

## **SOUTHEASTERN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (B)**

An action learning laboratory and dedicated website (using Blackboard) was established for team use in refining short term action plans and implementation details (Attachment A) through spring 2012 into fall 2013. Major program outcomes thus far included a new academic planning and review process; I AM SE (campus beautification) project; increased civic and community engagement; True Blue campus/community initiative; a new mascot; development and implementation of a campus master planning calendar; development of a Founder's Day event to commemorate Southeastern history and identity; and, a new internal communication system (Yammer). Other indirect outcomes involved consecutive stipends/salary adjustments; revision of the tuition waiver benefit for eligible dependents; assistance in the creation of a new shared governance forum format; and, more regular meetings established with important constituencies. Clearly, the SPDP resulted in tangible outcomes emerging from the campus wide foundation established from June through November 2011 (Attachment B).

### **Preparing for November**

In mid-October final preparations began for the November 10-12, 2011 program running on a Thursday-Saturday format. The preliminary program agenda was under discussion with the three Harvard facilitators as the eight groups were fine tuning their presentations for covering action plans and reorganization scenarios. It was determined during the facilitator briefing that the presentations could be either individually or as a group from the flip charts of the September 30th session. All copies of the background materials were distributed on October 30<sup>th</sup> (Attachment C).

This culminating program of the year was designed to ensure that all participants and facilitators had a shared understanding of the current status of the change process and the importance of it in identifying and understanding how it was consistent with and linked to the larger institutional mission. During the program sessions the Harvard facilitators would serve as respondents to the information presented—raising questions, seeking clarification, and soliciting comments/elaboration from the entire group—all in the interest of fostering a collective and shared sense of priorities in terms of what needed to happen to keep the process on track.

---

Copyright 2015, Lawrence C. Minks, All Rights Reserved. Reproduced for non-commercial educational purposes only with attribution to the author.



The participants were provided with the following background materials in preparation for the program:

- Organization Frames: Leadership in Organizations, outline by Dr. Susan Moore Johnson; and Southeastern Organization Chart (from 6/21 session)
- Southeastern Vision, Mission, Strategic Commitments, and Written Narrative Themes (from 6/21 session)
- Summaries of action plans, reorganization scenarios, and key performance indicators (from 9/30 session)

The major sessions of the program were designed to progress each day from general topics to specific applications:

- Day 1=Presentation of Action Plans and Reorganization Scenarios; Leadership, Management, and Governance-Keys to Leading Successful Change Initiatives; and Reasons People Resist (or are at least apprehensive) About Change
- Day 2=Inspiring Change; and How Will You Know When You're There?--Key Performance Metrics, Measures, and Monitoring
- Day 3=Implementation Considerations and Facilitating a Deeper Level of Commitment, and Key Learning and Insights

#### **Day 1—Thursday, November 10<sup>th</sup>**

The entire morning of the first day was devoted to group presentations of the action plans and reorganization scenarios. Each group responded to the task statement identifying the plan that would assist Southeastern the most over the next 3-6 months. Specific topics had been provided under 6 general categories: Communication/Morale/Information Dissemination; Academics/Class Scheduling/Student Resources-Recruitment; Faculty Issues/Faculty Morale/Faculty Recruitment and Retention; Campus Appearance/Improve Campus Image/Campus Beautification/Going Green; Marketing/Identity/Social Media; and Student Fiscal Management/Student Billing.

From approximately 40 pages of summaries from the September 30<sup>th</sup> session, each group rated their top items as follows:

- Group 1=Faculty Issues, Student Fiscal Management, and Marketing the University
- Group 2=Community Service/Engagement, Class Scheduling, and Faculty Morale
- Group 3=Communication/Information Dissemination/Morale, Campus Beautification, And Service/Volunteerism
- Group 4=Communication, Social Media, and Green Initiative



Group 5=Communication Between Campus and Department, Faculty Recruitment and Retention, and Recruitment

Group 6=Morale/Communication, Academics, and Improving Campus Image

Group 7=Campus Appearance, Identity/Marketing, and Resources for Students

Group 8=Campus Appearance, Communications/Social Media, and Faculty Retention

The four most frequently mentioned reorganization scenarios were the following:

- Executive Vice President or Provost Model

Vice President for Business Affairs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Director of Athletics, and Executive Director of University Advancement as stand-alone positions

Schools reduced from three to two (1) School of Education, Business, and Professional Studies and (2) School of Arts, Sciences, and General Studies)

