Western University

Scholarship@Western

The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University

Education Faculty

8-16-2020

Improving Faculty's Educational Technology Adoption

Hiba Sabri
hsabri2@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/oip

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, and the Higher Education Commons

WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Improving Faculty's Educational Technology Adoption

by

Hiba Sabri

AN ORGANIZATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

LONDON, ONTARIO

August 16, 2020

Abstract

The purpose of this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) is to assist higher education leaders in dealing with challenges related to faculty's technology adoption and improve educational technology practices in teaching. This OIP investigates the current problem of practice (PoP) at Hall University which is based on the concerns related to faculty's resistance towards using technology in teaching and in attending the existing educational technology training. This OIP has been analyzed through the lens of neoliberalism theory and its influence on higher education in terms of corporatization of education. This theory provides a holistic understanding of the complex nature of higher education practices and culture. Reinforced by the principles of collaborative and malleable behaviors, adaptive and distributed leadership approaches are proposed to influence relevant changes that assist in improving faculty's technology adoption. The premise of this OIP is to provide opportunities of collaboration for faculty to engage in learning about educational technology tools and approaches. The change implementation and communication plan of the proposed changes is guided by the Kotter Eight Step Model (1996). As for measuring the change outcomes, the PDSA cycle is used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the change process. Upon implementation, it is predicted that the outcomes of this OIP will improve faculty's engagement towards educational technology implementations in higher education.

Key words: *Educational Technology Adoption, Faculty's Technology Resistance, Adaptive Leadership, Distributed Leadership, Neoliberalism and Education, Instructional Technology Effectiveness*.

Executive Summary

Incorporating technology into teaching has resulted in major developments over the last few years (Mehra and Mital, 2007). The education sector has invested millions of dollars in purchasing or updating instructional technology tools (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). Governments worldwide have adopted new policies that supported the transformation of traditional teaching into a technology-based one (Giroux, 2002). Faculty members tend to resist these transformations by doubting the institutional motives behind the implementation of education technology initiatives (Portelli & Konecny, 2013). Inadequate training and lack of institutional technology vision are among the main reasons behind faculty's unwillingness to participate in such initiatives. Thus, faculty's perceive technology as being forced upon by their institution which leads to further confusion and resistance (Giroux 2002).

The institutional interest in employing technology-based curricula is associated with the influence of neoliberalism on education where the focus is on increased productivity, profit and competition (Busch, 2017). The neoliberal practices are leading higher education institutions to function as a business where revenue is prioritized over teaching and learning (Green, 2014). Faculty's resistance towards adopting educational technology into teaching is associated with different challenges mainly lack of faculty's technological competence and ineffective student's learning experience.

To bridge this gap, collaboration opportunities between the management team and faculty members are needed to achieve change. This entails improving the institutional leadership practices by adopting the distributed and adaptive leadership styles to promote trust and collaboration between the leadership team and faculty members.

This OIP aims to improve faculty's educational technology adoption by addressing the current problem of practice (PoP) at Hall University which relates to faculty's resistance towards technology adoption and how faculty members can be encouraged to participate in the existing technology training program.

Chapter one discusses the organizational context where the background of Hall University is introduced including its vision, mission and values. A leadership position and lens statement centered around the PoP is addressed through applying the principles of adaptive and distributed leadership. The theoretical framework of the PoP has been articulated through the theory of neoliberalism and a literature review on faculty's resistance towards technology in higher education. Furthermore, guiding questions emerging from the PoP are presented along with their potential challenges. A leadership vision of change has been described in the light of internal and external change drivers and organizational change priorities. Finally, Hall's organization change readiness is described through relevant change assessment tools.

Chapter two describes the planning and development of the proposed change plan. A thorough analysis of the adaptive and distributed leadership approaches are included to indicate how they can lead, advance and effectively enact change. The framework for leading the change process has been addressed through the levels of the Kotter Model (1996) that are essential for achieving a structured and comprehensive change. As well, a critical organizational analysis is presented expansively which discusses the needed changes at Hall and the desired change state. Moreover, three solutions are proposed for the change process with one solution that is deemed most effective for moving the change forward. At the end of the

chapter, ethical implications and practices are described, in relation to adaptive and leadership practices that are key in enacting the change.

Chapter three focuses on the implementation, evaluation and communication of the change process. This entails outlining the strategies for change taking into consideration the priorities and goals of the implementation plan. Also, this chapter presents comprehensive change steps that are aligned with the Kotter Eight Step Model (1996) along with the details on managing the change transition. The monitoring and evaluation of change has also been addressed through the PDSA Cycle to ensure that change will be implemented and sustained successfully. A detailed communication plan is described to build change awareness for various audiences who are involved in the change process. The chapter ends with a description of next steps and future considerations along with concluding remarks for this OIP.

This OIP will be of interest to organizations that need to deal with changing faculty attitudes towards the use of technology in teaching.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my mother for her unconditional support during this journey. Thank you mum for taking care of my kids when I was very busy studying and writing. Without your support, help and encouragement, I would not have been able to pursue my studies.

Special thanks of gratitude to my children, Daniel, Maryan and Narjis, and my husband Adel El-hage, for believing in me and motivating me throughout the course of this doctorate program. Thank you for your belief, understanding and patience in helping me finish this degree.

Finally, I would like to thank my OIP supervisor Beate Planche for her kindness, support and thoroughness. Beate, you have been generous in providing your feedback and enthusiastic about my progress in the program. Your help and encouragement made this process interesting and valuable. Thank you for your fruitful guidance.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One: Introduction and Problem

This chapter explores the problem of practice at Hall University through providing an organizational context and introducing Hall's vision, mission and values. Additionally, the chapter discusses a leadership position and lens statement including a theoretical framework of the PoP. The chapter ends with a discussion about the leadership vision of change taking into consideration the internal and external change drivers and organizational change priorities.

Organizational Context

Hall University is a public research university located in Quebec, Canada. It is one of the most popular universities in Canada and internationally. Established in 1821, Hall offers degrees and diplomas in over 300 fields of study, with the highest average admission requirements of any Canadian university. The most popular faculties are Arts, Science, Medicine, Engineering and Management. Hall receives students from 150 countries with more than 10,000 foreign students who make up about 27% of the student population. As for faculty members, there are about 1,707 professors excluding part time faculty members. Hall is considered as one of the most internationally diverse and research-intensive university in Canada.

The leadership of Hall University strives for maintaining a great reputation in the marketplace by making huge investments in research and technology. This is evident in Hall's strategic planning documentation (Hall, 2019) that focuses on 5 key objectives:

1. Be open to the world by:
   a. Maintaining international student registration at 25-30%.
   b. Providing 21st century educational experience to students through research opportunities, internships and international exchanges.

    c. Delivering academic programs online for international and local students.

2. Expand diversity: Ensuring the social, economic and intellectual diversity is represented in the university by:

    a. Increasing the employment of female professors at 25% in 5 years.

    b. Increasing Indigenous student enrolment to 1000 university wide.

    c. Supporting policies that enhance freedom of intellectual exchange.

3. Lead innovation: Supporting pedagogical and curricular innovation through the implementation of technology in the classroom and providing online programs.

4. Connect across disciplines and sectors: Reducing administrative barriers to academic appointments across academic units and facilitate interdisciplinary teaching and research.

5. Connect with our communities: Building collaborative relationships with existing commercial and policy sectors in Canada to attract new student's enrolments. As for Quebec, the goal is to increase French student's enrolment by 15% over the next 5 years.

Clearly, the leadership of Hall promotes and supports a culture of research and innovation. The university is affiliated with 75 major research centers and networks that are funded by the government and the industries in Quebec and Canada. In 2016, Hall University received $547 million as part of sponsored research and considered to be a member of different prestigious research organizations and forums worldwide.

Vision and Mission

Focusing on emerging technologies, Hall University's vision is to empower their community through technologies and rapid innovation including state-of-the-art solutions for

advanced learning, teaching and research. Technology is key in the strategic planning such as developing massive online educational resources that are hosted on the university's learning management system (LMS).

As for its mission, Hall strives for the advancement of learning and the creation and dissemination of knowledge by offering the best possible education, carrying out research and scholarly activities judged to be excellent by the highest international standards, and providing service to society (Hall, 2019).

Organizational Structure and Authoritative Leadership

Led by the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, Hall's senior administrative officers create a vision and direction for the University. The senior administrative office consists of the secretary general, chief of staff and Vice-Presidents (VPs). Under the VP of Finance and Admin is the Chief Information Officer (CIO) who is responsible for developing and implementing information systems and technology initiatives, policies and practices to support the university's academic objectives. The CIO will communicate useful recommendations that fall out of this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP). Under the CIO, are all the IT managers with whom I will be working to execute the recommendation changes of this OIP.

The senior administrative team's responsibility is to provide strategic guidance and oversight, ensuring accountability through a system of formal decision-making and reporting. Clearly, the formal decision making appears to be exclusive to the senior administrative team without including other parties such as faculty members.

As indicated previously, the focus of Hall's leadership is to excel in research and technology as ways of increasing revenue by attracting as many students as possible. One of

the major points in the first two objectives listed above is to provide online programs and incorporate technology-based curriculums. While technology has become a necessity in the 21st century education (Giroux, 2002), strategic planning doesn't appear to address faculty's collaboration or involvement in technology implementation. Faculty members are the main adopters of educational technology implementation and responsible for delivering technology-based learning (Buchanan et al., 2013). So, their feedback regarding educational technology initiatives is needed to warrant a successful technology adoption into teaching (Buchanan et al., 2013). Lack of faculty's involvement in the decision making appears to be an indication of authoritative leadership practices by Hall University (Lipman-Blumen, 2010). Authoritative leadership is mostly tied to hierarchical /traditional institutions where decisions are made unilaterally and determined by the will of the leader (Gonos and Gallo, 2013). According to Manning (2018) authoritative leadership is reflected in most higher education institutions since a bureaucratic model is usually dominant. From a modernist perspective, bureaucracy in higher education is evident in current organizational practices and activities that adopt corporate trends (Breese, 2013) . These trends are related to growth in student's enrollments (*bigger is better*), increase in majors, implementing new ways of teaching (*technology-based learning*) and applying business practices (*branding and cost savings*) (Andrews, 2006).

Bureaucracy fuels the power of a hierarchical and authoritative structure which makes change complex and difficult to accomplish (Kitana, 2016). Of concern is that, an authoritative approach in leadership doesn't always provide the rationale of why decisions have been made (Gumport, 2012). As the case of Hall University, faculty members are expected to participate in the university's technology initiatives without questioning the rationale behind such initiatives.

Leadership Problem of Practice

Recently Hall University purchased a new learning management system (LMS) from the vendor Desire2Learn to replace the former WebCT Vista system. The IT training department at Hall adopted the implementation of the project and provided the technological and pedagogical support. Faculty were offered intensive training support such as hands-on workshops, webinars, one on one consultations, and self-directed learning guides to facilitate the learning experience. However, the IT training department at Hall reported that the faculty displayed significant resistance towards using the new learning management system and other technologies. Therefore, the IT management team sought to understand why faculty are reluctant to use the existing learning technologies especially since Hall invested millions of dollars to implement these technologies. As a key Educational Technology Consultant within the IT training department, the problem of practice under investigation in this OIP is the need to address faculty's resistance towards using educational technology tools in teaching: How can faculty members be encouraged to participate fully in the educational technology training?

Hall has already invested millions of dollars for implementing educational technology tools with the goal of providing high quality education. Training faculty on how to use educational technologies efficiently can enhance student's learning opportunities and experiences (Giroux, 2002). As well, using these technologies can enhance the university's reputation and "uniqueness" in the marketplace which generates monetary expansion (Busch, 2017). Obviously, having a significant number of faculty members who are resistant towards using such technologies cause financial and profit losses to the university. According to Strebel (1996), individuals usually resist change in favour of keeping the status quo and are afraid of the

unexpected outcome that change might bring to their daily work routine. Therefore, individuals within organizations need to be involved and persuaded about the change to reduce potential resistance (Strebel, 1996). The organizational leadership plays a key role in the change process and dealing with employees' skepticism of the new reality (Oreg, 2006).

The negative attitudes towards adopting technology or attending technology training is leading to a of lack technical knowledge and skills needed by faculty (Georgina & Olson, 2008). Based on the results of a recent training satisfaction survey at Hall, the leadership team concluded that faculty believe there is a lack of institutional interest in consulting or communicating with them prior to employing any learning technology. Also, faculty members at Hall appear to mistrust their institutional leadership and try to avoid any technology training assuming that their leadership is imposing such training upon them. According to Lewin (2010), the authoritative leadership is characterized by following a controlling approach and instituting the decisions of the leader without involving the subordinates. This type of leadership can be exploitative because it is based on fear and punishment which leads to a lack of trust between the leader and his/her people (Khan, 2010). All these factors seem to have created an environment of low morale among faculty that has led to reduced productivity and an unwillingness to use Hall's educational technologies. Consequently, a significant number of faculty members at Hall appear to lack confidence and knowledge about using the current learning technologies in their teaching. The leadership of the university is seeking to achieve faculty's participation and adoption of educational technology initiatives. Having an environment of trust and collaboration is no doubt important to the leadership at Hall. A significant disconnect is perceived between what leadership believes should be and what is being experienced.

And thus, the aim of this OIP is to improve faculty's educational technology adoption by addressing the current PoP at Hall University which relates to faculty's resistance towards technology adoption. How can faculty members be encouraged to participate more fully in the existing technology training program?

<div align="center">**Leadership Position and Lens Statement**</div>

This OIP proposes the use of adaptive and distributed leadership practices that are aligned with the leadership aspirations that Hall wishes to promote such as trust, collaboration and technology adoption (Heifetz, 1994; Northouse, 2016).

Adaptive leadership was introduced by Heifetz (1994) as a modern form of leadership that is different from a traditional and hierarchical one. This leadership focuses on the adaptive abilities of individuals mobilizing them to face harsh challenges and succeed afterwards (Heifetz et al., 2009). Adaptive leadership encourages individuals to demonstrate behavioral malleability when there is a change in the surrounding environment (Kaizer et al., 2007). Adaptive leaders are considered competent in achieving solid organizational change as a result of their leadership qualities such as flexibility, adaptability, agility, and versatility (Pulakos et al., 2000). Contrary to other contemporary leadership theories, the essence of adaptive leadership is the adaptive behavior of the leaders rather than their traits (Northouse, 2016).

The rapid growth of globalization, international exchanges, technological innovations, shifting values etc. are leading to changes in how organizations operate (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Clearly, some organizations need an adaptive leadership to cope with this increasing change (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Change in our society is becoming more complex; creating one-size-fits-all solutions to resolve management challenges is proven ineffective (Glover et al., 2002).

Leaders cannot achieve change without being adaptive in an effective way to manage the challenges shaped by the modern world (Glover et al., 2002). As an adaptive leader, you are a people or follower centered leader which means that:

> "Adaptive leaders engage in activities to mobilize, motivate, organize, orient, and focus the attention of others (Heifetz, 1994). In addition, this approach to leadership is about helping others to explore and change their values. The goal of adaptive leadership is to encourage people to change and learn new ways of living so that they may do well and grow. In short, adaptive leadership is the behavior of leaders and the actions they take to encourage others to address and resolve changes that are central in their lives" (Northouse, 2016, p. 258)

As an adaptive leader, it will be essential to inspire the leadership at Hall to openly and adaptably deal with changes and make sound decisions that suit the organization and its people. Also, it is my goal to build a strong and supportive relationships between Hall's leaders and faculty members through cultivating trust and open communication.

