

Record: 1**Title:** Facing the future.**Authors:** Guskin, Alan Edward**Source:** Change; July/August 1996, Vol. 28, p26-37, 12p**Physical Description:** Illustration**Document Type:** Article**Subjects:** University & college administration
Organizational change
Educational leadership
Universities & colleges**Abstract:** Over 200 colleges and universities are taking part in programs to discuss the need for restructuring, which will be one of the major activities of many or most American universities in the next ten years. In a recent issue of the Pew Roundtable's Policy Perspectives, the authors argue that successful restructuring needs a partnership and common purpose between faculty and administrators in which universities are more responsive to students and the needs of society. At the same time, universities must maintain their commitment to academic freedom and the unhampered pursuit of knowledge, the authors assert. The writer presents a dynamic, strategic, political approach to restructuring that, among other things, accepts that human nature and human behavior in organizations, including colleges and universities, contain both positive and negative aspects.**ISSN:** 00091383**Accession Number:** 503448464**Database:** Education Source**FACING THE FUTURE**

The Change Process in Restructuring Universities

There is a growing public acceptance that colleges and universities are not cost-effective, that our tuitions are too high, and that academic institutions must therefore restructure their operations, much as has happened in other sectors of American society. Within the higher education community itself, there is a new awareness of our inability to understand how to do more with less, especially in the delivery of education. What we know is how to do more with more and less with less. Yet, doing more with less is what we must do.

While it may be surprising to some, today more than 200 colleges and universities are involved in programs to discuss the need for restructuring. Many are involved in Pew Roundtables both individually and in networks of institutions; the Council of Independent Colleges is involved in a 25-college network, also Pew funded, focused on restructuring faculty roles and rewards; the American Council on Education has

developed a Kellogg-funded network of more than 20 colleges and universities dealing with the restructuring process. These projects include large and small, public and private colleges and universities.

In a recent issue of the Pew Roundtable's Policy Perspectives, the authors assert that successful restructuring requires a partnership and shared purpose between faculty and administrators in which universities are more responsive to students and societal needs while maintaining the commitment to academic freedom and the unencumbered pursuit of knowledge.

Securing a more productive engagement between faculty and administrators begins with a tough discussion of what changes are needed and why. The impulse to deny the problem must be overcome, and the willingness to work together established as a precondition of purposeful action.

Their proposed change strategy, like that followed by the Roundtables and the other networks, is one of open dialogue between key players on a campus. To the extent there is an overall change strategy, the assumption seems to be that restructuring will occur and people will--or should--change because of the dire consequences of not changing; the idea seems to be that people will put aside their fears, anxieties, and prior beliefs and join the venture in a wholehearted manner.

But asserting a need to change is one thing, producing it is another. I share the hope that change can occur through a rational, discussion-based project, but do not assume such an outcome, because discussion alone rarely produces significant change in an organization. The approach advocated here--and in much of the wider literature on organizational change--assumes a more dynamic, interpersonal, and political change process. This approach views the more rational, discussion-based process common to the Roundtables as one part--mainly the beginning--of a more elaborate strategic restructuring change effort.

In brief, the dynamic, strategic, political approach presented here accepts that there is a bright and dark side to human nature and how people behave in organizations, including colleges and universities; that people have real fears and anxieties about the future that take time to overcome; that some people like change and innovation and thrive on it, while others do not; that many people resist change for reasonable reasons and that others will resist change temporarily as they await examples of how others have made a leap they can follow. Further, this article assumes that restructuring requires not only a partnership between faculty and administrators (and often trustees), but also a deep concern for student learning and the educational outcomes necessary for a person to be an effective member of the future society.

The basic conceptions developed here emerge from my own experiences as well as the literature on organizational change efforts. The inspiration to write this article emerged from the questions and concerns I encountered throughout the country in talking about my two earlier Change articles (July/ August and September/October 1994) with faculty members and administrators at over a dozen universities and colleges and at six national meetings. It has become evident to me that even when institutional and faculty leaders are committed to making significant changes or to restructuring, many do not understand the process of change necessary to achieve their goals and, therefore, either are immobilized or make unnecessary errors.

How can and does change occur? We know what it means to undertake incremental change; what does it mean to enter into an institutional restructuring process? How will we deal with people who resist changing?

What is the role of faculty and administrators in actually producing the change? How can we begin if the provost or president is noncommittal regarding the need to change? How do we know that the processes we undertake will work and make a difference?

THE KEY IS STARTING

The key to changing a university or college is to start the process. There are many reasons to resist restructuring our institutions--not the least of which are the difficulty and pain. But there are societal forces at work that will eventually lead us to make systemic changes in our institutions, whether we like it or not. I believe there is enough creativity and skill in almost every college and university to successfully produce a restructured institution, if we commit ourselves to begin.

The challenge is summed up by Marjorie Kelly in her article in the July/August 1993 issue of Business Ethics, "Taming the Demons of Change." She writes:

Transformation of any sort--whether human or chemical or corporate--is a perilous passage at best, calling for a radical letting go, and an openness to the unknown. It's hard to imagine anything more frightening. And it's hard to find a more likely route to progress--for in letting go of the old form, we create the space for a new form that will work even better. It comes down simply to this: that we can't advance as long as we're holding tight to what no longer works. And we have to break the mold before a new form can emerge.