Eliminate dean's positions—one dean (Arts and Sciences) becomes Vice President for Instruction (departments report)—reassign current deans to use their strengths in the organization

Create Directors—for example, Business Accreditation and Teacher Education Accreditation—any realignment must be consistent with external accreditations

- Enrollment Management (EM) continue to report to President

EM report to Academic Affairs or Student Affairs  
Academic Services report to Academic Affairs

Alternatives—Financial Aid report to Business Affairs, Admissions/Registrar report to Academic Affairs, Academic Services report to Student Affairs

EM report to one of the Assistant Vice Presidents (Academic Affairs)

- Continuing Education and Career Management report to University Advancement

- Assign Marketing Function to Communications area—deal with image, identity, media, multimedia, packaging, website



Several considerations were provided in advance of the development of the scenarios:

- The President's span of control—what needs to have the direct attention of the President?
- The existing structure supplemented with “layering” with what we have dictates cross-functional teams
- Current system overlays—cross institutional teams, responsibility, clustering, quality circles, etc.—could help with communication and morale—the bigger question is if there is a better way to make us more nimble?
- University Advancement, Center for Regional Competitiveness, and the Oklahoma Small Business Development Center works closely with the President
- University Communication report to the Executive Assistant to the President—or as a team
- How would University external communications be enhanced with any given structural change?

The afternoon session began with an overview of the keys to leading successful change initiatives—leadership (what?), management (how?), and governance (who?). This represented an advance in thinking pushing beyond the organizational frames to a higher level of complexity. Questions were posed applying the overview to the frames in the change process:

Leadership – courage and creativity in moving forward

What is this all about? What is the larger picture—stories, ideas?

Why is this worth doing? What is the meaning (Symbolic frame)?

Management – persistence, keeping people engaged

How do we go about this?

What needs to happen?

How do we plan our next steps?

How do we measure success? What metrics do we use? (Structural and Human Resource frames)

Governance – deals with openness

Who needs to be involved?

What processes should we follow to win support?

How do we go about engaging others in this important work? (Human Resource and Political frames)

Drawing from pre-work readings from John Kotter and Lorne Whitehead, the last session of the afternoon concentrated on why people resist change. One of the external facilitators summarized eleven reasons why people resist or are at least apprehensive about change: loss of control; too



much uncertainty; surprise (no advance warning); the difference effect (break in useful routines); the McDonald's factor (things comfortable to us); ripple effects; loss of face; concerns about competence; more work; past resentments; and, sometimes the threat is real (the past may symbolize real actions). The basic discussion questions included the following: (1) In what ways do you think Southeastern's change process might be resisted, slowed down, or otherwise impeded? (2) Do these reasons for putting the brakes on change seem logical or reasonable to you? Why or Why not? (3) What might you and others at Southeastern do to secure greater buy-in to advance the change process?

The closing remarks for the day focused on the fact that there would be no decisions made on reorganization as an outcome specifically. The approach would be to continue to discuss ideas, concerns, issues, and clarification. There appeared to be some patterns emerging since September and people were open to different and non-traditional forms of structural organization.

### **Day 2—Friday, November 11<sup>th</sup>**

The morning of the second day began with the individual groups responding to what they considered to be points of convergence, overlap, or combinations emerging from the action plans. This was designed to try to consider the underlying reasons and rationale for the ideas put forth in the change effort – e. g. What makes them worth doing? What makes others want to engage in them?

The highlights of the points of convergence for the action plans included an internal orientation; communication, connectedness, and identity; I Am SE as a basic platform; trust and connectedness as a base; and, morale/budget considerations. Dominant themes running through five of the eight groups appeared to communication, identity, morale, connectedness, and budget considerations.

Similarly, the points of convergence were presented by the groups for reorganization scenarios. Major themes from these presentations included the following: President's span of control from 5-8 individuals necessary to overcome silos; circular communication networks were possible; elimination of dean's positions; enrollment management remaining intact; Continuing Education and Career Management reporting to University Advancement; Information Technology reporting to President; variations of Provost/VPAA model possible; and, matrix, cross-functional institutional teams could work on specific issues such as marketing and a new mascot.



At the conclusion of the morning session, the Harvard facilitator invited all the participants to reflect on the discussion questions which were provided in advance and how we were doing in moving forward that afternoon—

- What is Southeastern's current change-oriented work all about? Toward what larger end should this work be directed?
- How can this work lead to more transformational change for the institution?
- In 5-10 years, where should Southeastern be? Where do you want it to be? How might it best get there?