Cultivating Trust

As an adaptive leader, it will be paramount to encourage Hall's management team to get to know their faculty and try to understand their roles, responsibilities, perspectives, and value their input. Bryk and Schneider (2002) explain that adaptive leadership promotes trust by involving employees in the decision making and empowering them to share their opinion genuinely about what works and what doesn't. According to Carmeli et al (2009), cultivating trustworthy relationships in the workplace facilitate employee's vigor and enhance job performance. This can be achieved through the demonstration of honest, responsible and respectful behaviors that are modelled by the organizational leaders (Legood et al., 2016). When these behaviors are accompanied with open communication and acknowledgement of individual's concerns and opinions, trust flourishes between leaders and their followers (Frazier et al., 2010).

Open Communication

As an adaptive leader, it will be vital to encourage the leadership of Hall to support open dialogue by encouraging faculty to share their perspectives and create their own networks to facilitate the information exchange. Open communication is effective for adaptive leadership since it can "enhance a system's capacity for adaptability in todays' fast-changing times" (Regine & Lewin, 2000, p. 4)**.**

Also, this OIP will encourage open communication by fostering social relationships. Social relationships promote trustworthiness, provide organizational fluidity and enhance problem solving (Gordon & Hartman, 2009). When coworkers trust each other, they become motivated to communicate their work-stress problems and dissatisfaction (Sandhya & Kumar, 2011). Consequently, some of the work-related stress is elevated and employees feel internally rewarded (Gordon & Hartman, 2009).

A culture of adaptability and collaboration can be entwined with a distributed leadership approach. This kind of leadership has become popular since it focuses on the multiple interactions of actors rather than the individual behavior of the leader (Bolden, 2011). According to Bennett et al., (2003) distributed leadership:

> "is not something done by an individual to others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization. It is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action" (p. 3).

Therefore, distributed leaders focus on helping faculty members understand change and adopt new goals to enhance teaching and learning (Harris, 2003). Although some researchers argue that there is lack of sufficient literature or empirical studies of distributed leadership (Bennet et., 2003), its interest is growing significantly. In the US, there has been a steady

increase in publications and reviews on distributed leadership since 2000 (Bolden, 2011). Jones et al. (2012) report that distributed leadership has contributed to a major improvement in leadership practices within higher education. This type of leadership promotes interactive communication between different team members who can act as individual leaders within their own team. Unlike traditional leadership approaches that focus on the heroic traits of the leaders such as transformational and charismatic leadership (Northouse, 2016), distributed leadership incorporates shared and democratic forms of behavior (Mascall et al., 2009).

The adaptive and distributed leadership approaches can be effective in improving relationships between faculty members and administration at Hall University. As one of the change consultants, I strive to work collaboratively with my colleagues to improve faculty's adoption of educational technology tools. Faculty at Hall are intelligent, knowledgeable and highly skilled individuals. They expect to be consulted and involved prior to any educational technology initiative. Also, faculty seem to be committed and motivated to share their opinion around the existing technology training program. However, the current organizational culture can be a barrier to enact adaptive and distributed leadership. For example, the IT leadership team and faculty seem to work in isolation as there is a clear lack of collaboration and consultation.

My role within the IT department is responsible for training faculty members and ensuring that they are technologically confident in using the university's educational technology tools. For this purpose, I will be working with a faculty committee as the main audience in the change process. This committee consists of 20 members representing different faculties (science, engineering, linguistics, music, continuing education and social sciences) and responsible for addressing faculty's concerns and communicating these concerns to the university's leadership. Also, the committee is entitled to make relevant decisions on their faculties' behalf. The CIO of

the information technology department is aware of the need to encourage faculty to adopt

technology and participate in the exiting training. Thus, I will be working with the CIO and the

IT managers on a plan to overcome faculty's resistance towards using technology in teaching. I

will need to rely on their support to promote my own adaptive and distributed leadership

practices.

Framing the Problem of Practice

History Overview of the PoP

Educational technology resistance in teaching by faculty has existed for decades (Spotts,

1999). Even the advent of writing was resisted in education by the ancient Greece (Carey, 1991).

As time has passed, technology use in teaching has evolved and it appears that the resistance of

educators has been a constant (Dewey and Duff, 2009). For instance, in the late 1960s the

concept of computer assisted instruction was introduced for specific content areas in teaching

and teachers challenged this concept as mind weakening (Carey, 1991).

Then in the 1970s, computers were widely introduced in the classroom in the US where

teachers resisted receiving training on modifying their teaching strategies to accommodate this

innovation (Spotts, 1999). As for the 1980s and 1990s, a wave of new instructional technologies

was introduced to the field of education from color monitors to appealing user interfaces and

interactive software packages (Spotts, 1999). Furthermore, the last 2 decades witnessed advanced

and sophisticated educational technology implementations such as distance education, packaged

online courses, mobile learning and learning management systems (Sclater, 2005). All these

developments affected faculty's perception towards technology implementation and adoption in

education questioning their role and the value of such technologies in teaching and learning. The

resistance of faculty members towards adopting technology has been discussed extensively in the literature (Hew and Brush, 2007). However, the literature has focused on many "superficial" reasons for this resistance such as technical failures, teacher's unease with technology and lack of technical infrastructure (Hew and Brush, 2007).

According to Fuller (2000), the overarching challenge of resistance to technology in higher education is lack of adequate training and vision by the institution's leadership. Faculty often challenge the adoption of new technologies due to unclear objectives by their institution (Fuller, 2000). Thus, faculty are reluctant to participate in the change processes because they feel that their leadership is being autocratic and lack a clear vision for technology use (McBride, 2010). They see technology as being forced upon them, of course, the result will be more confusion and resistance (Giroux 2002).

Neoliberalism

Educational institutions are investing billions of dollars per year for purchasing learning technologies (Mehra and Mital, 2007). For example, the US government spending on information and communication technology (ICT) in schools and higher education reached $4.7 billion in 2009 (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). As for Canada, by 2000, 88 percent of elementary and 97 percent of secondary students had internet access at schools (Clifford et., 2004). Clearly, there is a great interest by governments in incorporating educational technology into education. Some authors argue that this interest is associated with the influence of neoliberalism on education (Busch, 2017). According to Lakes & Carter (2011), neoliberalism has flourished in the 20th century as part of globalization where the political, social, educational and economic means of life are controlled by the free market. "In an overly simplistic formula neoliberalism intends to remove the

buffer of social welfare as a governmental function in the belief that the market operates most efficiently and effectively without regulation. ″ (Lakes & Carter, 2011, p.107)

There are extensive changes that are occurring globally as a result of neoliberalism (Green, 2014) which are leading to global competitiveness as well as instability within the field of education. HE intuitions are pressured to function as a business using corporate models and standards. In this neoliberalism era, the focus is on the development of revenue that is leading us ″to come to terms with new technologies, new social movements, and a changing global economy″ (Green, 2014, p.17). Giroux (2002) suggests that the shift in higher education, as a result of neoliberalism, is transforming knowledge to a form of financial capital and teachers' roles are changing to ″academic entrepreneurs″. Consequently, universities are pressured to increase their productivity by commercializing their educational and research activities for profitable gains (Huang, 2012). Education has become a commodity and subordinate to marketization and monetary expansions (Huang, 2012) such as creating standardized curriculums that are consistent with the demands of the free capitalist market (Portelli & Konecny, 2013). All these developments contribute to expand faculty resistance towards technology adoption as institutional revenue is prioritized over the faculty teaching principles (Portelli & Konecny, 2013).

Despite the significant transformations of educational practices as a result of neoliberalism, Busch (2017) recommends that we should not banish neoliberalism but work with it:

> ″It means ensuring that all students are exposed to a variety of (individual and social) images of the future. It means rejecting the insistence on limiting assessments to calculable outcomes in research and teaching, thereby rejecting standardization even as we accept standards″ (p.134).

Therefore, at Hall there is a need to convince faculty to adopt educational technology initiatives where they will benefit professionally. As well, this OIP aims to encourage faculty to

adopt technology practices into their teaching through providing them with a clear understanding of the value of educational technology implementation at Hall University.

Furthermore, change under the neoliberal practices are difficult to accomplish in higher education where leaders have to choose a relevant change approach to deal with organizational issues (Manning, 2019). According to Bolman and Deal (2013), there are four perspectives or frames that leaders should consider when dealing with organizational challenges: structural, human resources, political and symbolic. Given the bureaucratic structure of Hall University which follows a rigid, stable and centralized authority, change becomes a complex process (Manning, 2018). In particular, a political frame is relevant for understanding faculty's resistance towards using technology in teaching. The political frame addresses the problems of different groups within the organization through building coalitions and negotiating conflictual interests (Bolman and Deal, 2013). At Hall University, there seems to be two types of conflicting groups who have different priorities: the entrepreneurial (administration) group versus the research (faculty) group. Using Bolman's and Deal political frame can help these two groups achieve organizational goals through bargaining and negotiating.

Literature on Faculty's Resistance towards Technology

Buabeng-Andoh (2012) argues that faculty's attitude towards change is key when implementing educational technology initiatives. In most cases, institutional strategies tend to be misaligned with the faculty's teaching needs who believe that there is too much focus on technology and less on education (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). For example, at Hall University faculty's negative attitude stemmed from uncertainty about the functionality of the new LMS. Simply, they didn't see an educational value in purchasing a new system while the old one

functions well. While there is a general improvement in the faculty's attitudes towards integrating technology in higher education (Becta, 2008), they still need to be convinced that these technologies bring value to their teaching pedagogy.

Many studies revealed that faculty's lack of required skills and knowledge is one of the main barriers to the implementation of new educational technology tools (Schneckenberg, 2009). This lack of competency was attributed to different factors such as experience level with technology, teaching level, style and age (Luu and Freeman, 2001). As well, existing training courses as part of faculty's professional development focus on ″how to″ use the new technology tools rather than ″why″ using such tools can enhance teaching and learning (Luu and Freeman, 2001). At Hall, the one time-training programs seem to lack adult learning principles. Learning occurs when learners have a clear perspective of their needs, feel their autonomy is respected and life experiences are accommodated in the instruction (Knowles, 1978). Technology training courses at Hall are quick and sometimes are too technical for faculty to easily comprehend.

Moreover, the existing training programs at Hall are time consuming; faculty are already overloaded with other teaching and research tasks and many do not feel they have the time to participate in new training programs or initiatives. Often, faculty's time for the increased workload is not paid and attending training initiatives or preparing for courses that require technology integration becomes a burden which leads to faculty's frustration and lack of motivation (Schneckenberg, 2009).

PESTE Analysis

While neoliberalism provides the understanding of technology implementation in higher education, a PESTE analysis contextualizes the realities of faculty's resistance towards using

technology in teaching. A PESTE analysis can illuminate the influence of political, economic, social, technological, and ecological/environmental factors on faculty's resistance towards technology adoption.

Political: Quality assessment mechanisms are considered powerful governance tools where the government can enhance its role to regulate higher education (Austin & Jones, 2015). Hall University received a capital grant of approximately $50M by the provincial government to help in modernizing its IT infrastructure, facilities and buildings. There has been a pressure on Hall to comply with the quality assurance standards that were enacted by the government such as the regular evaluation reviews of its programs.

Economic: Paulsen (2001) discusses that some higher education institutions might try to efficiently allocate their resources by increasing their expenditure and subsequently improve their learning outcomes. However, achieving efficient allocation of resources is very difficult because in such change some people will benefit, and others might suffer. At Hall University, $1.3B were allocated for improving information technology infrastructure and deferred maintenance while $473 million were allocated for research funding. Obviously, this distribution of resources and investments would make educational technologies and curriculum advancement more advantaged than research areas. Therefore, this unfair distribution of resources would lead to greater faculty resistance towards using new technologies. Hall's faculty already believe that purchasing and maintaining IT tools don't add any educational value to their teaching practices (according to a recent faculty survey on the technology training). So, allocating more resources towards IT infrastructure and maintenance increases the frustration of faculty in the presumption that research is less important than technology

Social: Most faculty members at Hall are traditional and follow traditional teaching values. They tend to resist and question any new initiative that might intervene with their teaching principles. Therefore, adopting educational technology into teaching has been resisted by faculty challenging its influence on their teaching mission. Consequently, some faculty members clearly lack the confidence and the required knowledge to incorporate educational technology tools into their teaching.

Technology: Successful technology implementation requires a clear institutional technology vision. Allen and Seaman's study (2008) suggests that academic institutions with supportive technology vision in their strategic planning had the most successful technology implementation. At Hall, faculty seem to feel that educational technology changes are imposed upon them as a result of the institution's lack of vision, unclear objectives and improper guidelines of technology initiatives. These facts discourage faculty to use Hall's educational technology tools.

Ecological/Environmental: Storburg & Torraco-Walker (2004) discuss that change in higher education can be successfully implemented if faculty including sub-groups in management, students and staff are consulted and involved in the change process. However, at Hall, efforts to implement change have been rapid and the leadership team has not yet taken the required time to consult other parties with regards to new initiatives.

This organizational improvement plan cannot respond to all challenges presented in the PESTE analysis. However, planning will aim to provide faculty with proper guidelines and knowledge to be able to react to change.

Guiding Questions

As already stated, the problem of practice addressed in this OIP is the need to encourage faculty towards adopting educational technology tools into teaching at Hall University. In exploring the problem, complex realities related to the existing technology training programs have emerged. My efforts to recommend a feasible solution to the problem have led to further lines of inquiry related to faculty's technology resistance. Three lines of inquiry will be discussed in this section.

In considering the frequent educational technology implementation at Hall and the faculty's low participation in the technology training, the following question of inquiry emerges: Are the continuous educational technology upgrades at Hall contributing to faculty's resistance? The faculty's frustration towards technology implementations in teaching appears to exist because faculty are overwhelmed with large amounts of new technology tools (Campura, 2003). Educational institutions are constantly updating and purchasing new technologies and learning how to use them can be time-consuming for instructors (Moseley, 2015). As soon as instructors start to get acquainted with a new educational technology tool, another one gets updated or purchased by the institution (Thomas & Knezek, 2008). This causes frustration and skepticism about using educational technology tools by faculty who question the value of such tools and the rationale behind learning how to use them (Sangra and Gonzalez-Sanmamed, 2010). In most cases, faculty need to be convinced that these technology innovations bring value to their instruction and curricula (Becta, 2008).

Furthermore, many HE institutions fail to go through a needs assessment phase prior to educational technology implementation (Campora, 2003). Lack of a needs assessment leads to

inadequate implementation and greater resistance (Campura, 2003). Hall University, similar to other HE institutions, tend to focus on quick delivery of technology programs without spending a proper time on planning to accommodate the availability of diverse and numerous educational technology tools.

