &quot;lower&quot; and having less value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform people of decisions and events that may affect them</td>
<td>• Treat each other emotionally as children or parental figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide developmental opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Move decision-making as close to the work as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognize and support the collective intelligence and creativity of employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect confidentiality, as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect and role-model Valley’s new work relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe in integrity in dealing with people and issues—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>We Do:</strong></th>
<th><strong>We Don’t:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate openly, honestly, and completely</td>
<td>• Tell lies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assume accountability for the consequences of our actions, intended and unintended</td>
<td>• Twist facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect and use proper processes</td>
<td>• &quot;Pass the buck&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide timely feedback to people</td>
<td>• Manipulate or filter information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Honor all commitments, large or small</td>
<td>• Withhold needed information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take time to reflect on the consistency of what we say and do so in relation to the Mission and Values of the college.</td>
<td>• Use the &quot;underground&quot; when our desires are not met in appropriate processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenge behaviors that are inconsistent with Valley’s Mission and Values</td>
<td>• Tell or perpetuate rumors about people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate a clear sense of how stakeholders will be involved in decision-making</td>
<td>• Ignore unprincipled behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Honor the legal responsibilities of employees</td>
<td>• Make deals with individuals when decisions should be made collectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe in *delegating and accepting appropriate accountability*—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>We Do:</strong></th>
<th><strong>We Don’t:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Approach failure and mistakes as learning opportunities</td>
<td>• Seek, first, to place blame for failure and mistakes on others as a substitute for solving problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use facts and data in a problem-solving environment</td>
<td>• Tolerate situations where people hesitate to talk to a manager for fear of retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver and receive performance feedback in a respectful manner, focusing on development and improvement</td>
<td>• Tolerate situations where people hesitate (as a manager) to talk to represented employees for fear of union intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take personal responsibility for supporting Valley’s Mission and Values</td>
<td>• Use other people’s inaction as an excuse for our own inaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delegate and accept accountability along with responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognize that different forms of accountability are associated with different roles (individuals, teams, leaders, managers, supervisors, union officers, college officials)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Judge performance on actions and results, not words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support and use established conflict-resolution processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe in providing excellent service to all constituents (students, coworkers, customers, clients)—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We Do:</th>
<th>We Don’t:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seek input from our constituents on our service</td>
<td>• Ignore input from constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involve constituents in the design of services for them</td>
<td>• Create situations that put personal needs in conflict with those of constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that constituent needs are met</td>
<td>• Structure layers of people between constituents and those who directly serve them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand and strive to improve all dimensions of service quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the people who do the work communicate directly with those whom they serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We believe in the value of creativity and innovation—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We Do:</th>
<th>We Don’t:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage trying new things</td>
<td>• Dogmatically insist on doing things the old way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Celebrate successes and failures</td>
<td>• Censure people for experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Devise methods to leverage discoveries across the campus (share learning)</td>
<td>• Use innovation as an excuse to undermine or avoid complying with other values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide time and resources for innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate successful experiments into the college, as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide an adequate organizational framework for innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that creative activities are focused on advancing the Mission of the college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe in *the value of teams*—therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We Do:</th>
<th>We Don’t:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Create systems that foster change, involvement, and collaboration</td>
<td>• Micromanage daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set broad guidelines and allow teams to determine methods and goals</td>
<td>• Allow managers to make all important decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personally assume accountability for team processes and results</td>
<td>• Assign certain team members all the less desirable tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively share expertise with team members</td>
<td>• Reward and encourage hoarding of expertise and resources, including information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reward team performance</td>
<td>• Use the formation of teams as an excuse to arbitrarily increase workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide economic security for people whose jobs are combined with others in teams</td>
<td>• Second-guess teams’ choice of methods and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trust that teams can deal with individual performance within the team</td>
<td>• Withhold responsibilities from a team because of fears of poor individual performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider team processes to be the preferred method of managing work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that teams participate in decisions about team structure, mission and membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: LABOR RELATIONS PRINCIPLES

These Labor Principles are intended to create a framework to support and be part of VCC’s new work relations.