Over lunch the Harvard facilitators met with group leaders from Southeastern to debrief on how the program was going thus far. The discussion was primarily on how the small groups could be used to better understand and clarify what was meant by communication and connectedness. However, there was a sense of progress as boundaries continued to be explored. A key question was how would we begin to operationalize the change process in light of not possessing enough information? The facilitators stressed that the group leaders needed to think like coaches and push all participants in terms of their most creative thinking.

It was also apparent that there was an element of uncertainty surrounding the reorganization. When would it come? Who would make the decision? Would there be short term and long term reorganization plans? The cross functional team approach would require that people get out of their traditional roles and stimulate different ways of working together perhaps creating situations where people would be valued more. Longer term issues remained in regard to sequencing action plans and reorganization as well as taking advantage of synergies that might exist in action plans, structural changes, and the current shared governance proposal under consideration.

The afternoon session began by exploring key performance measures that the institution would need to develop and apply in its ongoing transformational change work. The Kellogg Foundation Logic Model was presented by one of the Harvard facilitators to begin the discussion. The discussion was framed in terms of moving from "strategy and action to management and implementation." Also included was how to track performance over time and how to view the framework in regard to a Unit of Analysis (e.g., Individual to Project/Initiative to Unit/Department to School to University to Cross-Institutional).

Further probing questions focused on consideration of the KPI's that had been developed to-date, linking the data back to the action plans, viewing measurement as looking at strategy first and working backward from that point. Other targeted questions/issues included:



- What new performance indicators and institutional metrics will need to be identified and implemented to get the institution where it wants to be in 2021?
- Will focus on these metrics move the institution's action plans and reorganization scenarios in the desired direction?
- What performance evaluation tools, techniques, and approaches will best suit the transformational change work going forward?

Concluding remarks emphasized how traditional University measures were inconsistent with innovative institutions of the future and how the right kinds of measures provoke the right kinds of conversations. Other comments centered on two elements learned thus far relative to content, better appreciation of the action plans developed and the process and that change was already occurring because we were working differently.

### **Day 3—Saturday, November 12<sup>th</sup>**

The morning session of the final day focused on implementation considerations and facilitating a deeper level of commitment associated with the future of the transformational change process. Two of the Harvard facilitators began the session reviewing challenges from the viewpoint of the four organization frames and relevant organizational change theory. The required reading for the session drew heavily from John Kotter's work on developing a sense of urgency. The entire group was asked to pick their unit of analysis or a project/idea that they wished to move forward and use that as a frame of reference in consideration of the following four phases of the change process:

- Awareness—reaching a reasonable consensus  
Why we need to change? Why fix it?  
What's in it for me/us? Is it actually better than the status quo?  
What is the final destination?  
Just exactly what do we aspire to change? What needs to be connected?
- Mobilization—finding idea champions, who is excited, who has the “fire in the belly criteria”  
How do we harness, nurture, and sustain energy?  
Who is the best mobilizing and in what ways?  
How can idea champion's best be supported?  
After scanning our environment, who can step up?
- Experimentation and Piloting—putting a toe in the water  
How do we balance high energy, “half-baked” versus “perfect” ideas?  
How do we adopt a “learn as you go mentality”?



How do we best assume a learning orientation—what do we know now versus before?  
What do we do with new insights?  
How do we adopt a “good try” perspective to foster risk taking and innovation?

- Fuller Scale Implementation—this is the “call to the bullpen” in making the “parts stick” that we want to sustain and solidify what is fluid  
How do we build on insights and recognize accomplishments of idea champions?  
What is our plan for replacing the idea champion(s) in order to sustain the initiative over the long term?  
What are the actions necessary to institutionalize the change or parts of the change?  
How are we going to handle the inevitable administrative ripple effect?  
Longer term, what are the best ways to evaluate the results of the change?

It was emphasized that all four organization frames would normally be active during all phases of the change process and one needs to realize that there never will be 100% consensus. We tend to zero in on distractors or minority views that will slow down and ultimately hamper getting to the end point. Managing change has to be viewed both as an art and science. It is science in terms of aspects being considered in advance to support the change, while it is an art because it is more situational dependent in most instances. Additionally, resource management during a change process is critical and it may be more important to manage energy, not time.