A second line of inquiry emerging from the problem of practice: Are the elements (content and delivery) of the existing technology training programs influencing faculty's adoption of technology? Faculty's unease with technology can be attributed to inadequate training (Schneckenberg, 2009). Most of the technology training programs available for faculty are focused on the ″how to″ use the new technology tools rather than why using such tools can enhance teaching and learning (Reid, 2014). In higher education, the current technology training for faculty has been designed to suit the needs of performance objectives rather than learning objectives (Zayim et al., 2009). At Hall, the existing technology training seems to lack creativity, collaboration and interpretation as it focuses only on the skills needed to complete the job.

The third line of inquiry stemming from the problem of practice: Can faculty's academic freedom be a contributing factor to the resistance of educational technology use? Faculty tend to claim that their academic freedom is violated when feeling pressured by their administration to accommodate their teaching principles to incorporate technology into the curriculum (Dewey and Duff, 2009). Also, there is a gap in work priorities between executives (profit oriented) and academics (research oriented) where the latter feels that they are under pressure to comply with the executive demands for curriculum accommodation which cater to the student's needs (Giroux, 2002). Therefore, faculty members at Hall seem to challenge the executive demands by complaining that their academic freedom has been breached. Also, faculty's performance is continuously evaluated by the students which affects faculty's salaries and promotions as well as

their morale. The feeling of academic freedom violation -as a result of the institutional practices-appears to widen the resistance towards technological innovations at Hall. Most faculty members believe that their academic freedom is not part of the institution's decision-making process (Giroux, 2002). For example, at Hall University, there were many complaints by faculty about replacing the learning management system (LMS). Faculty seemed to address their academic freedom rights so they can avoid using the new LMS. Furthermore, faculty needed to understand why they weren't involved in the decision making for purchasing a new LMS.

When developing the change plan, other pragmatic questions emerge such as: 1. How can faculty be motivated to embrace the cultural shift? 2. How can the long-term wins for change be evaluated? The lines of inquiry will be either grounded in the development of the plan or presented as recommended areas for further study.

Leadership-focused Vision for Change

This section focuses on comparing the envisioned future state with the existing realities of the problem. The goal of this OIP is to have faculty embrace educational technology implementation. Through the proposed practices of adaptive and distributed leadership, it is anticipated that faculty's technology adoption in teaching will improve faculty's technological knowledge and enhance the student's learning experience (Prensky, 2007; Lonn and Teasley, 2009).

Faculty's Technological Confidence

Technologically skilled faculty members apply deep and integrated knowledge when creating their own instruction (Keengwe et al., 2009). The acquisition of technological proficiency helps faculty members to bring innovation to the classroom such as providing

effective and appealing curriculum or creating digital and multimedia educational experiences (Keengwe et al., 2009). While some faculty members at Hall seem to believe that using educational technology tools are time-consuming, digital communication and technology save instructors time and effort in their teaching journey (Gautreau, 2011).

Currently, some faculty members at Hall seem to rely on print or digital material that are stored on their individual computers which takes time to update and maintain (Gautreau, 2011). With the use of educational technology tools such as a learning management system (LMS), faculty can store and update their course content in one location (Lonn and Teasely, 2009). As well, they can easily design interactive learning activities, send and return assignments to students as well as share content with their colleagues (Lonn and Teasely, 2009).

Also, the technology training courses offered at Hall seem to be time consuming. Faculty are already overloaded with other teaching and research tasks and might not have the time to participate in new training programs or initiatives. Often, faculty's time for the increased workload is not paid. Therefore, attending training initiatives or preparing for courses that require technology integration becomes a burden which leads to faculty's frustration and lack of motivation. Consequently, there is a significant number of faculty members at Hall who lack technological confidence. When faculty are offered adequate technology training that includes the practical experience as well as the rationale behind using educational technology, they will be motivated to participate in the training (An and Reigeluth, 2011).

The Student's Experience

Students nowadays rely heavily on technology in their daily lives such as the internet, mobile phones, social media environments and instant messaging (US Department of Education,

2017). Thus, using these technologies in learning can facilitate student's knowledge and enhance their learning experience (Prensky, 2007). These learners, as Prensky (2007) called them ″Digital Natives″, process information quickly, multi-task efficiently, access information in multidimensional ways and have low tolerance for traditional-based learning.

Therefore, faculty members need to acquire efficient technological literacy that is compatible with the student's technological experience (US Department of Education, 2017). Currently, at Hall, a significant number of faculty members seem to lack the required technology skills that provide the best learning experience for students. While these faculty members lack relevant technological skills; faculty's mission is to provide the best learning experience for students (Caruso and Kvavik, 2005). When faculty learn about the power of technology, they will become motivated to adopt educational technologies and abstain from questioning the value of technology implementation (Bristow, 2009). Consequently, it is anticipated that faculty will try to produce the best learning experience for students (Bristow, 2009).

Priorities for Change

There are two main priorities for change in this OIP: First, reshaping the existing organizational culture from working in silos to working collaboratively and second, building an environment of trust between the leadership team and faculty members.

Collaborative Organizational Culture

Currently, faculty members at Hall appear to believe that educational technology changes are forced upon them by their institution. Based on a technology training satisfaction survey, faculty seem to think there is a poor technology vision, unclear objectives and improper guidelines for technology initiatives that impede their motivation towards using such technologies. Moreover,

there seems to be a lack of collaboration between Hall's leadership and faculty members who are not involved in the strategic planning including decisions about new initiatives and resource allocation. In simple terms, Hall's leadership and faculty members seem to work in silos that further separates the divide between academics and executives.

Based on the distributed leadership approach that promotes collaboration, this OIP seeks to enhance the relationship between academics and the management team by creating opportunities for collaboration. Collaboration between academics and executives is one of the most effective elements in achieving change implementation in any educational institution (Jones et al., 2012). Involving faculty in the educational technology decision making will facilitate the implementation process and enhance technology adoption in the classroom (Kennedy et al., 2008). Therefore, Hall leaders will be encouraged to work with their individual teams conjointly through negotiating consensus, making decisions and discussing new initiatives (Gronn, 2002).

Building Trust

Trust between faculty and their leadership must be nurtured for establishing a collaborative organizational culture. Building trust through strong and supportive relationships is part of the adaptive leadership practices that will be incorporated in this OIP. Getting to know the employees and try to understand their roles, responsibilities, perspectives and value their input are key in establishing organizational trust (Northouse, 2016). Gaining the trust of Hall's faculty can be achieved through empathizing with their needs. A goal of this OIP is to help faculty realize that their leaders are one of them and they are all working together to achieve Hall's mission. By establishing an environment of trust, Hall's faculty will value and embrace

technology adoption because their roles are identified and their perspectives are acknowledged (Gordon & Hartman, 2009).

Change Drivers

In this OIP, the main change drivers to promote faculty's collaboration and technology adoption are the leadership team and some faculty members who favor the change and the actions of the implementation team. Supportive faculty members can work with change agents to promote change and spread the word about the benefits of educational technology implementation. As for the role of upper management, their actions can be related to creating a clear and new technology vision. Upper management's role, in the change process, is to frame the new vision without forcing it upon stakeholders (Murphy, 2015). This entails collaborating with faculty and receiving their perceptions and ideas about creating the new vision.

<div align="center">

Organizational Change Readiness

</div>

Organizational readiness for change assesses whether all levels of the organization are willing and capable of enacting change (Weiner, 2009). To evaluate change readiness, Rate the Organizational Readiness to Change questionnaire (Cawsey et al., 2016) will be used. The questionnaire consists of six dimensions with a total of 35 questions. The dimensions are as follows: previous change experience, executive support, credible leadership and change champions, openness to change, rewards for change, and measures for change and accountability. The cumulative score of the questionnaire ranges from -10 to +35. If the organization scores below 10, it means there is no readiness for change and the dimensions will help change agents highlight the areas that need to be improved. The higher the score, the more

of an indication that the organization is ready for change (Cawsey et al., 2016). The results of the readiness assessment are explained as follows:

Previous change experience: For this dimension, Hall's university score is -2 since existing faculty members are not willing to change the status quo. Previous change initiatives in the organization seemed to be resisted by faculty due to lack of trust in the institution's decision-making process.

Executive support: The score is 2 for this dimension as the upper management team is providing a great support for encouraging faculty members to embrace technology adoption. Senior managers seem to have a clear picture of the future and willing to sponsor the change.

Credible leadership and change champions: Despite the lack of trust in senior leaders, they are still willing to invest time and resources to achieve change goals collectively. As well, middle managers are providing their support by transmitting the senior leader's enthusiasm to the rest of the organization about the new change goals. So, the score for this dimension is 6.

Openness to Change: The culture of Hall University is very hierarchical. The process of decision making follows a top-down approach. So, there is a lack of innovative environment and creativity. On the positive side, faculty members seem to voice their opinions passionately and address their concerns clearly. Moreover, Hall has many communication venues that allow faculty members to share their opinions and concerns freely. So, the score for this dimension is high (7) which facilitates a smooth change.

Rewards for change: The score for this dimension is 2. Even though there is no reward system at Hall, faculty will be provided with plenty of resources to guide them through the change process.

Measures for change and accountability: There is some institutional data- results from a technology training satisfaction survey by faculty- that contributes to the assessment of the need for change. Still, there is a lack of a comprehensive institutional data. The score for this dimension is 1.

The overall score of the Rate the Organizational Readiness to Change questionnaire is 18 which suggests that Hall University is ready for change. However, there are some areas that might hamper change readiness such as lack of trust in senior leaders. Despite the usefulness of the Cawsey et al (2016) questionnaire in terms of measuring the readiness for change in any given institution, an individual's readiness for change is key as well (Weiner, 2009). This change plan will not measure faculty's readiness for change. Therefore, I anticipate that some faculty members will not be ready for change and their opinions might be a barrier for the proposed change plan.

Forces that Shape Change

External forces: Cawsey et al (2016) consider that "external political landscape of an organization is a reality that change leaders need to pay attention to and figure out how to engage" (p.30). Governmental rules and regulations on HE institutions are examples of external political forces that influence change (Austin & Jones, 2016). Hall University received grants and funding from the government to improve its IT infrastructure and facilities. Therefore, Hall is under pressure to comply with the government quality assurance standards. The university goes through regular evaluation reviews of its programs to monitor the progress of IT infrastructure implementations that might not serve the proposed change plan.

Internal Forces: There are two main internal forces that will support the change plan at Hall University. First, faculty's collaboration and intention to be involved in the technology implementation process. According to Bolman and Deal (2013), as part of the human frame standpoint, leaders should address their employees concerns and needs so they become encouraged to participate in change initiatives. This OIP will encourage the leadership of Hall to work with faculty members who support technology adoption to spread the word about their involvement and collaboration in educational technology implementation. This encourages other faculty members who are against the change to become more motivated and participate in the change plan. Also, this OIP will engage Hall leaders to work as drivers for change since they already demonstrated their support of this change project. The contribution of Hall leaders can be related to creating an environment of trust between the leadership team and faculty.

Conclusion

Chapter 1 introduced Hall's problem of practice which is centered on the faculty's resistance towards using educational technology tools in teaching. The chapter elaborated on the reasons why change is needed by providing a brief history of the problem and different perspectives from the literature. The influence of neoliberalism on higher education was discussed from the perspective of organizational theory. Moreover, the chapter explained the gap between the current practices of technology-based teaching and how the future can be improved by focusing on faculty's technology confidence and student's learning experience. The next chapter will examine the leadership approach to change and development as well as a framework for leading the change process.

Chapter Two: Planning and Development

Chapter two is centered around the planning and development of the change process. This includes integrating adaptive and distributed leadership approaches that promote adaptability to change and collaboration between faculty members and the leadership team. The framework for leading the change process is examined through the Kotter Eight Step Model (1996, 2012) which is relevant to Hall's culture. A critical organizational analysis is presented through an in-depth examination of needed changes by analyzing the current state of technology adoption at Hall and the desired change outcomes. Moreover, chapter two discusses three possible solutions for the problem of practice taking into consideration their benefits, challenges and needed resources. The chapter ends with addressing the ethical implications of the change plan and how my ethical leadership practices will move the change forward.

Leadership Approaches to Change

As discussed in chapter one, adaptive and distributed leadership approaches will assist faculty members at Hall University to embrace technology implementation in their teaching. This section discusses examples of how these two leadership practices can be applied.

Adaptive Leadership

According to Buller (2015), change needs time to be implemented successfully, therefore, adaptive leaders tend to slow down the change process by using six behavioral strategies that deemed effective in accomplishing robust organizational change, as identified by Heifetz (1994). These strategies are as follows: First, get on the balcony. Second, identify the adaptive challenge. Third, regulate distress. Fourth, maintain disciplined attention. Fifth, give the work back to the people and sixth, protect leadership voices from below. These adaptive leadership behaviors are considered as a general guideline for assisting followers to deal

with organizational challenges and accomplish successful changes (Miller, 2015). While all these behaviors are considered effective for organizational change (Miller, 2015), my OIP will address only the "Get on the balcony" and "Regulate distress" as needed behavioral leadership changes that are relevant to Hall's context. In this OIP, it will be necessary to encourage the leadership team to adopt these two strategies as ways of moving the change forward. Get on the balcony entails observing and understanding individuals' reactions to change and receiving a clear idea of their perceptions. As for regulating distress, it means helping individuals accept change without overwhelming them with the change. Prior to implementing changes in the organization, the management team demonstrates the importance and the value of the change for individuals to avoid disruption. Managers also seek individual's feedback to attain their opinions, feelings and perceptions about the change.

Moreover, adaptive leadership promotes strong and supportive relationships through cultivating trust, transparency and open communication (Northouse, 2016).

Cultivating trust. Trust in the leadership of the organization is needed to accomplish successful change (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011). Trust is not created randomly, it needs nurturing and care (Smylie et al., 2007). For example, the management team has to get to know their employees and try to understand their roles, responsibilities, perspectives and value their input (Cosner, 2009). Gaining the trust of individuals can be achieved through empathizing with their needs and protecting their interests (Cosner, 2009). Also, building trust is about creating collaborative opportunities in the organization through discussing new initiatives and receiving employees' concerns and aspirations (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011). Effective leaders are those who gain the trust of their employees by creating opportunities for sharing opinions and concerns and involving others in the decision-making process (Kennedy et al., 2008). When the management team supports their employees to voice their feelings about the change and is available to

respond to their concerns, this approach will assist in reducing resistance towards the change process (Kennedy et al., 2008).

Transparency. A collaborative and sharing environment is necessary where individuals from different departments work together to achieve a common goal without working in silos (Wallace, 2018). Such work environment is usually supported by transparent and honest transmission of information from senior management to employees (Wallace, 2018). If leaders do not have the right answers when things are not working, it is important to communicate this fact clearly with their employees. A productive work environment is honest and genuine where leaders and their employees have a common organizational vision and goal (Hirschi & Jones, 2009). Therefore, it will be essential to promote transparent and clear communication between faculty members and the leadership team to move the change forward.

Open communication. According to Schroeder (2017), open communication in organizations means encouraging employees to share their perspectives and create their own networks to facilitate the information exchange. This includes promoting social relationships through informal meetings, success celebration events, retreats and outings (Northouse, 2016).

Aside from building social relationships, Heiftez (1994) argues that open dialogue can flourish in a ″holding environment″ that promotes protection and safety for employees. Individuals in such environment can share their perspectives and ideas in a time of change or crisis (Heiftez, 1994). In the context of Hall University, a protective environment can be achieved by building different communication channels to link faculty with the management team and other individuals in the organization.