1. **We share the vision of a comprehensive educational institution that strives to serve the interests and needs of all stakeholders.**
   
   A. We accept responsibility and accountability for acting to accomplish the college mission.
   
   B. We accept the responsibility to work together to promote changes that will improve the performance of the college in serving student learning, the interests of students and the well-being of college employees.
   
   C. Our cooperative effort will be successful by engaging the talents, energy and enthusiasm of all employees in more effectively and efficiently meeting changing needs, providing opportunities for personal growth, and promoting greater trust and improved working relationships between union and administration/management at all levels.

2. **We will interact with each other and build relationships based upon trust, honesty, openness and mutual respect.**
   
   A. Trust and respect can only be established or enhanced when credibility and integrity are demonstrated on a continuous basis. Open, honest, and timely communication is essential to this process.
   
   B. We recognize that even in a healthy, long-term relationship, honest differences of opinion will occur. The mark of an effective relationship is the ability of the parties to agree or disagree on a specific issue without disrupting the entire relationship or ceasing to approach change in a constructive manner.
   
   C. With regard to conflict, we measure the health of our relationship not by the absence of conflict, but rather the
presence of effective processes to resolve conflict in a constructive manner within the relationship.

D. Both the administration and the unions recognize the importance of, and are committed to, dealing with each other in a professional and effective manner.

E. We will deal with each other directly and honestly.

F. In communicating accomplishments, we will give each other credit when credit is due.

3. **Management acknowledges and respects the role of unions in representing the interests of employees.**

   A. Management at all levels acknowledges and respects the unions’ leadership role.

   B. Management at all levels acknowledges and respects the representative role of representatives the unions select.

   C. Management at all levels accepts and respects collective bargaining and the exclusive role of the unions in representing bargaining unit employees on all matters concerning wages, hours and working conditions and in any situation defined as "dealing" by the NLRB.*

   D. Management at all levels accepts and respects the grievance processes of the collective bargaining agreements and will work within them.

   E. Management at all levels accepts and respects the right of unorganized employees to organize themselves in the manner of their choosing to engage in collective bargaining.

---

*"Dealing" involves a bilateral mechanism between two parties. It ordinarily entails a pattern or practice in which a group of employees, over time, makes proposals to management, management responds to these proposals by acceptance or rejection by word or deed, and compromise is not required. © NLRB, *Guidance for Seeking to Implement Lawful Cooperative Programs.*
4. The unions acknowledge and respect the role and responsibilities of management as delegated by the Board of Education.

A. The unions acknowledge that management is accountable to the Board of Education for accomplishing the mission and goals of the college and for day-to-day operations of the college.

B. The unions understand that the Board of Education has delegated to management representatives the responsibility for representing the Board in collective bargaining, and the unions accept and respect the exclusive role of these representatives in representing the Board.

C. The unions acknowledge that management may interact directly with individual employees on all matters not related to wages, hours and working conditions, consistent with 3.C. above.

D. The unions accept and respect the grievance processes of the collective bargaining agreements and will work within them.

5. The unions and management acknowledge and accept their responsibility in a constructive collective bargaining environment.

A. The unions and management acknowledge the responsibilities inherent in the principles enumerated in this agreement, and will strive to create the internal consensus and create the structural means to carry them out.

B. The unions and management will strive to provide an internal dialogue, alignment of employees' vision, and group coherence that increase the capacity of the college to achieve lasting, systemic improvements.

C. The unions and management will strive to create and maintain alliances to support public education and Valley Community College, jointly and independently.
6. **We will cooperate and emphasize problem solving.**

A. We are, in fact, interdependent with one another; therefore, we will mutually seek out and take into account our different points of view, which will lead to better solutions and the greater possibility of crafting and agreeing on options that meet each of our interests. We avoid win/lose behavior.