In concluding the morning session, the task assigned to the groups was to discuss their respective unit of analysis relative to any ideas or challenges associated with the change process. Other important focus questions provided in advance included—What do you see overall as the one or two most significant implementation challenges? If you could do just one thing to advance the change process, what would it be? Why do you think this one thing is particularly important?

The final session Saturday afternoon employed a “What? So What? Now What?” discussion protocol. This session was designed to engage all participants in identifying key insights, learning, and implementation considerations and action steps needed to continue to advance the change process. The following outline of the protocol was displayed in the front of the room:

- **WHAT?**  
An insight/idea that is sticking with you? (A keeper)
- **SO WHAT?**  
Why is this important to you? (Dominant theme)
- **NOW WHAT?**  
The action/next step for you? (Visualize/Operationalize)



The entire group was instructed to find another person that they normally had not talked with during the session for a “standing meeting” and go through the protocol. Any additional thoughts were to be posted on the flip charts for the action plans on the walls.

As President of Southeastern I made the following remarks representing the culmination of the session:

We will make sure that we capture all information from the teams these past three days. Let's all celebrate the work done the past three days, it has been remarkable, we enriched and elaborated on what has been done to date. Sequencing will be more important now with the long-term action plans and reorganization considerations. This requires different ways of working together and valuing the contributions of others—synergies will exist among action plans, structural changes, and shared governance.

Jim has given us a glimpse of 2021 with higher education continuing to face a rapidly changing environment—it is dynamic and will require flexibility/adaptation. We need to continue to monitor changes at the state level in aligning our metrics—communication of those changes will be essential, especially in regard to the collective impact it will have on the University.

Joe mentioned DNA. The basic DNA of Universities is based on decisions made in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and will require evolutionary adaptation. The strategy of a typical regional institution has been imitation—not innovation—being stuck in the middle—and they don't know what to do. Typically, they are overstretched and underfunded—the genetic tendency is that bigger is better versus simpler and and more affordable--they rarely match aspirations with capabilities.

Yesterday we referenced types of student populations to be served and curriculum or subjects to be taught—I would also add scholarship and expand that definition to include Boyer's model including student involvement.

Historically, throughout the 1920's and 1930's, institutions were characterized by student and faculty disconnectedness that resulted later in reinvention, collegiality, and a new sense of community. There was a reemphasis on instruction, identity, diversity, and social and public service (local, regional, and worldwide)--Universities played leading roles. It is not enough now to change superficially—Universities can wield much greater influence than they do today. And, we need to exert more influence.



Jim also mentioned yesterday that traditional University measures are inconsistent with innovative institutions of the future—and that the right kinds of measures/metrics provoke the right kinds of conversations. We need to get better at this.

In June, during the pre-briefing, I encouraged you to look at yourself as a leader at Southeastern and the contributions you make. I asked that you think of new ways about your role and expand your capacity/capabilities to exercise constructive and creative influence. Look around you---we will require levels of interrelationships, interdependencies, communication, and coordination as never before to face uncertainty. I am confident, very confident that moving forward with you and the entire Southeastern community, we can overcome anything we may face together in the future.”

### **December Reorganization**

The reorganization was announced the first of December based on feedback received throughout the program and board approval. The following changes were implemented:

- The School Dean positions were eliminated; School administrative/operational support would remain intact as coordinated through Departments and the Dean of Instruction
- The Dean of the School of Arts & Sciences would now serve as Dean of Instruction, reporting to the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The Dean of the School of Education & Behavioral Sciences would now serve as Staff Assistant to the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The Dean of Enrollment Management who had reported to the President, would now report to the Vice President for Student Affairs.
- The Director of the Continuing Education & Career Management Center who had reported to the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Support, would now report to the Executive Director of University Advancement.
- Matrix and Cluster overlay organization designs would be used as needed on a project/cross-functional team basis.

After reviewing all the information and a number of different models, it was determined in conjunction with the board, that these changes would represent the best fit for the University. This was based on including a flatter structure with significant enhancement of communication, coordination, and connectedness; increased speed and flexibility in adapting to rapidly changing conditions; and empowering individuals to expand their future leadership roles and capabilities in exercising constructive and innovative ways that would impact the University.



Earlier, during January 2011, realignments had begun with three other administrative appointments made including an Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Support, an Assistance Vice President for Academic Affairs/Instruction, and a new Director of Financial Aid.

Attachments:

A: Team Action Plans and Reports (from Blackboard site)

B: SPDP Chronology of Major Events

C: SPDP November 10-12, 2011 Agenda