Distributed leadership

According to Marshall (2006), the distributed leadership approach is useful when dealing with leadership challenges in higher education. He continues that distributed leadership is a ″complex, multifaceted process that must focus on the development of individuals as well as the organizational contexts in which they are called to operate″ (Marshall, 2006, p.5). Thus, the distributed leadership approach is helpful for complex organizational change since it supports collaboration between formal leaders and their employees to achieve successful changes (Jones et al., 2012). Promoting collaboration and trust within teams by distributed leaders contribute to the efficacy of decision making within an organization. Teams with such leaders work well together and make effective decisions than those with different leadership styles (Jones et al., 2012).

As this improvement plan promotes a distributed leadership approach at Hall University, collaboration is essential and supported through reinforcing cooperative relationships between cross-functional teams (Supovitz & Tognatta, 2013). These teams consist of the management group and different faculty members working together towards common values and ideas. Identifying common values and practices by diverse groups within the organization are considered most effective in boosting collaboration (Supovitz & Tognatta, 2013). Using the distributed leadership approach, teams don't have a formal leader and all team members including the official leader work together to make decisions through negotiations and reaching a consensus (Mehra et al., 2006). These democratic and collaborative practices of leadership are needed at Hall University since the existing decision-making process is usually limited to the management team. Therefore, this change plan proposes incorporating collaborative opportunities between faculty and the

management team to allow for sharing common technology values and vision that could help in facilitating technology adoption.

The attributes of the adaptive and distributed leadership styles complement each other and lend well to address complex organizational change (Heifetz et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2012). Hence, the change approach in this OIP is informed by these two leadership styles focusing on the adaptive and collaborative work that is needed at Hall University. Such work environment needs a relevant change framework which will be addressed in the following section.

Framework for Leading the Change Process

The type of change represented in this OIP is considered anticipatory since change is happening as a result of the influence of the external environment on the internal one (Nadler & Tushman, 1990). For Hall University, the influence of neoliberalism on education could be considered as an external event that is influencing the teaching practices of higher education (Olssen & Peters, 2005). In the case of anticipatory change, the leadership team decides to react to an external event by anticipating transformations that could provide competitive gains to the organization (Nadler & Tushman, 1990). This is applicable to Hall since the leadership team initiated a transformation in faculty's attitude towards educational technology adoption which includes a competitive advantage to the university by enhancing its profile in the marketplace.

Furthermore, executing organizational changes under neoliberalism require effective strategic management including ″appropriate cultural values, teamwork and leadership″ (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 323). To this end, implementing a proper change model that caters to Hall's external and internal environment is vital. There are many change models considered helpful for leaders and change agents for executing the change process (Cervone, 2013). The literature

discusses several change models that are efficient for organizational change such as the Lewin

change theory (1997), Duck's five-stage change curve (2001) and the Kotter Eight-Step model

(1996). Change agents typically use a change model that is relevant to the organization,

individuals and type of change needed (Buller, 2016). For example, the Lewin change model is

considered very rational and goal oriented which is suitable for authoritarian type of

organizations (Cawsey et al., 2016). It is also considered one of the earliest change models

(McAleese et al., 2013).

The Lewin change model ensures a successful change implementation through group

dynamics and directing individuals to accept new norms, situations and actions (Burnes, 2004).

According to Cummings et al (2016), the Lewin change model is effective since it focuses on

planned processes where managerial direction is leveraged to help individuals embrace the

change regardless of any hurdles involved in the process.

The first level in Lewin's model is unfreezing which means addressing the need for

change in the system. The second level is change where individuals within the organization

enact the new change approaches. By adopting these new approaches, performance becomes

more effective (Cummings et al., 2016). The third level is refreezing where the change is

integrated, and the new state is ″refrozen″ for another period.

The Lewin's change model has been criticized by many researchers as linear and

incorporates pre-planned change steps that move in a fixed state (Bamford & Forrester, 2003).

Furthermore, the model is considered rigid and lacks flexibility that is needed in today's

organizations where they operate in non-linear environments (Bamford & Forrester, 2003). This

means that organizations function in fast-paced systems where the influence of globalization and

free markets are constantly accommodated (By, 2005). Thus, organizational change is difficult to manage in such work environments (By, 2005). The Lewin change model doesn't seem to be suitable nor effective for today's organizations (Graetz et al., 2011). Furthermore, the last step in the model, refreezing, is not productive since it aims at refreezing change that contradicts with the dynamic and changeable nature of organizations that rely on innovation and open learning (Graetz et al., 2011).

While the change process of the Lewin change model is very straightforward and system oriented; it doesn't address the individual's emotions within the organization (Manchester, 2014). Ignoring the human experiences and behaviors in the change process can lead to negative consequences (Manchester, 2014). In the context of my OIP, Lewin change model is not relevant since it seems to lack adaptability to future changes. As indicated, the last level of the model affirms that change needs to be refrozen instead of adapting to new environments and improving constantly. This contradicts with the goal of my OIP which promotes adaptability to change and continuous educational technology learning.

On the other hand, Duck's Five-Stage Change Curve focuses on the individual's emotional and behavioral responses to the change process (Cawsey et al., 2016). As outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016), these five stages are:

1. Stagnation: This stage is where individuals are too comfortable and accustomed to their roles. Demand for change comes from external forces or a strong internal leader. Therefore, it is the role of the leader to direct the change and help these individuals learn about their new roles and responsibilities.

2. Preparation: Begins with a dramatic announcement of change from an internal person such as the CEO, or from an external force, such as an announcement of a takeover. While some people feel worried and nervous about the change, others feel excited and hopeful. This stage needs a significant time of preparation and planning for the change to succeed.

3. Implementation is when the change process starts. This includes organizational restructuring, new job descriptions and other logistics. As well, change implementation requires a change in the individual's mindsets, behaviors, work practices and habits.

4. Determination is when people realize that the change is real and they will have to work differently. This transformation might lead to resistance where leaders need to step in and pursue the new vision with high energy and enthusiasm.

5. Fruition is the time when the hard work pays off and the organization seems new. Then individuals feel confident, energized and perform effectively and efficiently. In this case, leaders make sure that this work efficiency and energy is continuous and avoid future stagnation.

While Duck's model takes into consideration the human aspect of change (Duck, 2001), implementing changes can still be very complex. This model is not relevant to my OIP since it is too focused on the human and emotional aspect rather than the organizational one. Also, human emotions are unpredictable and, contrary to Duck's argument, individuals don't react the same way in the time of change (McEwan et al., 2010). As a matter of fact, savvy leaders are the ones who monitor their own behavioral reactions to change so they can predict the emotional response of others and direct them from the negative state to the positive one (Whiteside et al., 2006).

In the context of my OIP, the Kotter 8-step model (1996) appears to be most relevant to the goals of the PoP. John Kotter was a professor of Leadership at the Harvard Business School who created a model for leading change that is considered an effective tool in organizational change studies (Stagalas, 2010). Unlike other models that focus on implementing rapid and descriptive changes such as Lewin and Duck change models (Cawsey et al, 2016), the Kotter model prepares people for the change and equips change agents with effective tools to make change permanent (Appelbaum et al., 2012). According to Buller (2015), the Kotter model is considered a highly influential change framework since it is applicable to many work environments.

The Kotter model helps leaders, practitioners, decision-makers and stakeholders to deal with challenging work environments and ultimately achieve fundamental changes in the organization (Appelbaum et al., 2012). Proponents of the Kotter model indicate that this approach is logical and efficient during the change process (Langton & Robbins, 2010) such as helping organizations to align planned change with strategic priorities set by upper management (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1989).

As discussed, the Kotter (1996) 8-stage model will be used as a structure for leading change in this improvement plan. This involves determining the challenges related to faculty's resistance towards technology, develop a detailed action plan for the needed changes, formulate a support system for faculty during change implementation and finally instituting the change. I will be working with the faculty committee who are the preliminary group to receive the change before institutionalizing it. Also, I will be working with a group of change agents to implement the needed changes. The Kotter (1996) 8-stage model provides a clear guidance for the change efforts and ensures sound transformations (Stagalas, 2010).

Stage One

Establish a sense of urgency: According to Kotter (2007) creating a sense of urgency is crucial to warrant collaborative activities. Managers address the need for change so individuals within the organization understand the necessity for the change. Also, Kotter (2007) recommends creating ″a crisis″ to explain the urgent need for change. In the context of this OIP, any plan would involve partnering with the IT management team who is responsible for technology implementation and communicating to stakeholders the dangers that the organization might encounter if technology is not adopted by faculty. In this stage, a consensus in favor of change should begin to emerge.

Stage Two

Create a guiding coalition: The coalition is a group of individuals with different roles and wide representations within the organization such as leaders, stakeholders, team members and early adopters. The goal of this coalition is to provide help and support during the change process. In the case of Hall, a group of champions (faculty members who are adopters of the project) can influence other faculty members by promoting the shift from a traditional curriculum to a technology-based one.

Stage Three

Develop a change vision. The focus in this stage is on creating a clear, easy and genuine vision that includes the desired state of change which is faculty's technology adoption. This work involves collaborating with the champions group (faculty representatives) along with members in the management team. The goal of the collaboration efforts would be to reach a common technology vision statement and plan.

Stage Four

Communicate the vision for buy-in: Once the desired technology vision is in place, managers would communicate this vision to the rest of the organization. For Hall, this means providing a clear, consistent, and focused communication that gives space for faculty members to address their concerns openly and genuinely.

Stage Five

Empower broad-based action: At this point, change action is created. Also, an incentive–reward system is developed to motivate individuals to participate in the change process. Since a reward program is involved, Hall University might need to provide financial support for faculty to aid the change process such as monetary compensations for attending technology training.

Stage Six

Generate short-term wins. Change takes a lot of time to implement, therefore, managers need to keep the momentum by celebrating small milestones during the change process. This approach spreads a sense of enthusiasm and positivity to help for a transformational change.

Stage Seven

Never let up. Using the short-term wins to move the change forward, all staff are prepared for the new change. At Hall, intensive communication is needed in this stage to ensure that faculty members are ready for the change.

Stage Eight

Incorporate changes into the culture. At this point of the change process, technology adoption should be part of the institution's culture.

As the Kotter model is a structured approach to move change forward, the following section

addresses the needed changes by analyzing the current state and the desired change state at Hall University.

Critical Organization Analysis

As discussed in chapter one, neoliberalism focuses on increasing profit and revenue such as investing millions of dollars for implementing educational technology tools with the goal of providing high quality education. These technologies serve the university's reputation in the marketplace and ensure a higher student enrollment rate that generates monetary purposes (Busch, 2017). Often times, some faculty members resist these transformations by questioning the value and influence of technology on their teaching principles (Giroux, 2002).

Faculty's resistance towards technology use is causing two main challenges at Hall University: lack of faculty's technological competence and ineffective student's experience (as per the technology training survey results).

Faculty's technological competence: As discussed previously, based on the existing educational technology training survey, a significant number of faculty members resist using educational technology tools at Hall because they seem to lack the proper technology knowledge and skills. Resistant faculty tend to depend on traditional teaching methods such as using print material which is time consuming to update and maintain (Gautreau, 2011). Using educational technology tools such as a learning management system (LMS), faculty can maintain their course content and communicate with students more effectively through interactive messaging and learning activities (Lonn & Teasely, 2009).

Hall already offers some technology training courses for faculty to improve their educational technology skills. It is worth noting that only new instructors sign up for these

courses as part of their employee onboarding program. Hall training records show that the existing and senior faculty members have lower number of registrations than new faculty. This may well be because existing faculty are already overwhelmed with teaching and research tasks. Thus, attending non-paid training might not be motivating (An and Reigeluth, 2011). Moreover, the existing technology training at Hall seems to focus on the practical knowledge without incorporating the institutional rationale behind educational technology implementation. Therefore, most faculty members at Hall resist such implementation because they appear to distrust their institution by questioning the true motives behind instructional technology efforts (as per the existing educational technology survey). Faculty tend to believe that the decision to update existing educational technologies is attributed to commercial and market demands rather than an educational need (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).

According to (Miller et al., 2000; Friel et al., 2009) the factors that inhibit faculty from adopting technology into teaching are personal, institutional and emotional. The personal experience of faculty members relates to confidence of traditional teaching methods and their unwillingness to change their concept of teaching (Weston, 2005). However, the organizational barrier includes lack of incentives for faculty to encourage them to change their medium of instruction to a technology-based one (Weston, 2005). As well, organizations that lack proper technology implementation, strategic planning and effectively framing educational technology initiatives are likely to face strong resistance from faculty members (Bates, 2003). As for the emotional factor, faculty members especially those who are inept at using technologies can be anxious to integrate technology into their teaching (Friel et al., 2009). The reason behind faculty's anxiety is fear of failure and losing their credibility among their peers (Friel et al., 2009).

It is encouraging to note that when trust is established by offering faculty adequate technology training that underpins the institutional technology vision, faculty become more confident about adopting technology-based teaching (Keengwe et al., 2009).

Student learning experience: One of Hall's strategic objectives is enhancing the student experience through implementing technology in the classroom and providing online programs. Students nowadays depend heavily on technology in their daily lives and they are more receptive to curriculum that involves technology tools (Presnky, 2007). Faculty members need to know how to use these instructional technology tools to enhance the student's participation and experience in the classroom (Prensky, 2007). As well, in today's marketplace technologically literate employees are needed, so students should have plenty of opportunities to use technology prior to their graduation (Caruso and Kvavik, 2005). Even though faculty's mission is to provide the best learning experience for students (Bristow, 2009), faculty members at Hall seem to be struggling with technology adoption that helps in providing such a learning experience. Faculty appear to question the rationale behind technology adoption and the influence it has on teaching and learning. As indicated, the results of the satisfaction technology training survey, most faculty seem to distrust their organizational leadership believing that incorporating technology into teaching has been forced upon them by their institution. Faculty members at Hall need a clear and genuine technology vision to be able to trust their organizational leaders who constantly promote technology initiatives.

As discussed in chapter one, the change readiness findings revealed a need for a cultural shift from working in silos to working collaboratively. A cultural shift requires creating opportunities of collaboration between faculty and the management team through involving faculty in the strategic planning process and consulting with them regarding technology

initiatives (Kennedy et al., 2008). When the management team involves faculty members in the educational technology decision making, they become encouraged to adopt technology in their teaching (Kennedy et al., 2008). Clearly, Hall needs an established environment of trust to ensure faculty's technology competency, enhanced student experience and collaboration between faculty and the management team. The following section elaborates on the need of trust in today's organizations and how it can be developed at Hall University.

Organizational trust is defined as the employees' willingness to be vulnerable to the organization based on optimistic expectations about their current and future experiences (Robbin & Judge, 2010). Organizational trust facilitates innovative practices, enhances individual's motivation and commitment (Williams, 2001) and most importantly promotes collaboration between different organizational groups (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011). Trust strengthens relationships since it creates an environment of respect for the profession and caring for the needs of others (Cosner, 2009).