B. We will jointly develop and put in place structures and processes (such as steering committees, communications plans, feedback mechanisms, and bargained agreements) that will bring our intentions to life.

C. Our commitment to joint processes is thorough and sustained. Regular interactions over a productive agenda is critical, and all participants must be willing to commit the time and energy required.

D. Within joint processes, the desire by any party to meet separately will be respected. Where there is insufficient basis for joint effort, independent responsibility will be acknowledged and supported.

7. **We accept the principle of continuous improvement through employee involvement and empowerment as the means by which we will achieve our shared vision.**

A. Each employee has the ability and responsibility to contribute to the success of the College.

B. We will engage the challenges of today and tomorrow and thereby support educational excellence by striving to provide those closest to the work with information, resources, skills, and the authority to manage them to improve student learning, services to customers, and processes within the college.

C. Encouraging and valuing everyone’s contribution will promote teamwork that will continuously improve the college and employees’ job satisfaction, creativity and personal growth.
D. We will utilize our collective bargaining processes to determine sharing of the benefits of efficiencies and revenue enhancements made possible by improvements jointly created by employees.

This agreement is made by the Valley Community College Education Association, the Valley Community Employees Federation, the Valley Community College Management Committee, and the Valley Community College Administration.

President, Valley Community College

Faculty Union President

 Classified Staff Union President

Management Steering Committee Chair
Every employee at VCC can provide leadership in the achievement of VCC's goals given the opportunity to develop and use leadership skills and the willingness to assume personal accountability for the success of the organization. The managers and team members who succeed within the framework of the new Work Roles and Relationships will be those who visibly embrace the Values and Behaviors that are the basis for that framework.

- Supports, protects and communicates the mission of the college
- Supports, protects and communicates appropriate cultural values
- Actively advocates positive change
- Continually analyzes his/her behavior to ensure that he/she is not a barrier to team performance
- Maintains service excellence as the highest priority
- Promotes and supports direct feedback between the teams and the receivers of their services
- Ensures that there are processes in place to record and track student/customer/client requests and complaints
- Shares all student/customer/client feedback with the team
- Communicates a clear, future-oriented vision of the team that is consistent with and supports the VCC Mission
- Confronts substandard performance or behaviors that subvert team performance
- Encourages creativity and innovation
- Fully communicates all information that is pertinent to team performance
- Ensures the free flow of information throughout the college
- Supports and protects neighboring teams by assisting them with knowledge, expertise and feedback to help them succeed
Role Elements of the Manager

Managers will engage in collaborative activities which assure that all work within the college is focused on maintaining excellence. Those activities include working with teams, in teams of managers, in cross-functional teams, and as individuals on special assignments.

Leadership:
- Draws satisfaction from the power of employees to achieve results that contribute to the Mission of the college
- Ensures that a process is in place to identify and clarify boundary conditions for work activity
- Maintains an environment that supports partnership among all employees, regardless of role
- Establishes processes focused on positive change
- Holds the team and individuals accountable for achievement of results
- Focuses on results and processes, but not specific methods
- Ensures that strategic goals and expectations are established and measured
- Ensures that teams establish clear operational goals and priorities

Facilitation:
- Provides help and resources rather than orders and directions
- Works personally with team members to help them build technical, organizational, and people skills
- Allocates resources (time, money, space) for training and development activities
- Helps the team learn how to work effectively together
- Deals with substandard performance appropriately with support, education and training
- Provides developmental opportunities for the team and individuals so they have skills to effectively manage the day-to-day operations without outside direction
- Insures that conflicts within the team are resolved
- Works to procure necessary resources for the team, including information and information-processing tools
- Will pitch in and help the team in its daily work, if needed
- Helps create and support energy and commitment in the team
- Provides resources for creativity and innovation
•Ensures that students/customer/client feedback is received, considered, and acted upon, without needing to be directly involved