This exhortation to start sounds like a strange beginning to an article on change strategies for restructuring universities, yet I believe it is a core issue. We are too good at analyzing all the difficult issues involved in doing some-thing--anything--and thereby immobilizing ourselves. If we look holistically at the world around us and allow our intuitive skills to roam a little, it will soon enough become obvious that we cannot continue to practice our academic profession with dignity and integrity without fundamental changes.

Heretical as it may sound, we must put brakes on our analytical abilities and take some leaps of faith. To quote Michael Hammer and Steven Stanton from their book, *The Reengineering Revolution*:

The longer we analyze the current ways of operating the further we fend off that awesome day when we will have to change something. Analysis thus becomes a defensive maneuver to avoid making fundamental change.

How many times have we seen plans rejected because we've analyzed in depth their problems, only to be left with the status quo, which everyone agrees is less desirable than any of the rejected alternatives? At two institutions in which I've served, I've personally been associated with planning for changes in academic calendars that almost everyone agreed were not working well. Yet the proposed new calendars--each of which was much better than the existing one--were debated endlessly, their weaknesses highlighted, their potential benefits diminished. In one case, a faculty survey found 80 percent agreeing that the existing calendar was a hindrance to the academic program and student retention. Yet, it took three different planning groups over a four-year period to finally develop an acceptable plan, which then was passed by the faculty by only two votes!

In beginning the restructuring process, we must not ask ourselves what the detailed final outcome will look like; it is impossible to state with clarity what our restructured institution will look like 10 years from now. By

starting the process and focusing on a number of basic goals, we can use the creativity and wisdom of people in our institution to develop--within the context of the institution's heritage--a vision of the future.

SOME BASIC ISSUES

Restructuring a college or university--or a school within a university--is a complex and difficult undertaking. If it were not so important to do so for the future education of our citizens and for people's quality of life inside and outside our institutions, I would not advise it. But do it we must.

To understand what's involved in such an effort, I'll first raise and discuss a number of basic issues; then I'll review steps in the change process itself. My "basic issues" include an understanding of why people resist change, the essential role of leaders, the difference between structural and incremental change, and the impact of size and complexity on a restructuring effort.

Why People Resist Change

Many people will resist change, any change, and the more significant the change, the greater the resistance. For many, probably most, change is difficult, painful, and an uncertain leap into an unknown future.

James O'Toole explores this issue in depth in his recent book, *Leading Change*, in which he concludes that there are a number of reasons why people resist change, even when it is in their interest:

[First], resistance to change occurs when a would-be leader challenges the comfort of the group, the members' satisfaction with the established level of their power, prestige, privileges, position, and satisfaction with who they are, what they believe, what they cherish.

Individuals are what they believe, and groups are their cultures; hence to require a group to change its shared beliefs is to threaten its very existence Peaceful change thus requires acquiescence in upsetting the dominant world view . . . in effect, the collective eating of crow by those who have the power to resist change.

[Second], in almost all instances, the majority of haves [people who have the power] resist the call to reform, not so much because they fear change, but because they bristle at having the will of others imposed on them Thus a major factor in our resistance to change is the desire not to have the will of others forced on us.

It is not difficult to draw higher education parallels to O'Toole's analysis, especially when dealing with restructuring the faculty role in student learning or the academic calendar. In university life, those in power--the "haves"--are clearly the faculty and academic leadership. The cultural norms and belief system regarding student learning are built around an academic calendar: faculty are expected to teach courses to groups of students in classes usually offered a few times a week during a 12-to-16-week semester or 10-to-12-week quarter. And, in doing so, faculty teach their discipline as learned in graduate school and thereafter.

This belief system is shared by those in formal leadership positions--almost all of whom were once faculty members--as well as by full-time faculty members throughout the institution. Changing this belief system will be difficult, not only because it represents a consensus on the campus and throughout almost all higher

education, but because the overwhelming majority of faculty members and administrators find it hard to imagine viable alternatives. Moreover, academic leaders and faculty are particularly sensitive to anyone imposing their will on them--from the outside or inside.

The discomfort of those in leadership positions regarding the restructuring of the university is as great as or greater than that of the faculty: administrators believe in or accept the validity of the present system; they have become leaders by being able to manage successfully the present systems that will have to be overturned; and they have learned to be successful at creating change that occurs incrementally. Further, for many, the level of collaboration and the breakdown of some of the hierarchy that would be necessary to achieve a restructured university may undermine their conception of their role as leader.

Yet, I am not pessimistic about the future. Traveling around the country talking about these issues, I have been struck by the pain--and good sense--of many faculty members and administrators at numerous institutions. A number of years of little or no salary increases combined with the non-re-placement of departing colleagues have been sobering: more students to teach, more courses to prepare, and a slow erosion of the faculty salary base. Faculty may be fiercely individualistic and, like everyone else, focused on their traditions, but they are very smart. And, most recognize that their future does not look good.

But Who Shall Lead the Change?

Over and over again, I have heard faculty moan hopelessly that their provost or president (as well as many of their colleagues) is not interested in making any significant changes. Frustrated, upset, and sensing that things have to change, many faculty have bought into the notion--surprisingly common throughout higher education--that leaders alone are primarily responsible for leading change and fixing the problems. Isn't that the reason they earn the "big bucks"?

University administrators share this same understanding, but their experience--positive and negative--in producing small, incremental changes makes them leery of major structural change. They know that they need to act like leaders to deal with the expectations of the faculty and their board, so they look out at the faculty and exhort them to change.