Research about trust in higher education stresses the importance of reciprocal trust between the organizational leadership and faculty (Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Smylie et al., 2007; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). When the leadership team doesn't express care and support for the faculty's needs, it is assumed that faculty members will view their leaders similarly (Smylie et al., 2007). Thus, a culture of distrust emerges (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Professional trust which includes care and respect in an organization is usually demonstrated in the collaborative behavior between different organizational groups (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Lack of such collaborative behavior tends to be attributed to distrust in the individual's competence and performance (De Jong & Elfring, 2010). This seems to be the nature of trust relationship at Hall University where there is a lack of collaborative opportunities from the faculty's side to engage

in the educational technology initiatives. Hall's leadership team appears to believe that some

faculty lack the required skills to use the best suitable educational technology tools in their

teaching. When trust is low, the environment for improving collaborative behaviors is limited

and faculty members will most likely be discouraged to participate in the change process (Holste

& Fields, 2010). Therefore, promoting an organizational trust through supporting collaborative

practices and mutual respect between the leadership team and faculty is needed at Hall

University. Primary steps in the improvement plan would be working with early adopters and

faculty members who support technology adoption to encourage other faculties to participate in

the change process. According to (Gillard et al., 2008), early adopters are considered as change

agents who exhibit both the motivation and the skills needed to assist in advancing the change

process.

Interpersonal Trust: Interpersonal trust is a mutual trust-building process between the

individuals involved in such a process (Zucker et al. 1996). These individuals need to open up

about their feelings and learn through social interaction about each other to nurture a trustworthy

relationship (Zucker et al., 1996). To promote interpersonal relationships in the workplace, the

management team requires to create a culture where relationships are valued through caring

about the individual's needs and concerns (Six, 2007). Furthermore, interpersonal trust, whether

trust in management or trust in colleagues, promotes job satisfaction and greater job performance

(Matzler & Renzl, 2006). Therefore, this OIP will encourage nurturing interpersonal trust,

mainly trust in management, to facilitate the adoption of educational technology initiatives by

faculty. Indeed, open communication is key in developing organizational trust and interpersonal

trust which is discussed further in the following section.

Cultivating Trust

Organizational trustworthiness at Hall can be improved through promoting open communication. Several studies have discussed the influence of communication on developing trust relationships within organizations (Dirks, 1999; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Open and sincere communication help individuals exchange information about their objectives, life goals, interests and problems (Wang & Montgomery, 2007). Therefore, an organization can learn about their employees' realities and in return the employees learn more about their organization's priorities and objectives (Eisenberger et al., 2001). This openness helps to build a culture of inclusion that is the basis for professional trustworthiness (Pless & Maak, 2004).

Inclusion of employees means involving them in the decision-making process, consulting them with matters related to their daily tasks, accepting their proposal of new ideas and searching for their consensus (Wang & Montgomery, 2007). Basically, these practices underpin employee's rights, freedom of speech and acknowledge their existence as respected organizational citizens (Wang & Montgomery, 2007). Although some studies argue that inclusion of employees in the decision-making process is not an indication of effective communication (Pucetaite et al., 2010), a number of studies revealed that sincere and open communication ensure a solid platform for establishing organizational trust (Pucetaite et al., 2010). Open communication at Hall can be promoted through leveraging transparency, clarity and honesty in transmitting the information to the rest of the organization. This also entails bringing Hall's faculty and the management team to work together towards a common technology vision and mission.

As organizational trust is considered essential in advancing the change process, three possible solutions are examined in the following section including their benefits, challenges and

resources to ensure successful change implementation.

Possible Solutions for The Problem of Practice

This section includes three proposed solutions to achieve faculty's technology adoption into teaching. These solutions are assessed through presenting their benefits and challenges. One solution is chosen to tackle the problem of practice and improve the current state of technology adoption at Hall University.

Solution One: Maintaining the Status Quo

The first solution to faculty's technology resistance at Hall and their low participation in the technology training is to keep the status quo. Currently, the IT department at Hall University offers tremendous technology training support including hands on experience, one on one consultation services and online tutorials. However, based on a recent survey by faculty, the results showed that faculty members are discouraged to adopt technology into their teaching or even use some of the available training resources. One of Hall's strategic objectives is to provide the best technology training experience for faculty especially that the university invested millions of dollars to upgrade and implement educational technology tools. The weak participation of faculty in the educational technology training led the management team to explore why technology has not been adopted by faculty. Also, the new learning management system (LMS) implementation seems to be the most significant technology initiative at Hall with purchasing costs reached to more than one million dollars without factoring in the allocation of resources such as time, staff, system maintenance, training, logistics and so on. Thus, keeping the status quo would suggest that no change or improvements would be made for technology adoption in

the classroom. This means that faculty would continue resisting technology initiatives and avoid attending the existing training that enhances their educational technology skills.

Benefits and challenges: Faculty members seem to be very comfortable using the old LMS, some of them complained to the IT department about purchasing a new LMS while the old one was working well. Clearly, keeping the status quo would not cause any disruption to faculty's teaching activities.

Moreover, faculty seem to believe that their institution is pressuring them to incorporate technology into their teaching. They addressed some concerns about a violation of their academic freedom when they were asked to adjust their curriculum taking into consideration the new LMS. If the status quo is maintained, faculty wouldn't feel pressured to use technology in teaching nor would it disturb their academic freedom . On the other hand, some challenges related to technology competency and student's learning experience might arise.

As discussed previously, faculty members who are against attending technology training might eventually lack the proper technology skills that are needed in today's teaching environments (Presnky, 2007). Also, Hall University migrated all the existing courses from the old system into the new one. Therefore, untrained faculty members might have difficulty accessing and navigating into the new system to find and manage their courses.

Furthermore, the student learning experience might be affected if faculty keep resisting technology adoption into the classroom (Caruso & Kvavik, 2005). For example, faculty may have a challenge in dealing with the student's constant reliance on technology for communication, learning and collaboration (US Department of Education, 2017). Students nowadays are technologically savvy and use technology spontaneously in their learning such as using the internet, instant messaging, online social environments and mobile learning (US

Department of Education, 2017). Therefore, faculty who lack a proper technological expertise are not capable of providing effective and successful learning experiences for students (Bristow, 2009).

Resources needed: The maintenance of the status quo doesn't require major resources. However, there is a possibility to hire more IT support staff to respond to faculty's demands for resolving technological issues as a result of faculty's unfamiliarity with the newly implemented tools. Despite the flexibility of keeping the status quo and not disrupting faculty's teaching practices, this approach is not useful for Hall University. If improvements are not suggested, the problem of practice will continue to exist.

Solution Two: Creating a Reward System

A second possible solution is creating a reward system for faculty to encourage them to participate in the existing technology training program. As discussed previously, faculty seem to have a low participation rate in the existing training at Hall University. Reasons behind such reaction to training were attributed to lack of time and incentives to attend the training (Abadi et al., 2011). Therefore, this solution proposes creating a reward system that includes either a monetary compensation or a faculty recognition program for participating in the training. Torrington (2009) contends that these rewarding tools will definitely motivate faculty to attend the existing technology training and improve their technological skills that are needed in today's teaching.

Creating a reward system is one of the strategies used by organizations to maintain their well-performing employees and improve the performance of others (Kotelnikov, 2010). The rewards include compensations, recognitions, promotions and non-monetary bonuses; however,

most reward systems within organizations concentrate on two areas: compensation and recognition (Kotelnikov, 2010).

Compensation: This includes performance bonuses, special gifts, extra vacation time and paid overtime where eligibility for rewarding employees is based on exemplary performance or working extra hours (Finkle 2011). In the case of Hall University, faculty members who participate in the technology training can be rewarded for working overtime. Consequently, faculty would hopefully become more motivated to attend the training and gain the required skills that help them to adopt technology in their teaching.

Recognition: This entails a manager to employee or peer to peer recognition for a positive behavior or an achieved accomplishment (Sarvadi, 2010). Also, recognition includes appreciation by showing gratitude to employees for their actions (Sarvadi, 2010). If compensation or paying faculty overtime for attending training is too complex to implement, perhaps a faculty recognition program can be an alternative.

Benefits and Challenges: Hall University should consider motivational factors for faculty to encourage them to participate in training programs related to their teaching practices (Gautreau, 2011). Usually, salary and recognition are the most prominent extrinsic motivational factors that influence faculty's decision to adopt technological innovations into their teaching (Gautreau, 2011). A reward system is essential for faculty since it motivates them to participate in the training and gain the required technological knowledge (Bates, 2000). It also helps to accomplish organizational goals and objectives by providing quality learning experience for students.

While a reward system is beneficial for both faculty members and the organization, it can be challenging to implement (Wilson, 2003). There is no standard framework for designing a reward system that can be used in different organizations (Wilson, 2003). In fact, it is very

complex to create taking into consideration the environment, types of rewards, employees' values and behaviors as well as costs (Hartman et al, 1994). Proponents of intrinsic motivation argue that extrinsic motivation such as salary and recognition do not guarantee a long-term motivation (Schoeffler, 2005). However, the intrinsic motivation supports continuous productive performance through passion and innovation (Garlick, 2009). Employees who keep receiving the same extrinsic motivation will lose interest and reason to perform better in the future which could cause performance and financial challenges in the organization (Schoeffler, 2005).

Resources needed: HR time and services are definitely needed to build a reward system that is relevant to Hall's performance expectations and metrics. Working with the management team and the faculty committee, HR would identify the reward system requirements to be implemented. The rewards can involve one or more of these areas: bonuses, promotions, extra vacation time, gifts or simply a congratulatory letter from the management team. Finally, HR would have to complete all the needed paperwork in timely manner.

Aside from HR time and services, there is a significant cost associated with building a reward system (Njanja et al., 2013). Currently at Hall there are about 1,684 faculty members who need to be trained on how to use Hall's educational technology tools. A reward system would need a substantial budget especially if the monetary compensation is chosen. However, recognition is less costly to implement. But there is no guarantee that faculty would attend the existing technology training if monetary value is not involved (Njanja et al., 2013). Therefore, creating a reward system as a solution doesn't seem flexible to implement since it requires great costs for planning and execution. I don't think that Hall University is ready to dedicate a great budget for resolving the current problem of practice. Hall's budget is mainly targeted for research and teaching purposes as well as updating the organization's IT infrastructure. The

senior management team doesn't seem to be prepared to provide financial compensation or institute a faculty recognition program.

Solution Three: Incorporating a Technology Vision into the Existing Training

A third solution to the problem of practice is to incorporate a technology vision into the existing training. As discussed previously, faculty seem to believe that the existing training is very practical and doesn't include the vision or the rationale behind technology implementation. Based on a recent survey conducted by most faculty members at Hall, the results indicated that faculty needed to understand the value of technology initiatives. In addition to why Hall keeps upgrading its educational technology tools while the old ones work well. This solution proposes creating a technology vision to be shared in the existing training. Currently, the existing technology training at Hall consists of 3.5 hours of hands on experience per tool except for the learning management system (LMS) training that is broken down into 10 modules. Each module is about a separate feature or a tool in the LMS that also consists of 3.5 hrs of training. So, the solution proposes that the IT department team who is responsible for creating the technology training adds a technology vision section into the beginning of each training (or module). This section should be about 30-minute presentation by the trainer discussing the elements of the new technology vision. Such elements include: the technology vision statement, why Hall University is investing in new technologies and how it is important for the organization and faculty's teaching practices.

Benefits and Challenges: Successful technology implementation requires a clear and concise institutional technology vision (Keengwe et al., 2009). Once this vision is created which also includes explicit organizational objectives and proper interpretation of technology

initiatives, faculty might feel encouraged to use technology in their teaching (Keengwe et al., 2009). Moreover, a clear and genuine vision promotes trust and collaboration between faculty and their institution (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). One of the main requirements of creating a genuine vision is involving different individuals who are impacted by the change process (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). In the case of Hall University, this requires collaboration between faculty and the management team to achieve change successfully. Currently, faculty members seem to resist technology adoption believing that educational technology changes are imposed upon them by their institution that lacks a clear technology vision. Incorporating a new technology vision in the existing training would facilitate technology adoption especially if faculty are involved in the communication process and informed about the value of change (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).

Creating a technology vision requires collaboration between the IT management team who are responsible for communicating the new vision in the training, the faculty committee and representatives from the executive team mainly the Chief information officer (CIO). There are gaps in priorities between the executive team who are profit oriented and the faculty committee who are research oriented (Giroux, 2002). The interests of the executive team are to maximize revenue through creating a unique profile for Hall University in the local and international marketplace to attract a high rate of student enrolments (Giroux, 2002). Therefore, implementing advanced technological tools that facilitate the new generation's learning experience supports the profitable purposes of the executive team (Dewey & Duff, 2009). This contradicts with faculty's mission of enhancing research and quality education (O'Sullivan, 2013). Hence, there is a possibility that the executive team and the faculty committee would have conflictual ideas related to the new and clear technology vision. This means that this new vision might not be accepted by some faculty members.

Resources needed: Incorporating the technology vision into the existing training doesn't require a major resource allocation. The IT department who is responsible for designing and delivering educational technology training can assign an instructional designer to manage the integration of the technology vision part into the training. Currently, there are five full time instructional designers who work under the IT training manager. So, there is no need to hire an additional instructional designer to join the team. One of the five instructional designers can be the lead on the project.

As well, refreshments are needed in the training to encourage attendance and provide a welcoming environment. The refreshments would likely consist of donuts and coffee for 20 participants with a total of $40 per training session. Currently, there are 10 training sessions scheduled every month, the total budget of refreshments would be $400 per month and $4800 per year. Refreshments can be discontinued in the training few months or one year after change implementation.

The third solution is the most relevant and realistic approach for dealing with the problem of practice and enacting change. Thus, it is the chosen solution and further details regarding its implementation are introduced in chapter three.

The PDSA Model

The improvement plan proposes using the PDSA model for monitoring and evaluating change. The PDSA model provides a structure for developing and evaluating changes that ultimately lead to improvement (Moen, 2009). It consists of 4 cycles:

Plan–Change to be tested or implemented

Do– Perform the actual change test

Study– Measurable outcomes, collect data, compare date (before and after change), reflect on the change data and lessons learned.

Act– Plan for the next change cycle or full implementation

These cycles are assessed on a small scale. Based on the results of these cycle assessments, change agents generate assumptions prior to change implementation. This provides the opportunity to realize if the predicted change will succeed and how to encounter change challenges (Cleghorn & Headrick,1996).

The PDSA cycle is an improvement test that includes iterative and structured process involving continuous learning and using various tools until the problem is improved (Langley et al., 2009). This is where theory and practice overlap at all four levels of the cycle by understanding ″variation, psychology, systems thinking and knowledge building towards a common purpose for improvement″ (Langley et al., 2009, p. 88).

The PDSA cycle is entwined with this plan's distributed leadership practices that promote collaboration between the leadership team and faculty members by involving the latter in the decision making. A main requirement in the PDSA cycle is to include internal audience (faculty) by asking for their feedback on what works and what doesn't (Taylor et al., 201). Faculty members in the PDSA cycle should be involved in the change process when appropriate to increase change adoption. While the PDSA cycle provides a structure for monitoring and evaluating the change process, it does not suggest measurement tools (Speroff & O'Connor, 2004). Hence, this OIP proposes designing observation templates and surveys that are helpful for the Do and Study stages since they are responsible for executing change and measuring outcomes.