**Institution-Wide Advocacy:**
• Is aware of and communicates what is happening in other departments and teams
• Helps team members work with and resolve issues with other teams
• Ensures the synergy of collaboration among teams across the campus
• Ensures the team has timely information about institution-wide service performance
• Ensures that teams are aware of new technologies and trends
• Maintains an awareness of and shares information about community, government, legal, and funding issues with the team
• Is a resource and facilitates acquisition of other resources for the team as it continues to redesign and improve its work systems
• Deals with union/management relationships in a constructive and principled manner

**Team Advocacy:**
• Actively works, with the concurrence of the team, to eliminate unnecessary policies, procedures, and practices that hinder team performance
• Actively works to align reward systems with team performance expectations
• Actively seeks recognition for team achievement by the broader VCC community
• Listens to, and acts on, team suggestions
• Actively supports team decisions that are within the agreed-upon limits of team authority
• Actively works to acquire needed team resources

**Student/Customer/Client Advocacy:**
• Ensures processes are in place to systematically receive and respond to student/customer/client input
• Ensures that there are regular meetings and communication between the team and other teams with which it interacts
• Provides resources to assess and improve service performance
Supervision:
- Clearly distinguishes between management/facilitation, supervision, and leadership
- Engages in directive activities when team processes break down to the extent that the team is unable to resolve problems
- Deals with performance problems according to established procedures and contractual agreements; has primary accountability for progressive discipline and due process

Role Elements of the Team and Individual

The team and each individual team member will be engaged in those activities which assure that the daily operating requirements/objectives are achieved. The team will be fully accountable for the daily operating system within established guidelines. Team members can be drawn from any employee group.

The Team:
- Originates and executes tasks in the work process
- Improves how tasks are performed in the work process
- Solves work-process problems
- Works to resolve interteam conflicts
- Establishes work-process goals and objectives supportive of broader college goals
- Identifies and requests needed resources
- Allocates process resources as appropriate
- Establishes priorities for work sequencing consistent with team goals and objectives
- Institutes and participates in processes that directly involve customers/clients
- Rigorously records and tracks all issues regarding service quality and assures resolution
- Recognizes and celebrates individual contributions to team objectives
- Identifies developmental needs for the team or for individual team members
- Participates actively in the selection of new team members
- Works to provide developmental opportunities for team members within the daily work schedule
The Individual:

- Shares in all aspects of the work of the team
- Assumes personal accountability for team performance
- Is willing to help out in areas of critical need
- Identifies and seeks to develop needed skills
- Is a positive contributor in all team meetings and decision-making processes
- Learns and uses meeting leadership and decision-making skills
The Team Development Continuum

The Team Development Continuum is a visual model of how work groups and managers move together from a directive, top-down work system to one in which teams are, in many respects, self-managed. In this model the role of the manager evolves in a complimentary way to the development of the team, assuming more and more support, facilitation, and strategic activities and fewer and fewer administrative management and supervisory activities.

While it is apparent that work systems cannot change from authoritarian to self-managed by decree, the developmental path is often unclear. This continuum is designed to suggest that there are identifiable stages of team development that can be planned for and measured. This continuum is also based on the premise that movement toward self-management is dependent on successfully completing specific transitional activities.

These transitional activities fall within several general categories:

- **Developing capability**: This involves learning the new skills required to perform the added and different tasks in the new work system.

- **Establishing infrastructure**: Information and communication systems, layout of work areas, and human resource practices will need to be aligned to support the new work system.

- **Developing reliable methods**: Best practices must be established and agreed to for all processes that affect the output of the team.

- **Change assessment and planning**: Work-system-change objectives must be established, organizational assessments conducted, and change plans developed at all levels to guide and support the Team Development Process.