The argument is that since most of the financial resources in universities are in personnel and related costs, and since most personnel costs are in the academic area, then what is needed is to reduce the number of faculty members and get those remaining to be more productive. However, since the only way to make faculty members more productive in the present educational model is to have them teach more students and courses, faculty naturally resist as best they can.

And, here we stand; administrators exhorting the faculty to make incremental changes that won't really meet the institution's needs, and faculty members resisting the exhortations but slowly losing ground as they are left with fewer colleagues and less money. The conflict and anxiety increase.

The problems we are facing are not the result of inappropriate resistance by faculty or administrators; rather, they are systemic in nature. People in colleges and universities--faculty, administrators, students, and even trustees--act the way they do because the institutional systems of American higher education have supported and rewarded their present behaviors. In addition, creating alternative systems of rewards for faculty and students, or alternative uses of faculty time, or different approaches to facilitating student

learning, have been overtly or covertly discouraged at all institutional levels by the organizational structures and systems.

My perspective in this article, and in my previous ones, is to encourage faculty and administrative leaders to face the future directly by being proactive in creating necessary changes in the most effective and least painful ways--rather than only reacting to the pressures from external agencies. Embedded in these writings is my belief that changes forced by a state legislature or severe financial realities will cause serious ruptures internally and could undermine an institution's sense of academic integrity and autonomy.

On other hand, I believe internally induced change will be less traumatic and, if effective, can maintain our integrity, autonomy, and dignity. Further, except in very rare circumstances of extreme urgency, I believe internally induced changes in the academic area will not be effective if imposed on faculty by the administration or trustees. Even though strong administrative leadership is important, the entire structural change process must be based on a sense of collegueship between and among faculty, administrators, and trustees.

Importance of Leadership

The overall commitment of an institution's senior leadership team, or the chief executive or head of the unit being restructured, is an important element in achieving a successful restructuring effort. While such commitment is required in any successful change effort, it is more essential in the restructuring process because of the global nature of the change being implemented and the time it will take to be successful. Strong leadership commitment will be needed to maintain the focus of key players over a lengthy period of time, and to convince those resisting that the change is highly likely, thereby encouraging some to make the leap earlier rather than later. This strong commitment is also important in protecting and encouraging those deeply involved in the risky business of experimenting with and making the change.

Since resistance can occur at any level, commitment of the university leader or unit leader is essential in overcoming the inevitable foot-dragging or outright resistance of a member of the leadership group. In any restructuring effort, all senior administrators must either buy in or leave, and only the senior leader can make that happen. If one member of the senior leadership group is unchecked in his or her resistance, there is a significantly increased likelihood that the restructuring process will be resisted by the faculty members or administrators who are the most uncomfortable with the proposed changes. The senior administrator, in effect, confirms their discomfort.

Such resistance of senior- and middle-level administrative leaders is to be expected, given the fear that jobs will be lost and that years of effort will be restructured out of existence. There are good reasons for making the change. but it can be an overwhelming feeling for those who have devoted a career to the old systems. In my July/August 1994 Change article on administrative restructuring, I indicate that in my own institution I had to force the resignation of a senior university vice president in order to assure the successful continuation of our restructuring process. Once that occurred, everyone understood the depth of my commitment and intention to persist over the long run.

Besides maintaining focus and overcoming administrative resistance, leaders often develop, or facilitate the development of, the vision that supports a restructuring process. They are also critical players on the restructuring coordinating team, especially since they are responsible for communicating to everyone a

sense of urgency regarding the need for institutional change.

All this raises a critical issue concerning the length of terms for college and university leaders. Since restructuring an institution will take a minimum of four to five years, and more likely five to seven years, the revolving-door presidencies we see today can indeed undermine a restructuring process. This change in presidential leadership is further accentuated by the tendency of chief academic officers to serve five years or less.

This lack of leadership stability becomes particularly acute when we realize that most new presidents have never served in that role before and over 75 percent of them are chosen from outside the institution. These new leaders will need a year or two to learn their job and understand the subtleties of the institution. Hence, if a restructuring process is initiated, and if the president leaves in four to six years, it is likely that he or she will do so in the middle of the restructuring process. Given the stresses and struggles of any restructuring process, changes in leadership could well deal a significant blow to the success of the entire project.

While institutional leaders can be encouraged to stay longer, it is my observation that most successful presidents leave because of their difficult relationships with faculty and boards; the latter is especially true--and increasingly so--in the public sector. If institutions are to be successful in facing the future, then governing boards and faculty leaders will have to form healthier and more productive relationships with their institutional leaders, and to focus on enabling the president to be an effective institutional leader rather than viewing her or him as a hired hand or public figure to be attacked when mistakes are made.

When Leaders Don't Lead: Managing Leaders

But, does this mean that without a wonderful, courageous leader all is lost? If this is so, are we concluding that because of the limited availability of such leaders, significant university restructuring will be rare?

In discussing the need for restructuring at a number of universities, I was often met with dedicated faculty and administrators who said with sadness that they were willing to enter into such a process but that their academic leaders and/or president were noncommittal. What could they do? I implored them not to give up, pointing out that the university is more their future than anyone else's, and that they had to develop strategies to induce their senior administrators to become leaders. The urgency of the next decade requires them to do so.