Leadership Ethics and Organizational Change

Ethical standards in organizations are needed to improve the morale of employees, achieve organizational efficiency and enhance internal relationships through reinforcing moral behaviors and actions (Brown et al., 2005). When leaders adopt ethical standards by adhering to moral principles in making decisions, they are considered fair and just (Yilmaz, 2010). The existing ethical responsibilities at Hall University are congruent with the university's mission in a way that protects all employees' integrity and preserves confidence of the entire Hall's community. As well, all employees are expected to comply with ethical and behavioral principles that foster a culture of respect, trust and inclusion. As the change plan develops, it will take into consideration these ethical standards that are set by Hall University. The adaptive and distributed leadership approaches proposed in the improvement plan strengthen Hall's ethical and behavioral principles through promoting credibility, honesty, trust and inclusion.

Credibility

Credible organizational leaders are the ones with a great knowledge and intelligence who are known to be trustworthy and reliable by their followers (Butko, 2012). Leaders who are identified as credible is determined by their employee's perception of these leaders' behaviors and actions (Butko, 2012). Often, leaders face challenges with regards to communicating change which can influence their credibility (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). The success of the change process depends heavily on the leadership credibility through providing consistent and clear information to employees (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Therefore, this improvement plan seeks to enhance leadership credibility through providing a well-defined technology vision and clearly communicating it with all faculty members.

Honesty

Honest leaders believe in leading by example, they mean what they say and their words are usually aligned with their actions (Schwartz, 2013). According to Northouse (2016): "Honesty is not about telling the truth. It has to do with being open with others and representing reality as full and completely as possible" (p. 346). Thus, open communication is key and effective leaders are those who promote sharing information transparently and openly (Pucetaite et al., 2010). Faculty members at Hall seem to share their honest feelings about technology initiatives with each other only. Faculty appear to be sophisticated and cautious when sharing their opinions with the management team. Incorporating the adaptive leadership approach in this OIP will assist faculty to communicate their ideas and feelings openly with their management team. This includes providing an environment of protection and safety (Heiftez, 1994) where many communication channels are built to strengthen information sharing and relationships between faculty and the leadership team (Schroeder, 2017).

Trust and Inclusion

Trust and inclusion are key for Hall University since they are considered part of the existing code of ethics set by the organization. Trust in the organization is the basis of successful relationships with stakeholders, customers, employees and others who have links with the organization (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Trust flourishes when leaders care about their employees' well-being and respect their ideas and concerns (Smylie et al., 2007). Trustworthy leaders are honest and truthful who build strong partnerships with employees as well as competently steer them through the change process (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011). One aspect of achieving trust is dependent upon engaging employees in the decision-making process where

managers demonstrate interest in employee's opinions and perspectives (Handford & Leithwood, 2013). As discussed previously, Hall's faculty members seem to distrust their leadership due to lack of cooperative opportunities for faculty to address their ideas and concerns about technology initiatives. Using the adaptive leadership approach, cultivating trust is key in facilitating technology adoption. For example, the management team needs to empathize with faculty's concerns and needs and value their input (Cosner, 2009). Thus, it is posited that faculty members would positively react to change since their perspectives are respected and taken into consideration during the decision-making process (Kennedy et al., 2008).

As for inclusion, it is defined as the active involvement of all individuals in the organization regardless of their gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnicity and age (Roberson, 2006). This also entails providing a collaborative working environment between diverse teams related to the organization such as stakeholders, customers, employees and managers (Voegtlin et al., 2012). In a time of change, the leadership team involves faculty members, stakeholders and regular staff in the decision-making process to promote inclusion and avoid resistance to change (Voegtlin et al., 2012). Inclusion in this improvement plan is promoted by incorporating the distributed leadership approach that supports a democratic working environment between the leadership team and faculty members. This contains negotiations and mutual consent on decisions related to Hall's technology initiatives. The negotiation process would be carried out in smaller teams including members from the management team and faculty where there is no managerial influence or control. All participants in the team, including the official leader, collaborate towards identifying common ideas and goals that are consistent with Hall's mission.

While these ethical considerations are essential to move the improvement plan forward, I anticipate some challenges by Hall's leadership team. The existing leadership at Hall University

is traditional and authoritarian where the influence of power and control are embedded within the culture of the organization (Gonos & Gallo, 2013). Decisions seem to be made firmly by upper management without negotiations and key information is usually delivered officially through announcement emails and monthly newsletters. I assume that introducing a democratic work environment would be disruptive for some managers, despite their willingness to participate in the change process. This improvement plan seeks to connect the adaptive and distributed leadership approaches to Hall's existing code of ethics so that trust and inclusion contribute to a culture shift where faculty and the leadership team move from working in silos to working collaboratively.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the planning and development of a leadership change process to address the PoP. For example, the adaptive and distributed leadership approaches were chosen to guide the change process and the Kotter model was selected as a framework for leading the change. Three solutions were presented in this chapter. The selected one is based on creating a technology vision and incorporating it into the existing technology training at Hall University. Finally, the chapter concluded with a discussion of the ethical responsibilities that will be employed in the change plan such as: credibility, honesty, trust and inclusion. These ethical behaviors are aligned with the adaptive and leadership approaches. The next chapter focuses on implementing, evaluating and communicating the organizational improvement plan.

Chapter Three: Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication

Chapter three presents the implementation plan of educational technology adoption at Hall University in response to this OIP's Problem of Practice. This chapter discusses how the change will be executed using the Kotter Eight-Step model (Kotter, 1996) along with a description of how the transition will be managed. In addition, this chapter explains how change is evaluated, communicated and maintained over the life cycle of the project (eighteen months) and beyond. Monitoring and evaluation of the change plan is outlined using the PDSA cycle. Furthermore, this chapter addresses a four-phase communication plan with the stakeholders to ensure change support. The chapter ends with a thorough examination of next steps and future considerations that are needed to sustain organizational change at Hall University.

Goals and Priorities

The goal of this implementation plan is to promote educational technology adoption by faculty members at Hall University. The priorities for such a change implementation are to increase faculty's technological competence and enhance students' learning experiences. As discussed in chapter one, many higher education institutions, including Hall University, are impacted by tenants of neoliberalism such as implementing continuous educational technology improvements that are influenced by marketing demands (Giroux, 2002). Higher education institutions seek to market their profile locally and internationally to increase revenue by attracting large numbers of students (Giroux, 2002). These neoliberal practices at Hall are affecting the reaction of faculty members towards educational technology implementation. This entails low participation in the technology training programs that is leading to faculty's low confidence in using technology and ineffective student's learning experience. Influenced by the

adaptive and distributed leadership approaches, this implementation plan will address these two priorities that are considered vital for Hall University. Also, this plan fits Hall's technology strategy that is related to sustaining a prestigious reputation in the marketplace by investing in advanced educational technology tools. This implementation plan will lead to an improved situation for many organizational actors through using a variety of resources. Students, who are usually technologically savvy, will benefit from technology-based curriculum that is suitable for their needs such as easy access to course content (Prensky, 2007). Hall's staff workload will decrease by using some of these technologies; mainly the new learning management system since it includes simple and easy procedures for storing data. The IT staff can provide clear troubleshooting instructions due to the advanced and responsive new technology tools.

Moreover, the entire Hall community will benefit from easy access to information and updates as the new learning management system and the content management system send automatic notifications to Hall user's smartphones or email addresses. Overall, adoption of educational technologies should promote greater job satisfaction and effective user experience due to its flexibility and responsivity (Lonn and Teasely, 2009).

Change Implementation Plan

This implementation plan relies on the collaborative nature of the faculty committee, the champions group and the IT leadership team to move change forward. It consists of four phases that are aligned with the Eight-Step Kotter model as shown in Table 3.1.

Phase One

This phase consists of the first three steps of the Kotter model (Kotter, 1996): Establish a sense of urgency, create the guiding coalition and develop a change vision.

Establish a sense of urgency: This phase runs from May to July of 2020. Here the need for change will be addressed so faculty can understand the necessity for change. The IT management team consisting of the CIO and the IT managers who are responsible for technology implementation will reinforce the change by addressing the potential organizational challenges if technology is not being adopted. This involves meetings with the faculty committee and discussing the feedback on a recent survey conducted by faculty members across all departments. The survey results are related to faculty's hesitance towards participating in the existing training and the use of Hall's educational technology tools. To promote a sense of urgency, as the Educational Technology Consultant, I will lead these meetings using an adaptive leadership strategy in terms of effective communication and open dialogue with the faculty committee. For example, I will incorporate the ″bring the outside in″ strategy (Kotter, 2012) by presenting some case studies and testimonials from other universities who are using the same LMS as Hall. The faculty committee will provide their input openly on these case studies and the overall feedback survey. I will ensure that the faculty committee's feedback is acknowledged and taken into consideration. Also, I will address the benefits and the importance of adopting educational technology tools by showcasing some examples of how technology can improve teaching and learning. These meetings will discuss the creation of the guiding coalition which is step two of the implementation plan.

Create the guiding coalition: Early July, a group of champions will be created that includes some faculty members who are adopters of the project to influence other faculty members by promoting a shift from a traditional curriculum to a technology based one. Emails will be sent out to all faculty members that include information about the change project as well

as a link to the project website. Interested faculty members can sign up by email or on the project website.

Develop a change vision: At Hall, there is a need for a clear, easy and genuine technology vision that includes the desired state of change which is faculty's technology adoption. This will be achieved through several workshops with the faculty committee, the champions group and the IT management team to work on a new technology vision statement. The new vision will serve the short, mid and long-term goals of the change that will be discussed later in the chapter.

Phase Two

This phase corresponds with step four and five in the Kotter model. Phase two starts in August and ends in September: Get the buy-in and empower the stakeholders.

Get the buy-in: Once the desired technology vision is in place, the faculty committee that represents different departments within the organization would communicate this vision to the rest of faculty members demonstrating the benefits of incorporating technology into teaching. A sensemaking strategy (Kezar, 2014) will be used to help faculty understand the role of technology in enhancing learning retention, student engagement, collaboration, advanced curriculum, not to mention the return on investment for the organization (Kezar, 2014). The communication will be clear, consistent and focused to provide a space for faculty members to address their concerns openly and genuinely. Furthermore, an online forum will be created for each department at the university so faculty can address concerns or share their ideas and feedback. To leverage the sensemaking approach, a guest speaker/researcher in the field of

educational technology will be invited to the town hall meetings to discuss the benefits for instructional technology initiatives.

Empower stakeholders: At this point, the action would be creating a solid professional development training for faculty members to facilitate their technology adoption. Also, this training will work as an incentive system to motivate faculty members to learn about technology that enhances faculty's technological competence. However, this professional development program may need further resources such as financial support. For example, refreshments will be provided during the training sessions to encourage participation. The HR department's help is needed as well to provide a list of all faculty names and departments to facilitate scheduling.

Phase Three

This phase corresponds with steps six (generate short-term wins) and seven (never let up) in the Kotter model and will last approximately six months running from October 2020 to April 2021.

Generate short-term wins: Change takes a lot of time to implement, therefore, to keep the momentum there will celebrations of small milestones during the project such as the initiation of the professional development training or the increase of faculty's registration in the training courses. This approach will spread a sense of enthusiasm and positivity which helps further a transformational change. The champions group and I will monitor faculty's registration in the training on weekly basis. In case of low registration, reminder emails will be sent to faculty members outlining the benefits of the training including clear and easy instructions on the registration process. Also, these emails will provide an overview information about the training

sessions and remind faculty that refreshments will be available-as incentives- to promote registration.

Never let up: The implementation plan will focus on leveraging other resources to achieve faculty's adoption of technology such as HR to promote hiring new faculty with advanced technological competence so they can easily integrate into the new culture. Also, the champions group will provide coaching sessions for faculty members who request some assistance using some educational technology tools.

Phase Four

The last phase in the change implementation plan relates to step 8 (routinize the change) in the Kotter model and will run approximately between May to September of 2021.

Routinize the change or incorporating changes into the culture: This means that the new practices are instituted and maintained to warrant their continuity in the future. According to Cawsey (2016), this stage requires relevant measurements to ensure that the change implementation has been successful. The PDSA test model will be used for this purpose and will be discussed in detail in the following section. Phase four involves celebrating the end of the project and change achievements including the professional training program and new technology vision. To ensure participation in the new training, existing and new faculty members can sign up in different ways such as Hall University main website, the HR website and the learning management system. Additionally, the monthly newsletter will continue to publish a section on the training and other educational technology research for the following year. Getting feedback from faculty is essential at this stage by sending a training evaluation form to faculty members after each training for continuous improvement. For example, if the survey results

conclude that training should be focused on the hands-on experience, this will be communicated with the training team to tweak the design of the training by incorporating practical exercises. Instead, faculty's feedback on the training might be related to lack of information on the rationale of educational technology initiatives and request more information on the value of such technology in teaching. Again, this issue will be addressed with the training team, mainly with the instructional designers, to modify the training content to reflect faculty's feedback.

Table 3.1
Change Implementation

Implementation Phases	Kotter-Steps	Activities	Timeline
Phase 1	1. Establish a sense of urgency 2. Create the guiding coalition 3. Develop a change vision	• Meeting with the faculty committee and the IT leadership team. • Gathering feedback from the faculty survey. • Signing up for the coalition group. • Creating workshops for developing the technology vision	May to July (2020)
Phase 2	4. Get the buy-in 5. Empower stakeholders	• Consistent and clear communication with the faculty committee • Using sensemaking approach • Initiating the technology training program	August to September (2020)
Phase 3	6. Generate short wins 7. Never let up	• Celebrating small wins • Leveraging other resources (HR)	October 2020 to April 2021
Phase 4	8. Institutionalize the change	• Publicizing the new practices. • Signing up for the training sessions. • Creating evaluation metrics. • Getting feedback from faculty for sustaining the change.	May to September (2021)

Build Momentum

Celebrating victories for the short, mid and long-term goals create a sense of confidence in the change process and promote the belief that success is possible (Pietersen, 2002).

Celebrating such victories or small wins build up the momentum towards institutionalizing the

change goals and providing reassurance that change efforts are finally accomplished (Kotter,

2012). As highlighted in Table 3.1, small wins are incorporated within the stages of the

implementation plan that are consistent with the change goals.

Short term goals: Create a collaborative relationship between faculty and the leadership

team is the first short term goal. Based on the results of a recent training satisfaction survey, the

leadership team concluded that faculty believe there is a lack of institutional interest in

consulting or communicating with them prior to employing any educational technology platform.

Also, faculty members appear to mistrust their institutional leadership and try to avoid any

technology training assuming that their leadership is imposing such training upon them. Using an

adaptive leadership approach, this implementation plan promotes strong collaborative

relationships through transparent and open communication. The second short term goal is

reducing faculty's mistrust in Hall's leadership. Trust in the leadership of the organization is

essential for accomplishing successful transformation (Northouse, 2018). This can be achieved

through openness in communication and valuing the input of individuals within the organization

(Lines et al., 2005). Trustworthy relationships between employees and upper management can be

accomplished when the latter shows interest in solving problems related to the employee's well

being (Lines et al., 2005). This creates the impression that the upper management cares about

their employees (Konovsky & Pugh,1994). In this case, employees are motivated to learn about

the change and provide relevant feedback and share their perspectives (Konovsky & Pugh,1994).