The Team Development Continuum is a model and is intended to serve as a guideline to help understand and plan for change. It is very
unlikely that any team will move smoothly along the continuum as it is displayed.
Team Development Continuum

**Stage 1: Authoritarian**
- **Manager**
  - Receives specific direction from above
  - Directs work group on daily goals and methods
  - Performs all administrative tasks
  - Administers discipline
  - Individually provides job instruction
  - Sets standards
  - Hires and fires

- **Work Group**
  - Performs daily tasks (jobs)
  - Works as directed by manager
  - Receives minimal information
  - Provides little or no input
  - Unaware of work of other work groups
  - Unaware of how their work contributes to Organizational goals
  - Very little discretion as to methods

**Transition Activities**
- Communication skills training
- Facilitation skills training
- Coaching skills training
- Improve information sources/systems
- Establish a managers' forum
- Establish a strategic planning forum

**Stage 2: Participative**
- **Manager**
  - Provides input to Organizational strategies
  - "Self" goals and ideas to work group
  - Requests input from work group before making decisions
  - Provides more information
  - Discusses work with other managers
  - Instructs work group in admin. tasks and assigns some to group
  - Retains responsibility for all aspects of performance mgmt. and discipline

- **Work Group**
  - Performs daily tasks with some cross-training
  - Receives instruction in performing admin. tasks
  - Provides input on work methods, scheduling, priorities, etc.
  - Performs some administrative tasks
  - Receives and discusses basic customer feedback from manager

- **Transition Activities**
  - Problem-solving methods training
  - User needs discovery training
  - Performance Mgt. skills training
  - Change Mgt. skills training
  - Develop user feedback system
  - Establish reliable methods

**Stage 3: Collaborative**
- **Manager**
  - Participates in developing strategies
  - Forms and leads problem-solving teams
  - Participates as an equal in developing team goals and methods
  - Works with users to get performance feedback directly to the team
  - Participates with the group in establishing cross-training systems
  - Seeks input from the group on resource needs and works to acquire resources
  - Establishes clear performance management expectations
  - Performs fewer admin. functions

- **Work Group/Team**
  - Participates in and leads team problem-solving activities
  - Train on other job function

- **Transition Activities**
  - Selection and assessment training
  - Planning and budgeting training
  - Training in additional Admin. tasks
  - Establish an inter-team network
  - Establish reliable methods

**Stage 4: Semi-Autonomous Team**
- **Manager/Leader**
  - Participates actively with other managers in strategic activities
  - Works with other managers to assure the optimal allocation of organizational resources
  - Communicates fully with the work team
  - Establishes clear boundaries (sphere of influence and control) for work team activities
  - Supports team needs for resources and development
  - Works to implement team recommendations

- **Work Group/Team**
  - Participates in and leads team problem-solving activities
  - Train on other job function

- **Transition Activities**
  - Selection and assessment training
  - Planning and budgeting training
  - Training in additional Admin. tasks
  - Establish work system design
  - Establish transition plan

**Stage 5: Self-Managed Team**
- **Leaders**
  - Acts as advocate and representative (a shepherd/steward) of the change process and objectives

- **Work Group/Team**
  - Establishes team goals which support the achievement of organizational goals
  - Accountable for the performance and improvement of all daily work processes
  - With a very few exceptions, performs all needed admin. tasks
  - Acquires all needed resources within the constraints of its own budget
  - Meet with customers/users--respond directly to their needs
  - Coordinate with other teams
  - Identify resource needs and acquire them
  - Manage team performance
  - Prepare budget and team strategic plan
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The Decision Continuum (Who Decides Who Decides?)

The change in work systems from authoritarian to self-managed is, in many respects, a change in the accountability for making and executing decisions. This continuum is designed to be used as a tool to plan for and assess those changes in the decision-making processes that must occur in a move toward a team-based work system.

The Structure of the Decision Continuum:
The left-hand column lists those decisions that are significant to the performance of the team or organization. This list should be developed by the organization or team working with the tool and should have consensus support. The next five columns represent the continuum of decision-making, ranging from "manager decides" to "team decides." The center column represents consensus (manager/team); left of center is "manager decides with team input"; to the right of center is "team decides with manager input."

Use of the Decision Continuum:
Step 1:
As a team, determine the decisions to list in the left column. Which decisions are important and meaningful? Which decisions can be moved?