My observations over the last two decades have led me to conclude that while it is important for leaders to lead, it is also important for leaders to be managed. Universities are unique organizations where leadership is and must be shared; it is the very nature of our educational institutions that selected faculty members are expected to provide leadership at the top of the organization along with administrators, especially regarding the education of students.

By managing institutional leaders, I am not implying colluding against, controlling, or sabotaging them. Rather, managing leaders should be in the service of the larger institutional interests. Managing a leader takes sensitivity: it requires working with the leader rather than against him or her; it requires a sophisticated understanding of how organizations operate, how institutional decisions are made, how power is exercised in a university, and how chief executives and chief academic officers think.

We know that no leader is capable of leading by herself or himself. And no leader has the institutional base or experience to lead without the helpful guidance of those who desire her or him to be successful. While managing leaders sounds like an oxymoron, good, experienced presidents and provosts know how desirable it is to be managed by their senior administrators and others--including supportive faculty leaders--within the context of the president's and provost's leadership.

Underlying the actions involved in managing a college or university president or provost is my assumption that these chief administrators are most effective when they lead others in collaborative ways, that they need to have the best judgments of those they lead--collectively and individually--and that they must not be isolated or encouraged to work alone, no matter what their proclivities. A smart and effective president or provost will relish being managed, for it will enable him or her to provide leadership on the important issues that must be faced.

Just as we discover when we attempt to build political support in our communities for something we deeply believe in, we must accept that educational as well as political leaders are captives of pressure groups as much as or more than their own personal interests. A well-meaning community leader, therefore, will be responsive to pressures that enable him to be an effective leader in the service of community interests. In a similar vein, we need to believe that a noncommittal, well-meaning university president or provost can be persuaded by faculty and other administrative leaders to lead a restructuring effort for the benefit of their institution's future health.

What is needed is a set of incentives that pressure the president or provost to act. This means that committed faculty members and administrators quietly build significant support among key faculty and administrative colleagues who are respected by the leadership, based on the assumption that the president or provost would act appropriately if he or she knew such support existed. The strategy is that the leader can be persuaded to take on the restructuring effort as a major part of his or her own agenda, based on the leader's judgment of the data presented, the institutional need, and the support the leader will have for acting.

The key perspective for faculty and other administrators to have in managing university leaders--and in being led by them--is that of wanting to provide the president and/or provost with the means and opportunity to lead rather than being upset and complaining that the leader is not leading. Replacing senior administrators who do not lead with someone else is no guarantee that real leadership will occur. I believe that, in most cases, a benign university president or provost can be helped to become an effective leader of a restructuring effort if the community pushes or cajoles him or her in that direction.

Managing leaders as well as being led by them should be seen as the legitimate and healthy functioning of a college or university by both faculty members and administrators. Such collaboration would bode well for implementing a restructuring process. The alternative--viewing a university as a basically hierarchical or authoritarian institution--is contrary to the interests and desires of faculty, and in the long run is not effective in any change effort requiring faculty to undergo significant restructuring of their work.

Restructuring vs. Incremental Change

Universities continually change one or another element in the academic program, in the way administrative units are organized, in the addition of a student service, and so on. Except in rare circumstances, the

change--whether an addition or subtraction--is intended to be limited to the particular area involved, leaving untouched the basic underlying processes by which students learn and faculty teach, as well as the organization of the university itself.

Even when new computer systems are incorporated, the manner in which service is provided is rarely changed; rather, the service is provided faster, or new services are added. While many of these changes are helpful in providing more effective services and satisfying more people, the institution's underlying structures and processes remain the same. This is true even when organizational units--such as a department or school--are cut or rearranged, because the basic educational and administrative processes involved remain unchanged. Hence, these are called incremental changes.

Restructuring a university refers to changing basic underlying processes by which services are delivered, whether of an educational or an administrative nature. For example, restructuring the academic area or the role of faculty members refers to changing the way faculty work and students learn as well as changing the academic calendar and formats that determine the way students and faculty interact. Using computer technology in restructuring an administrative area means that the service will be delivered in new ways, usually involving people who work together in closer contact with those being served, and whose work is organized around the technological capacities of the computer.

In my previous Change articles on restructuring the administration (July/ August 1994) and the work of faculty (September/October 1994), I proposed some ways to accomplish these changes in the administrative and academic areas.

Restructuring assumes that the underlying change occurs broadly throughout the unit being restructured. It assumes that all parts of a unit or organization are systemically interrelated, so that a change in one element will impact all the other parts of the unit or organization. Restructuring as a change process in higher education is very similar to what Hammer has called "reengineering" in the corporate sector.

Because incremental change does not noticeably affect the basic underlying processes of an institution or the underlying belief systems, it is often accepted after some discussion; it is also easy to conceive of because it is consistent with how people have practiced their professions. But incremental changes do not deal with the type of structural changes necessary for a future of reduced resources, increased availability of and demand for powerful technologies, and the demand that a college or university be accountable for student learning outcomes.

William Massy and Robert Zemsky, in a recent EDUCOM white paper, "Using Information Technology to Enhance Academic Productivity," highlight the implications of restructuring in their discussion of how information technology can be used to achieve "more with less productivity enhancement." This enhancement requires that technology replace some activities now being performed by faculty, teaching assistants, and student personnel. With labor accounting for 70 percent or more of current operating costs, there is simply no other way. Faculty will have to reengineer teaching and learning processes to substitute capital for labor on a selective basis. Failing to make such substitutions will return institutions to the more-with-more scenario.