To develop and nurture trust at Hall, the leadership team needs to care about faculty's

perspectives and appreciate their input.

Mid term goals: Create awareness about the need to use educational technology in teaching**.** Currently, one of the reasons that faculty resist educational technology implementation is questioning and doubting the motives behind such implementation. In today's higher education institutions, faculty members are overwhelmed with the continuous updating and learning of educational technology tools (Compora, 2003). Faculty members tend to complain about lack of time and proper resources to support them in adopting technology into teaching (Sangra and Gonzalez-Sanmamed, 2010). Faculty believe that updating existing instructional technologies don't necessarily add any value to their teaching mission (Becta, 2008). They tend to see it as a decision taken by the institution's upper management and imposed upon the rest of the organization (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). Therefore, the implementation plan will help faculty understand that although educational technology initiatives are supported by the institution's leadership, there is a value behind technology that enhances teaching and learning. Moreover, this implementation plan will support faculty members by giving them the opportunity to voice their concerns about the change to reduce resistance.

Long term goals: Increase faculty's participation in the technology training programs. Achieving the short and mid term goals will facilitate accomplishing long-term goals where faculty members embrace educational technology by attending the existing training programs. In other words, trust in the institution's leadership is cultivated by involving faculty members in the decision-making process with regards to educational technology implementations (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012). This collaborative effort helps in reducing faculty's resistance and expanding the adoption of instructional technology into teaching (Kennedy et al., 2008). The goal here is to help faculty members enhance their technical knowledge to provide effective learning experience for students. This corresponds with one of Hall's strategic objectives which is implementing

advanced instructional technology tools that promote a modern and efficient learning environment for students.

Managing the Transition

Successful change execution requires proper transition management that takes into consideration the stakeholders' reactions and perceptions (Stragalas, 2010). As the project consultant who is responsible for managing the transition, I will address the faculty's committee concerns with regards to their lack of trust in the institution's leadership and the decisions of implementing educational technology tools. Using an adaptive leadership approach, I will seek to enhance trust relationships to facilitate change implementation. For example, numerous meetings will be scheduled between the faculty committee and members of Hall's leadership team to address faculty's concerns about educational technology initiatives. These meetings will promote open dialogue by clearly identifying the roles and responsibilities of Hall's leadership and faculty committee members after implementing the change. Open dialogue between these two parties demonstrate care and empathy with the faculty's needs and interests that are necessary elements to achieve trust (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011).

Furthermore, the champions group will ensure that the feedback from the faculty committee is met. They will steer the direction of the change process by managing the resources that might arise and provide the necessary support. I will facilitate the champions group participation in the project by clearly outlining their responsibilities. To maintain faculty's engagement, the champions group will schedule celebration events that are aligned with achieving the short, mid and long-term goals of the change project. Lastly, to plan for a proper transition, I will be prepared for any potential obstacles during the change process. Providing

effective communication to the stakeholders and respecting the change plan timeline will definitely reduce any unexpected challenges during change implementation (Husain, 2013). An effective communication plan will be discussed later in the chapter that will assist the successful execution of this change plan. As well, soliciting and acknowledging feedback from faculty by incorporating it in the change reduces potential resistance (Husain, 2013).

Stakeholders' Reactions

Addressing the stakeholder's reaction is vital to ensure that their needs are taken into consideration during the change implementation plan (Stragalas, 2010). Bridges (2009), argues that the stakeholders are usually concerned about the ″New Beginning″ phase. This phase usually involves a sense of loss and confusion since the stakeholders might not be confident about the new identity or the change purpose (Bridges, 2009). The stakeholders go through a psychological re-adaptation where they need reassurance about the new change environment (Schein, 2010). Understanding and responding to the stakeholders' psychological reactions towards the change is helpful during the transition and reduces resistance (Schein, 2010). As the transition manager, I will address these reactions through providing consistent information during our regular meetings to reinforce a positive outlook on the ″new beginning″. Moreover, celebrating new successes or achieved goals will be scheduled to increase faculty's morale (Kotter, 2012). Lastly, a key to addressing the stakeholders' needs and reactions is soliciting their feedback where the change implementers' responsibility is to verify the correct application of such feedback (Lewis, 2007). When people feel heard, attitudes towards change become positive (Brownell, 2008). Effective listening and seeking individual's feedback during the time of change promotes individual's loyalty to the change project (Brownell, 2009). This is because individuals feel that

their voices are heard and their opinions are transferred into actions (McClellan, 2014). In this

implementation plan, soliciting feedback from faculty members is done through regular

meetings, information sessions, online surveys and town hall meetings. During the stages of the

implementation plan, faculty's input will be integrated to warrant their support for sustaining the

change. This also helps in building trustworthy relationships at Hall University because faculty

members will feel that their leadership team is mindful of their needs and interests. (McClellan,

2014).

The Guiding Coalition

According to Kotter (2012), a guiding coalition is a key ingredient in achieving

successful transformation since the coalition is usually powerful by promoting commitment and

collaboration in the change process. The guiding coalition facilitates communication between all

parties who are affected by the change and positively depicting the picture of the desired future

state (Kotter, 2012). This is because the coalition involves powerful people who have great

relationships, respectful reputation and high-level knowledge (Cunningham & Kempling, 2009).

In this change implementation plan, the champions group will serve as the guiding coalition.

According to Kotter (2012), the guiding coalition usually involves people with credibility and

expertise. The champions group of this OIP will include key and well-reputed faculty members

across all departments who are supportive of the change. Moreover, the champions group will

play a central role in advancing the change process.

As a transition manager, I will contact these members individually and ask them to join

the project explaining the change goals and solutions. As well, participation in the champions

group can be voluntary; providing the details on how to join are delivered by email, the

newsletter and through the information sessions. The target is to have between 15 to 20 members from different faculties. This champions group is well connected with most faculties since the members are well-known in the university. Some of them are public speakers who have won important prizes and were granted great research funding. The champions group's credibility and expertise will eventually influence other faculty members through reducing resistance towards educational technology adoption into teaching. As part of the implementation team, they will assist in moving the change forward through the following shared responsibilities:

- Spreading a sense of enthusiasm of the change by holding information sessions about educational technology adoption in education.

- Participating in meetings with the faculty committee and the IT leadership team to provide input on faculty's perceptions and concerns about the change.

- Managing the Yammer page (a social media page for the project) in terms of updating the events information and responding to comments.

- Taking part in creating the technology vision.

- Reviewing and providing feedback on the new technology vision.

- Joining the professional technology training program as a pilot group and providing feedback.

- Providing a one on one technology consultation sessions for faculty members (upon request).

Support & Resources

Designating proper resources for the change project facilitates individual's adoption and support, these resources are usually related to time, people and financial support (Cawsey, 2016).

There are few resources that are needed during this change implementation process. As discussed in chapter two, Hall University has a large IT department including pedagogy consultants, instructional designers, programmers and IT support staff who are experienced and capable of providing full-fledged technology program implementation. This involves providing a back-end support for the computer applications and the front-end support that requires adequate training design and delivery. Therefore, there is no need to hire external consultants or technology specialists to help in implementing technology programs or providing training for faculty. On the other hand, there are miscellaneous resources needed for the change plan such as providing refreshments during the training program sessions to promote participation. The total cost of refreshments is about $4800. Also, an educational technology guest speaker will be invited to attend the two town hall meetings. Each town hall meeting is 3 hour long and the hourly pay for the guest speaker is around $150. So, the total is $900 for the two sessions and the overall cost for the project is about $5700.

As for the other resources such as the training logistics, communication management and cross-departmental assistance (mainly HR) will be provided inhouse at no additional costs. As previously discussed, the educational technology adoption project is one of the primary initiatives for Hall's leadership team who already declared their full support for the change plan. Therefore, all the needed and existing resources will be provided to make this implementation plan successful.

Potential Implementation Challenges

Two main challenges have been identified in this change plan. First, updating the existing educational technology tools at Hall University such as the LMS which requires migrating all

course content from the old platform to the new one. Even though faculty members will receive a

technology training to help them locate their course content in the new LMS, they might feel

overwhelmed navigating through the new system. Therefore, in the implementation plan, this

issue will be addressed with the training department. The champions group and I will ensure that

faculty members have access to a ″how to guide″-after completing the training-to assist them

using the new system. The ″how to guide″ will be designed by the instructional designers of the

training team.

Second, attending in-classroom training might not be feasible to all faculty members due

to conflicts in schedule. In this case, attendance can be affected leaving many faculty members

untrained. The solution to this issue would be providing different methods of training. This issue

will be coordinated with the training department to create custom training sessions (that are

scheduled on specific times requested by the participants), webinars and one on one consultation

sessions. The goal here is to guarantee that all faculty members will receive the required training

and coaching to facilitate technology adoption. However, some limitations to the training might

exist which will be addressed in the following section.

Limitations

There are two main limitations or challenges for this change implementation plan. First,

the proposed evaluation metrics don't validate if faculty members are adjusting their teaching

practices and incorporating education technology tools into the classroom.

The second challenge relates to the limited involvement of other audiences such as

students and staff members who might be useful for the change plan. These limitations will be

revisited at the end of the chapter where recommendations are proposed as next steps and future considerations.

Change Monitoring and Evaluation Process

This section outlines an effective process for monitoring and evaluating the change process that is aligned with the goals of the change implementation plan. The monitoring and evaluation process provide the guidance and relevant measurements during the steps of the change implementation plan and determines if the problem of practice has been well addressed. The PDSA model will be used as the monitoring and evaluation process since it suggests continuous improvement and achieves the objectives of the change implementation plan (Deming, 2000).

Gustafson et al (2003) argue that without a proper monitoring and evaluation process, implementing change can cause uncertainty and complications. Therefore, evaluation is needed to mitigate unfruitful and failed change implementation planning (Skinner, 2007). The knowledge on how to measure and evaluate real change makes change more sustainable (Walton & Russell, 2004).

Furthermore, Russ-Eft & Preskill (2009) consider evaluation as a systematic assessment of an activity that should involve data collection related to the goals of the change implementation plan. The evaluation process develops the knowledge needed to institute relevant decision making that improves the organization's change process (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2009). As for the concept of monitoring, it is considered as a continuous intervention with repeated assessments (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). Furthermore, Markiewicz & Patrick (2016) consider that monitoring is related to tracking the change progress through proposed activities,

outputs and processes. In the evaluation process, the focus is on assessing and analyzing relevant data through formative and summative measurements to build a deep understanding of the applied changes (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). The details of the monitoring and evaluation activities of this implementation plan will be discussed in the stages of the PDSA cycle.

Implementing successful changes require a structured evaluation process and monitoring including robust analysis of data and clear communication that contributes to overcoming resistance (Datta, 2007). Therefore, I have selected the PDSA cycle since it is an efficient tool to evaluate and monitor the outcomes of the change implementation plan (Speroff & O'Connor, 2004). The PDSA cycle is not only a robust tool to monitor and evaluate change, but also involves organizational learning (Pietrzak and Paliszkiewicz, 2015). This is essential for my implementation plan since the short, mid and long-term-goals are related to professional learning as mentioned in the previous section of this chapter. The evaluation process of this eighteen-month implementation plan will address these goals through the champions group who will examine the implementation feedback by faculty members. Applying this feedback by addressing faculty's concerns and providing informative communication will facilitate monitoring the change progress along with the short, mid and long-terms goals associated with the implementation plan stages.

The PDSA cycle consists of four stages:1. Plan for the test based on evaluation data 2. Do or apply the test on a small scale 3. Study or check if the change had the desired effect using relevant measurements 4. Act to standardize the new process or implement a new change (Deming, 2000) that includes small tests to guide, measure and evaluate goals set by the implementation plan (Morris & Hiebert 2011).

Plan

The first stage in the PDSA cycle is planning which involves defining the problem and setting a strategy for achieving the change outcomes including measurement methods (Moen & Norman 2010). This stage is aligned with the first three phases of the Kotter model: Establish a sense of urgency, create a guiding coalition and develop a change vision. As specified in the previous section, the intended goals for these three stages are:

- Addressing the need for technology adoption

- Creating a group of champions from faculty members who can work as adopters or influencers of the project

- Create a technology vision.

These intended outcomes can be mobilized through analyzing the existing data from the training satisfaction survey that was conducted by faculty to provide feedback on the technology training initiatives for PoP validation. Moreover, as explained in Table 3.2, the observation notes created during the meetings with faculty committee will be used to monitor the selection of the champions group making sure it is done successfully. Collecting all the data from the brainstorming meetings for creating a technology statement will be utilized to ensure proper change execution.

Do

The second stage is applying the proposed change solutions which is dependent upon two main steps: the first one is communicating and educating about the change and second motivating the audience to embrace the change by creating incentives (Pietrzak & Paliszkiewicz, 2015).

This stage is aligned with steps four and five in the Kotter model where the central focus is communicating the new technology vision with faculty members as well as motivating them to learn about the benefits of using educational technology tools into teaching. As discussed in the previous section (implementation plan), a creation of online forum for each department within the university will help gather certain data such as faculty's perceptions, new ideas, suggestions and concerns about the new technology vision. This data will be useful to assess faculty's acknowledgement of the change and modify the new technology vision if needed.

As for motivating faculty to learn about the benefits of incorporating technology into teaching, a survey will be sent out by email to faculty to explore their understanding and acceptance of technology use. The data from the online forums and the results from the surveys will help in identifying faculty's feedback towards technology adoption and developing procedures that will contribute in executing the change. In the Do stage, participation of stakeholders and receiving their feedback is essential so stakeholders (or participants) can feel included in the decision making and taking part of the improvement initiative (Taylor et al., 2014). This aligns with my distributed leadership approach where collaboration is promoted through involving faculty members in the decision-making process

Study

The Study stage in the PDSA cycle is concerned about implementation control that includes milestone reviews (Pietrzak and Paliszkiewicz, 2015). This stage is aligned with steps six and seven in the Kotter model: Generate small wins and Never let up. Generating small wins involve spreading a sense of enthusiasm between faculty members to motivate them for a transformational change through monitoring the accomplishments of the implementation plan (Pietrzak &

Paliszkiewicz, 2015). This monitoring process would help in identifying major and minor accomplishments and validate them with the stakeholders (faculty members) to promote positivity about the implementation plan (Kotter, 2000). Additionally, the Study stage involves analyzing data related to the planned objectives (Popescu & Popescu, 2015). This is related to Kotter's step seven (2000)- Never let up- in the implementation plan where the analyzed data can be the guidance on how to mobilize faculty members for the change such as identifying relevant resources. For example, the HR department will promote hiring new faculty with advanced technological competence so they can easily integrate into the new culture.

The data for analysis will be taken from meeting observation notes and survey results as measurements in this stage. Moreover, an adaptive leadership approach will be incorporated to mobilize faculty members to embrace the change. For example, I will support open communication by fostering social relationships to promote organizational fluidity and enhance problem solving (Gordon & Hartman, 2009). These social interactions can be promoted through informal gatherings, celebrating successes, organizing retreats and outings. Also, an environment of protection and safety or what Heiftez (1994) called "the holding environment" will be created to enhance open dialogue and trust among individuals within the organization. A protective environment will be provided through building different communication channels such as:

- Online forums for faculty members so they can share their thoughts, opinions and feedback with regards to the change implementation. They also have the choice to access and submit comments on this website via anonymous login if they feel insecure or find it risky to provide an honest input.