Step 2:
As a team, come to a consensus on where you would want each decision to be made in a fully developed Self-Managed Team. This represents your "decision-making vision" for this specific team. This will serve as a developmental objective. Also, come to a consensus on the decision-making profile of each of the other developmental stages. These will serve as mileposts in your developmental process.

Step 3:
As a team, use the continuum to determine how decisions are currently being made. The difference between your vision and your current situation represents your developmental "gap" relative to decision-making.

Step 4:
Establish a developmental plan to progressively narrow the developmental gap.
Step 5:
Periodically use the tool to assess your plan progress. Adjust your plan or reposition resources as necessary.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet Template</th>
<th>Work System Change Decision Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager/team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>team decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>team decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td>with team input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 - Authoritarian</th>
<th>(example)</th>
<th>Work System Change Decision Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barry Hebert Consulting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2 - Participative</th>
<th>Work System Change Decision Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td>with team input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3 - Collaborative (example)</th>
<th>Work System Change Decision Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td>with team input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>manager decides</th>
<th>manager decides with team input</th>
<th>manager/team decide based on with manager input</th>
<th>team decides</th>
<th>team decides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 - Self-Managed Team (example)</td>
<td>Work System Change Decision Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>manager decides</td>
<td>manager decides with team input</td>
<td>manager/team decide based on consensus</td>
<td>team decides with manager input</td>
<td>team decides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Examples of decisions teams make)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine daily work priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine methods (including changes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule daily work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determines needed resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires needed resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set performance standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine corrective actions, if needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on rewards and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine developmental needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule developmental activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and select new team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine who gets advanced/promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take disciplinary action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminates team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with customers/clients/users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides on acquisition of new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barry Hebert Consulting
August 1, 2000

Mr. Barry Hebert, Consultant
2533 Charnelton
Eugene, OR  97405

Dear Barry,

I am writing to confirm our conversation regarding authorization to use the Team Development Continuum and the Decision Continuum as an appendix to my dissertation. As we discussed, I would like to utilize the Team Development Continuum and Decision Continuum as examples of a work change model for my dissertation on organizational transformation. The dissertation is part of my Ed.D. program at Oregon State University.

You indicated that I could use the Team Development Continuum and the Decision Continuum in the appendix for my dissertation. Please let me know if I have accurately summarized our conversation by signing a copy of this letter and returning it to me.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Simmons
642 Wimbledon Court
Eugene, OR  97401

Barry Hebert, Consultant

Date
Organizational Transformation: Lessons Learned
By One Community College

I am conducting a doctoral research project under the supervision of Dr. Betty Duvall that is documenting the process redesign organizational change effort. This study will describe the approach used, outcomes realized, and lessons learned. This research will contribute to an understanding of how one community college approached organizational transformation.

This research project involved personal observation and note-taking over a 4-year period at college meetings, including executive-level meetings. Institutional records and documents were also examined for the period of 1988-1998. Studying organizational change in community colleges is valuable because it enables educators to better understand, describe, and explain and perhaps predict behavior within institutions of higher education. You may benefit from this research by learning more about organizational change.

You are being asked to review the findings and provide corrections, clarifications, or comments on the accounts reported in this study. You were selected because of your participation in the process redesign organizational change project. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your decision whether or not to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The confidentiality of your involvement within this project, as well as the documents that are produced will be preserved throughout the research process. As part of the dissertation, I may wish to use some excerpts from documents that support data analysis or results. Any use of quotations from my observation of college meetings will be disguised in such a way as to protect anonymity. I may also wish to use some of these materials in the future for instructional purposes or in publications. Any use of the materials not consistent with these purposes would require your additional written consent.
Questions about this research project should be directed to Betty Duvall at (541) 737-5197 or Linda Simmons at (541) 484-6378. Your signature below indicates that:

- You have read and understand the information provided above, and that you willingly agree to participate.
- You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
- You will receive a copy of this form.
- You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

Participant signature  
Date

Researcher signature  
Date