Intelligent substitution will require much more attention to the processes by which teaching and learning

actually take place. Faculty will have to invest time and energy in learning about what they do and why they do it, and then open themselves up to the possibility of doing things differently. Departments will have to understand teaching costs at the level of specific activities, not simply broad functional terms.

Size and Complexity Are Important

Sometimes a college or university may be too big to restructure as one whole, so that the appropriate unit for a restructuring effort is not the whole university but a school or college. While the entire institution, or major part, may ultimately be restructured, in such circumstances it is important to work with the individual unit or to unbundle the larger institution into smaller, manageable structures in which the student's entire education can take place.

Doing this will enable the restructuring of educational and administrative processes to occur. For example, it may be necessary to unbundle undergraduate education and all the faculty involved from graduate education. Or, as was experimented with in the late 1960s, it may be necessary to reduce the undergraduate educational unit size even further, possibly creating colleges within colleges.

The key issue is that the student's entire education--or a significant part of it--takes place within that unit, and that faculty are directly tied to that unit so that their work can be restructured without the interference of colleagues not involved in the restructuring effort. It would be undesirable to have faculty members who are committed to new forms of teaching and learning in a newly restructured unit tied to a departmental structure that serves other goals--like traditional undergraduate education models or graduate education. In effect, one cannot ask faculty members to make the necessary changes in their work and to be judged by the reward systems of colleagues doing very different work.

In such restructuring efforts, there will be a good deal of criticism that the smaller size will lead to an increase in costs, since the centralized larger units are more efficient. While some services, such as libraries, can be more efficient and cost less when handled centrally--especially with the use of new electronic technologies--I believe that student learning and most administrative services are not among them.

The complexity of large universities creates inefficiencies and costs that can be avoided in restructured, less complex units in which people take greater responsibility for their actions and work is divided by function and not structures--for example, units serving the student's non-learning needs as an integrated whole rather than having the student deal with a myriad of offices built around the convenience of administrative units and institutional politics. The radical changes in computer technology offer much support for decentralized, autonomous activities following acceptable standards at reduced time and cost. The business literature is filled with such examples; so, too, is my experience.

The reduced complexity of smaller units leads to the possibility that faculty colleagues will be more supportive of experimentation. Also, this less complex environment could enable faculty work to be tied more closely to the effectiveness and productivity of the educational unit and thereby to financial, career, and psychological rewards.

In addition, smaller, less complex educational units provide an important environment for testing out new ideas as the restructuring process evolves. Since not all ideas work, it is wise to test them out in a smaller

setting where adjustments can be made quickly with minimal costs. Wholesale implementation of new restructured processes should not be undertaken until these have been tested and shown to be beneficial. Therefore, these smaller environments become an important part of the phasing in of new restructured activities.

Finally, smaller and less complex educational units would increase the focus on the student as learner and the faculty member as facilitator of learning, and decrease the focus on those academic and administrative bureaucratic elements in large, complex units that create distance between faculty member and student, increase student dependency, and are costly in both human and financial terms.

THE CHANGE PROCESS

In the previous section, we focused on some of the key underlying issues involved in restructuring: the nature of resistance to change, the important role of leaders, the distinction between restructuring and incremental change, and the impact of size and complexity. But some of the most significant issues remain; namely, the components of an effective change process to restructure a college or university.

Jack Lindquist, one of the most insightful writers and leaders of organizational change in higher education, who unfortunately died prematurely in 1991, sums up four basic approaches to changing attitudes and behavior in universities:

Some believe that humans are essentially rational, so reason and evidence should do the trick

Others find that humans are social creatures . . . [so that] awareness, interest, trial, and eventual adoption [occur] through a process of social interaction and persuasion in which opinion leaders and reference groups are influences, perhaps as important as the rational soundness of the change message itself

Still others believe that the main obstacles to change are not impressive messages nor social influences. Psychological barriers are the problem

Yet another group maintains we are political animals at base, busy protecting and strengthening our vested interests.

As Lindquist points out, effective organizational change in higher education--especially the restructuring process we are dealing with--requires working in all four areas: the rational, social-interactional, psychological, and political. In doing so, we must use a change strategy that deals with developing, presenting, and discussing information based on theory, research, and generally accepted evidence; that focuses on opinion leaders and social networks by which people are influenced; that deals honestly with people's fears and anxieties; and that builds coalitions around people's interests, and utilizes the institution's leadership and governance structures.

Restructuring the administrative or academic area of a college or university is a major undertaking that will take at least four to five years. My own experience has been in the restructuring of a university administration and in major incremental change efforts in the academic areas of three institutions. While significant and difficult, these academic change efforts did not involve the type of restructuring I have proposed in my previous article on restructuring the role of faculty.

At present, while a growing number of institutions are beginning to discuss seriously the need to restructure and are beginning to invest heavily in classroom computer technology-- many of them quite creatively--I am not aware of any institution that has undertaken the restructuring of faculty work and the educational process. In fact, in discussions with individuals involved in the largest Roundtable restructuring efforts, I found considerable concern about the lack of any good existing models. But I am convinced many institutions will undergo the restructuring process in the next five to 10 years. And it is highly likely that any such restructuring of faculty work will follow a process similar to that of the administrative area and other major change efforts.

First, any restructuring effort will require the development of a working consensus on the urgent need to restructure. By a working consensus, I am referring to a consensus among the major administrative and faculty leaders of a college or university as well as many of the major opinion leaders on the faculty and the board of trustees.

Second, such a restructuring effort requires a working consensus around a vision of the institution's future.

Third, while key academic and administrative leaders are critical in creating this sense of urgency and vision, there are others throughout the institution--both faculty and administrators--who will want to be involved from the outset. The leadership of the college or university should seek out those people who are supportive of the change effort and work with them.

Fourth, the restructuring process takes a considerable amount of time to fully implement. The restructured institution does not emerge whole at one time; rather, it is implemented in a series of phases that evolve over time. These revolutionary changes require evolutionary processes.

Building a Working Consensus

Creating an institution wide sense of urgency can be very hard work for those who sense the importance of starting the restructuring process. The reasons for the difficulty are many and only partly relate to a general resistance to any change. While many people sense something is amiss in higher education, they tend to blame others and/or look to them to change the conditions: for governments to grant more money, for administrators to somehow fix the problem, for faculty to be more productive, for more students to enroll or pay higher tuition, and so on.

It seems that both faculty and administrators have bought into a perspective common to people who work in large, central, planning-oriented organizational and governmental bureaucracies; namely, that somehow their work deserves support because they are doing it, irrespective of successful institutional performance or external needs. Activity becomes the norm, and if there are problems, then one should do more activity--more committee meetings, more fund-raising, more teaching--without fully understanding how it relates to helping the institution become more effective.

I believe this "activity" perspective occurs because the outcomes of present teaching and educational processes are, for the most part, unexamined--a perspective that is reinforced by the sanctity of the classroom and the autonomy and individualism of the faculty. As a result, it is extremely difficult for faculty members (or administrators) to make a clear connection between their work and institutional financial and academic performance.

Similarly, since incremental change is commonly understood and practiced when there are serious financial problems, many incremental changes are initiated based on assumptions that the decreases in financial support are temporary and good times will return in a year or two. Universities continue to cut departments, make significant cuts in all non-faculty positions or expenses, or make across-the-board faculty cuts to deal with their financial problems, even though a careful analysis of the impact will show that these measures solve the problem only temporarily, while in the long term sharply undercutting the quality of faculty work life and reducing the access and quality of the education offered.

Developing a working consensus around the urgency to start the restructuring process requires that leaders in the faculty and administration create a powerful initiating/coordinating group that develops the institutional strategy for starting, and has the capability to fully implement the restructuring effort over time. Among the group's first acts is to seek out those people who understand the need to act, to encourage them to join in the effort, and to have them urge their colleagues to come forward. This consensus-building process will lead others to respond.

At the same time, it is important for the initiating/coordinating group to collect and present widely the good data and research that are disconcerting regarding the future and indicate the need to restructure. Such information can be a powerful prompt for initiating discussion about the need for internal change on a campus. Smart faculty and administrative leaders know how to use research and data to start the conversations that need to occur. In fact, the 200 colleges and universities involved in Pew Roundtables and the other discussion strategies are involved in using the literature, research and data--as well as local pain--to initiate this first step in the change process.

The institution's leaders must spend a good deal of time communicating their sense of urgency based on external and internal economic and social realities. People throughout the institution must be aware of the leadership's perception of the need to change and commitment to act. And they should know that many other influential people are joining the process.

At the same time, leaders of the restructuring process must understand that many faculty and administrators will not want to join the effort at the beginning--nor need they--and no significant accommodations should be made to them. It must be remembered that people join a change effort at a number of different stages; few remain resistors to the end.

The process, then, for creating a working consensus to face the urgent need to restructure a university requires articulate and strong institutional leadership; the participation and commitment of many of the key faculty, administrators, and trustee opinion leaders; a collaboration between these leaders in a coordinating/initiating group; continuing communication wherever possible about the urgent need to restructure based on the economic, social, and educational realities of the present and future; an appeal to supporters within the institution who agree with the sense of urgency; and the creation of an institutional context in which it is assumed that the restructuring process is essential for the future of the institution and has already begun.

Building a Working Consensus Around a Vision of the Future

While the beginning of the change process starts with an urgent need to face the future of the university, building the future requires a leap of faith. And institutional leaders must show that they have faith that a

viable future will evolve.

As I have stated earlier, it is essential at this point that the key administrative and faculty players not get bogged down in detailed analyses of the likely outcomes of the transformational process, a style of inquiry and problem-solving process common to those of us in higher education. Too much analysis into a future we cannot possibly predict in detail will lead to an unnecessary waste of time, unending debates, and discouragement.

As we embark on planning the future, a powerful, overall set of directions is needed--a vision of the general outcomes of the restructuring process. This can be accomplished with enough detail and some excitement by asking two basic interrelated questions:

1. if we were going to create this university today given what we know and given the technology available, what would it look like?
2. Given the likely economic and social realities of the next decades, and what we presently know, how can we create a university--especially at the undergraduate level--that a) enhances student learning and student access; b) reduces university expenses and student costs to attend; c) makes faculty work life a positive experience; and d) meets the needs of the larger society?

Answering these broad questions in a general way creates the "there" that we are headed toward--a vision of a desired future. It focuses the restructuring effort by clearly differentiating how the university presently operates from how, in broad terms, we would like it to operate if we could re-create it.

Obviously, this is a pragmatic change effort and not all our aspirations for the future can be realized. But focusing on a vision of the future enables people to think holistically about what they are undertaking, to make choices among options along the way, and to defend against the desire of individuals to return to the "here" as the ever-present difficulties emerge in the restructuring process.

John Kotter in a recent article in the Harvard Business Review on "Leading Change: Why Transformations Fail," writes:

Without a sensible vision, a transformation effort can easily dissolve into a list of confusing and incompatible projects that can take an organization in the wrong direction or nowhere . . . In failed transformations, you often find plenty of directives and programs, but no vision A useful rule of thumb: if you can't communicate the vision to someone in five minutes or less and get a reaction that signifies both understanding and interest, you are not yet done with this phase of the transformation process.

Creating a working consensus on the vision follows the same basic process as the development of a sense of urgency. In fact, the two processes should overlap a good deal, as the sense of urgency leads to asking the basic questions and developing an image of the future, which then reinforces the viability of acting on the sense of urgency. Institutional leaders and opinion leaders must seek out others throughout the institution to join the effort, but there should be no sacrifice of the vision in order to include resisters. It is essential to work with those who want to make the changes and assume that almost all the others will eventually participate as they see their interests affected.

At the same time, it is important to make sure that the vision is broad, thereby permitting a great deal of flexibility in creating the future. This will allow many different members of the academic community to see how their interests can be taken into account in the implementation process. In fact, alternative models of work may be employed as faculty members and administrators take seriously a focus on student learning and reduced expenses.

The key issue will be maintaining a clear focus on the vision and broad directions as the change process evolves. This means that the restructuring implementation process will involve continuing iterations between the central coordinating/ initiating group--that is, the "holder" of the vision and broad directions--and implementation teams that create the concrete meaning of this vision and its direction in the key educational and administrative areas of the institution. There is a great deal of room for creativity, but there can be no compromise with the overall vision and directions.

Working With Those Committed to Change

As emphasized above, it is essential that the leadership of the restructuring process focus on those who support the change effort rather than worrying about those who do not. It is common in higher education to let those who are in opposition determine the agenda of a change process, thereby forcing compromises that undermine the overall direction. This most often occurs because institutional leaders attempt to win acceptance from a governance group too early in the process, resulting in the need to co-opt the resisters to get their acquiescence or votes. I believe that a decision by the governance structures to move forward should occur relatively late in the process, when there is a general understanding of the need to change, there is a vision of the restructured institution, and there are many who support the effort.

The literature on the adoption of innovations, especially the work of Everett Rogers, indicates that relatively clear stages can be observed in the way people accept major changes in how they work and use new techniques and materials. Some people--the innovators--like to be involved in change activities and will be the first to adopt such innovations; others--the early adopters--need to see the innovators lead, but they are right behind; still others will follow at a later point as the need becomes clearer and they see others' success. Then, there are the laggards who may resist to the very end, but they tend to be a small minority.

The key insight in this for university restructuring is that we must allow the process to evolve and must continually make the case for the changes by communicating through campus opinion leaders to a broader and broader audience. Further, as we seek to develop ideas for implementing the vision, we should involve greater and greater numbers of people in planning groups. An effective restructuring process requires that an institution's leadership initiate the change effort, yet it requires a broad collaborative effort for successful implementation. This broad collaboration occurs through implementation teams established to realize the vision.

Strategic patience and perseverance are essential ingredients of any major transformation effort. To quote James Collins and Jerry Porras from their recent book on successful businesses, *Built to Last*, "Luck favors the persistent." This is a secret ingredient in gathering support for the restructuring effort--to persist until the restructured university comes into being.

Phased Implementation Process

The restructured institution should not and cannot come into being at one time; as stated earlier, these

revolutionary changes are implemented by an evolutionary process.

The restructuring process must be guided by a powerful central coordinating group responsible for implementing the vision, which includes the revolutionary changes. In order to accomplish this, the central group needs to create a number of implementation teams to work on specific parts of the restructuring effort; these teams reflect the evolutionary nature of the restructuring process. Examples of such implementation teams may include those responsible for:

1. the assessment of student learning outcomes;
2. integrating all student services into "one-stop shopping";
3. seeking out partnerships with other colleges and universities to reduce costs and increase learning opportunities;
4. establishing faculty development training programs around the use of technology and new faculty roles, such as mentoring and small-group discussion skills;
5. creating demonstration projects that use technology to reduce faculty workload and enhance student learning;
6. developing new faculty roles; and
7. developing alternative academic calendar structures.

These teams will cut across traditional faculty and administrative lines, thereby taking the restructuring process deep into the institution and bringing many new people into the effort.

As previously stated, the primary function of the central coordinating group is maintaining the focus on the overall vision and strategy as more and more people and implementation teams participate; this will prove essential to the overall success of the restructuring effort. The central group also focuses on dealing with the political realities of the institution. Because this group contains the key administrative and faculty leaders, it has the capability to allocate scarce fiscal and human resources, to form implementation teams that build coalitions across campus, and to monitor the work of these teams. Further, because this central group maintains the calendar of the change effort, it can make the necessary adjustments to deal with unforeseen difficulties.

An important element in the implementation process is creating early victories. Because the restructuring process will take at least four to five years to complete, it is important that people feel a sense of accomplishment along the way. Waiting to the end to feel some sense of success may be discouraging for too many and increase their resistance out of frustration or anxiety about the long-term outcome. But, as Kotter maintains, "Creating short-term wins is different from hoping for short-term wins. The latter is passive, the former active."

In developing the implementation teams, care should be given to seeking such early victories. In the examples presented above, it is possible to envision that "one-stop shopping" for students can occur early in the process. So, too, can establishing a faculty development process to help faculty with new skills,

creating demonstration projects using new technologies, and some partnering with other institutions. On the other hand, creating new faculty roles, and inventing alternative academic calendars might well take a long time to achieve. Each institution will have a wide array of issues to deal with in a restructuring effort; focusing on some early victories will help create the context for later success.

It is important to establish demonstration projects to test out new ideas. Such projects can be fairly sizable, such as a group of faculty and students forming a small college within a college, or can be small, such as a few faculty testing out new ways to use technology to restructure the role of faculty members. These test sites will also determine whether those new ideas are worthy of broader dissemination within the institution.

Most colleges and universities are fortunate in having faculty members who are already experimenting with new methods of delivering educational services. It is important that these individuals be given the necessary support and independence to pursue these innovations.

Implementing small and large demonstration projects--some of which are successful--can create models of success. Knowing and seeing that their colleagues have successfully implemented new educational or administrative processes encourages those who are interested in the change effort but can't figure out what it looks like or what they can do.

The reality of any restructuring process is that since we are dealing with the basic underlying processes, structures, and belief systems of the institution, the change cannot occur quickly; people just can't alter their belief systems overnight--nor should they. Hence, while difficult to develop, there is a need for a clear, general time line for the introduction of changes that are being planned. Adjustments in the schedule will, no doubt, be made at one time or another as new ideas and plans emerge or as difficulties occur, but these must be made with great care. People need to know when important changes in their work will be required, so that they can have some sense of control over their lives. Predictability and consistency are important elements in enabling people to adapt their work lives to new practices.

Finally, while there are other elements of the implementation process, it is important to highlight five tools for success:

1. Internal expertise should be used as much as possible. This approach will give more credibility to the change process, will reduce the number of mistakes and difficulties incurred as consultants learn about the institution, will avoid external consultants using "cookie-cutter" approaches to the institution, and will enable the faculty and administrators to have colleagues who will remain with them over the long haul. While some external support may prove helpful, an assessment of internal resources is essential. It is my impression that there is much more faculty and administrative expertise at most colleges and universities than is recognized.

2. Risk-takers should be supported. Those faculty members and administrators who are the innovators and early adopters should be supported in their efforts, as an indication to others of the seriousness of the restructuring efforts and to show the risk-takers that the institution supports their activities.

3. Link with other institutions going through the change process. Restructuring a college or university is a difficult undertaking, and it is especially nice to know that others are struggling in the same way; the

mutual support and commiseration gained in this way cannot be over-estimated. Such networking may overcome the tendency of faculty and administrators in a particular institution to believe that their problems are unique and the result of their lack of ability or the special nature of their own institution. By sharing experiences one institution may be helped to avoid sticky problems already solved by others. Further, faculty and administrators love to talk with colleagues and they may find it easier to share problems with those outside their institution than inside, as well as to accept help from outsiders.

4. Investing in faculty development will be necessary. The changes being asked of faculty members in restructuring their work lives will be extraordinary and will require them to function in ways they never conceived of and for which they were not trained. Significant support for faculty development will be necessary. By providing these dollars--especially in difficult times--the university indicates its commitment to the changes as well as respect for the difficulties that faculty are undertaking.

5. Investment in technology will be needed. New technologies will play a key role in the restructuring process and universities must be willing to invest in them. This does not mean a university must have all the bells and whistles of the most recent technological developments, but it does mean that the technology needed to restructure the work of administrators and faculty will be available.

FACING THE FUTURE

Restructuring will be one of the major activities of many or most of the universities in the country over the next 10 years. The process by which these transformations take place will not be easy and will not be quick. As the planning and implementation process unfolds, many tough decisions will have to be made, some wrong turns will have to be redirected, technology will not work as expected, difficult people and situations will have to be overcome, and adjustments made in the timetable. And, people will grieve the loss of the past--people, structures, and processes--as they enter into the future, whether leaping or crawling.

As Kotter concludes his article on transformational change efforts:

In reality, even successful change efforts are messy and full of surprises. But just as a relatively simple vision is needed to guide people through a major change, so a vision of the change process can reduce the error rate. And fewer errors can spell the difference between success and failure.

As I have discussed in my two previous articles, powerful pressures will force major changes in how our colleges and universities are organized. The major issue for those of us in higher education to face is whether we faculty, administrators, and trustees--are going to lead these change efforts or be forced into them by external agencies and groups.

We must face the future. If it weren't necessary we shouldn't and wouldn't do it.

~~~~~

By ALAN E. GUSKIN

Alan E. Guskin has been Chancellor of the five-campus Antioch University since July 1994, following a major restructuring of the university administration. Prior to that he served as President of Antioch University, (1985-1994) and of Antioch College (1987-1994). From 1975 to 1985 he was Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Parkside. He has continued to teach and write throughout his careers as a

Chancellor and President and currently holds the faculty position of Distinguished University Professor.

---

**Source:** Change, July/August 1996, Vol. 28, p26, 12p

**Item:** 503448464