- Scheduling "open door" meetings with the champions group so the rest of faculty can feel confident to ask questions and share their concerns.

The information gathered from these online forums and "open door" meetings will aid the champion's group in identifying potential change obstacles and act towards reducing them.

Act

This stage is the last one in the PDSA cycle which relates to the last step in the Kotter model, institutionalizing the change by incorporating technology adoption into the culture of Hall Univeryity. In the Act stage, the data analysis that was done in the Study stage may be either neglected, adjusted or scaled up (Langley et al. 2009). The central focus here is to evaluate if the implemented changes have been effective and adequately addressed the PoP. The feedback from the faculty committee and the champions groups as well as other units in the university such as HR which is responsible for hiring new faculty members with advanced technological aptitudes will be useful in providing reliable data or information to monitor the changes in the final stage.

Table 3.2
Change Evaluation and Monitoring

PDSA Stages	Kotter Steps	Evaluation Tools	Tracking Change
Plan	1.Establish a sense of urgency 2.Create a guiding coalition 3. 3.Develop a change vision.	• Design observation templates to be used in meetings • Design meeting minutes template	• Analyze the existing data from the training satisfaction survey that was conducted by faculty prior to starting the change project. • Review of meeting minutes to provide feedback on the technology training initiatives.
Do	4. Get the buy-in 5. Empower stakeholders	• Design a template of online communication platform • Design a survey for faculty's feedback	• Create an online forum for each department to receive faculty's perception. • Send a survey to faculty to engage them in the change implementation.

Study	6. Generate small wins 7. Never let up	• Analyze data • Study observation note and survey results	• Data analysis taken from observation notes for meetings minutes and survey results.
Act	7. Routinize the change	• Analyze data	• Analyze data and feedback from the faculty's committee and the champions group to apply the change

There are certain limitations in the monitoring and evaluation process of this

implementation plan. First, in the Do stage the extent of collaboration between the leadership

team and faculty members will not be tracked or assessed. Effective monitoring requires

reporting on the individual's performance with respect to the change objectives (Cohen, 2005).

This is difficult to accomplish since Hall's existing performance metrics are not in synch with

this implementation plan. Also, creating new performance measures for Hall University are out

of scope for this OIP.

Moreover, in the Study and Act stages, the champions group might not have enough time

to analyze the feedback from the meetings, information sessions and surveys. Although the

champion's group consists of faculty members who are highly knowledgeable with a great

expertise in research and teaching, analyzing data within the framework of organizational change

might be confusing for them.

Also, I will not take on the task of verifying the rigor of the data analysis and this remains

out of scope for this project. Therefore, this implementation plan will not track or measure the

rigor of data analysis in all stages of the PDSA cycle.

Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation

Employing the PDSA cycle in the change implementation is useful due to its iterative

nature of assessment that ensures continuous improvement (Moen, 2009). This entails an

analytical process where the steps of the implementation plan are analyzed, revised and repeated

to warrant that the change works even after its institutionalization (Moen, 2009). In this OIP, continuous feedback from faculty members and the champions group who will monitor the change after implementation warrant such improvement. After the change implementation and institutionalization of technology adoption, the faculty committee will continuously monitor if the existing training includes the new technology vision through reviewing the training evaluation forms taken by participants. The updates on the data revisions from these evaluation reports will be discussed at every quarterly meeting to ensure the change improvements are moving in the right direction.

As a change consultant, my role will be managing the monitoring and evaluation process to make sure the transition happens successfully. Working closely with the faculty committee, the champions group and the IT management team, I will make sure that feedback from each group is applied transparently. Using the distributed leadership approach, I will work to ensure that any decision made by one of these groups are done collaboratively and justly. According to Jones et al (2012), teams with distributed leadership approach are effective to the organization since collaboration is promoted between all members of the team. Supovitz & Tognatta (2013) add that the distributed leadership approach creates a more democratic and collaborative work ethic among cross-functional teams where common values and ideas are leveraged to reach consensus on decisions. This collaborative teamwork requires transparent and effective communication that is essential between team members as well as the entire change process. Furthermore, clear communication is needed in the monitoring and evaluation process to warrant effective change improvement. In the following section of this chapter, a plan for communication will be formulated to clearly address the path of change and milestones to the rest of the organization.

Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process

This section focuses on the role of communication during the change implementation plan and includes strategies to help stakeholders understand the need for change. Effective communication during the change implementation leads to positive results especially if the change is connected to improvement in the individual's behaviors, performance and job satisfaction (Lewis, 2000). On the other hand, providing irrelevant communication during the implementation plan can create further resistance to change. Such resistance would be related to low trust, lack of organizational commitment and job dissatisfaction (Zhang & Agarwal, 2009).

Good communication is needed to reduce resistance and achieve productive change results (Husain, 2013). It also leads to robust and sustainable change if it clearly identifies the individual's role in the change process (Husain, 2013). Therefore, communication in the implementation plan should clearly educate individuals of all levels in the organization and motivate them in the change process (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006). This includes creating a strategy that supports positive attitudes, high knowledge and appreciation of the proposed change to overcome any resistance (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006).

Change agents need to understand how people perceive the meaning of their work, their role and interactions with their own institution (Langer and Thorup, 2006). Thus, all voices in the organization need to be heard and considered in the communication about change (Langer and Thorup, 2006).

To this end, the success of executing and adapting to a new change is significantly associated with productive communication and useful distribution of information (Lewis, 2002). Building awareness for change is a key piece of this communication plan which is related

to sensemaking and social relationships as communication approaches to overcome resistance.

Sensemaking

Sensemaking is a mutual process where individuals within an organization seek information, attach a meaning to their understanding and act upon it (Kezar, 2014). According to Weick & Quinn (1999), sensemaking happens when people try to collectively structure meaning out of the uncertainty and ambiguity they encounter during a time of change. This eventually leads to understanding and acceptance of the new organizational conceptualizations that help individuals to act consistently with their new realities (Thomas, 2000).

Sensemaking is considered an integral part in communicating change since it creates a reciprocal understanding and enhances trust relationships (Van Vuuren & Elving, 2008). The success of a strategic change is not only tied to implementing new procedures and structures, but also dependent on how the new interpretations are transferred to stakeholders and other people involved in the change process (Fiss and Zajac, 2007). Understanding how people make sense of their existing work realities are helpful cues for change agents to facilitate the construction of a new language or environment in the organization (Fiss and Zajac, 2007). Through sensemaking, individuals will have a solid interpretation of the change processes and its direction within the organization (Weick & Quinn, 1999). This can be achieved through providing communication opportunities for individuals such as roundtable discussions to make sense of their new roles in the proposed change (Weick & Quinn, 1999). As well, change agents might depend on key individuals who are supportive of the change to explain their daily work routines (Coburn & Russels, 2008).

In the context of this implementation plan, roundtable meetings between faculty committee, the champions group and myself (as the change consultant) will be held on weekly basis. These meetings will ensure that the information about the role of educational technology and its benefits is relayed to the rest of faculty members. The faculty committee and the champions group will be responsible for personalizing the change to the rest of faculty and spreading a sense of optimism and understanding of the value of technology adoption in teaching. As outlined in Table 3.3, this will be achieved through holding different group dialogues during the implementation plan where guest speakers are invited to share their knowledge on the importance of technology adoption to promote a collective understanding. Moreover, Town Hall meetings will be scheduled to promote sensemaking discussions through dialogues, case studies, data and reports about educational technology implementation. Relating to the adaptive leadership approach, I will strive to incorporate transparent communication. For instance, faculty members who distrust their institutional leadership and believe that technology implementation is part of a hidden agenda, their concern will be addressed publicly during these town hall meetings.

Social Interactions

The second communication that will be used in this implementation plan is social interaction. Social interaction in organizations occurs when individuals connect with each other through similar values, ideas, goals and preferences (Coburn & Russels, 2008). Social interactions are considered as informal communication between people that serve the organization in leveraging social support, learning and embracing change (Daly, 2010). Although social or informal networks have no communication structure and are often less organized, these

networks contribute to the success of enacting change ad reforms through helping participants express their ideas about the new vision (Daly, 2010).

Sustaining change doesn't only need a robust change plan, it also requires individual's strong adoption of the new way of operating (Mohrman, 2003). Such adoption to change can be achieved through less hierarchical communication and ongoing interaction that permeates fluid transmission of information (Mohrman, 2003). Large-scale organizational change works best when the organization nurtures strong ties through social networks and interconnection among different subunits that contribute to accepting, understanding and implementing change (Kezar, 2014).

Furthermore, social networks promote knowledge sharing through mutual and rich dialogues (Kezar, 2014). Although these dialogues might include discussions of conflict and resistance, the dynamism of these networks and the abundance of its potential input can lead to conflict resolution and greater learning (Kezar and Lester, 2011). Therefore, informal networks rely strongly on establishing interpersonal relationships that demonstrate support and eliminate uncertainty during times of organizational reform (Kezar & Lester, 2011).

As discussed in chapter two, effective communication is achieved by promoting open dialogues to motivate faculty members to share their perspectives through their own social networks (Schroeder, 2017). In this implementation plan, informal connections are facilitated through informal gatherings held face to face and online using a social media platform (Yammer).

As presented in Table 3.3 informal gatherings include celebrating milestones events about the initiation of the change project, creation of a champions group and the end of the project. Social gatherings also include existing events at Hall such as a bagel breakfast offered

once a month, Christmas lunch, Halloween party and a summer barbeque party during the month

of July. The faculty committee, the champions group, the IT leadership team and other faculty

members who are interested will the attend these events. As for Yammer, similar to Facebook

which is a social media platform used at Hall University, a page will be created that is accessible

to all faculty members and the leadership team. One or two members of the champions group

will administer this page by sharing announcements about the social events including time and

location, posting pictures/videos and responding to conversations.

Using a distributed leadership approach that focuses on promoting collaboration between

the faculty committee and the IT leadership team, these social gatherings will reinforce a sense

of inclusion by faculty (Voegtlin et al., 2012).). As discussed in previous chapters, faculty seems

to feel that they are not included in the decision-making process for choosing proper educational

technology tools. Having these social meetings and gatherings will help the champions group to

encourage a sense of inclusion by discussing the updates on the change project and the benefits

of using the existing technologies. Also, the champion's group will discuss their own experience

using technology in teaching and how they learned using the new technology systems. Faculty

members who struggle with technology will be encouraged by the champion's group to register

in the new training or request a one on one consultation session. The consultation sessions are

delivered by the champion's group members and are considered coaching sessions to help

faculty members during the change transition.

Communication Strategies

Klein (1996) discussed many general communication strategies that are needed in any

change implementation plan. These strategies will be used in specific phases of the

implementation plan such as sharing information, addressing resistance, garnering participant's feedback, clarifying expectations and providing next steps. However, there are three main strategies that will be used in all phases of this implementation plan: information credibility, two-way communication process and active participation.

According to Armenakis et al (2000) information credibility is a kind of persuasive communication since it genuinely addresses the need for change by repeating the communication from different sources. The more the change topic is addressed, the greater is the sense of change urgency (Ginsberg &Venkatraman,1995; Kotter, 1995). Conversations about the change imply that change implementation is progressing, and individuals are receiving the rationale behind the change (Jansen, 2004).

As for the two-way communication process, it involves mutual communication between the individuals and the management team about important and official information to garner individual's support for the change (Klein, 1996). According to Weick (1987), a two-way communication allows for participant's engagement, reduces uncertainty and increases collaboration. Furthermore, Bolden and Gosling (2006) argue that a two-way communication process generates interpretations, provides clarity and avoids discrepancy of understanding. Addressing discrepancies or inconsistencies of people's understanding of change is an important focus in the communication process to promote credibility of change agents (Bolden & Gosling, 2006).

As well, active participation will be used as a communication strategy in this implementation plan since it is applicable to the chosen solution (building a technology training). Armenakis and Harris (2002) consider active participation as one of the most effective

communication strategies since it leads to efficiency in building skills and knowledge through continuous practice.

Communication Plan

This communication plan consists of four stages that are aligned with the phases of the Kotter model as seen in Table 3.3. It also includes change goals, communication channels, audience, roles and responsibilities and timelines.

Phase One

The first phase of the communication plan is managing change readiness that is aligned with the first three stages of the Kotter model: Establish a sense of urgency, create a guiding coalition and develop a change vision. According to Kotter (1995), the change implementation plan usually starts with communicating the urgent need for change with a strong message that promotes assertive collaboration of many individuals. Communicating the information about the change must be credible and comprehensible so change agents are able to move forward with the change process (Armenakis et al., 2000). Moreover, the availability and repetition of information from more than one source helps in the retention of the message where the new information sink deeply (Klein, 1996).

To reinforce information credibility, Gist et al (1989) argue that communicating the same message from different sources ensures a greater authenticity and approval. The diversity of sources in delivering the information that includes a mix of internal and external informants is influential in creating a sense urgency and contributing to change readiness (Armenakis et al., 2000). Therefore, the communication plan will leverage external and internal sources for sharing information that underpins a sense of urgency to embrace educational technology tools in

teaching. The goal is to solicit support from all faculty towards improving educational technology practices. Communication sharing in this phase will focus on change readiness by addressing any potential resistance. As stated by Klein (1996), attending to the resistance early-on will help in the readying for the change implementation. Therefore, this communication phase will ensure the distribution of information that involves the necessity of change as well as its justification and influence on the individuals within the organization (Van Vuuren & Elving, 2005).

As presented in Table 3.3, communicating a sense of urgency will be addressed through the following:

- Information sessions presented by members of the leadership team and the faculty committee to discuss technology adoption. These information sessions are delivered from May to July.

- Dedicate a section in the monthly newsletter that discusses the importance of technology adoption referring to case studies and research. The newsletter is usually sent by email to all faculty members and will last throughout the change implementation plan.

- Provide lunch and learns in a presentation room to be broadcasted online for those who wish to attend remotely. These lunch and learns are delivered by speakers from the IT leadership team and/or the faculty committee providing live demonstrations of the new educational technology systems.

As well, these communication channels will include content pertaining to improving educational technology practices, creating the guiding coalition procedures for the interested faculty members and preparing for the new technology vision.

Phase Two

This phase focuses on change receptivity and is aligned with steps four and five in the Kotter model: Get the buy-in and empower stakeholders. To ensure change receptivity, the new technology vision, its benefits and the desired state will be communicated with the faculty committee and the champions group during the weekly meetings. The two-way communication strategy is applicable here to empower faculty members to embrace change that increases the receptivity of change. This includes communicating with the management team to clarify any misunderstandings and uncertainty (Nelissen and van Selm, 2008). Weekly meetings between the faculty committee and the IT management team will involve sharing information about the change and the place for faculty to ask questions and raise concerns.

Also, a survey will be distributed to faculty members across all departments to gather feedback and clarify any misunderstanding. The feedback will guide me and the champions group during the weekly meetings discussions to address some of the questions that faculty might have such as what is the direction of such change and what's in it for them? Communicating the new technology vision from multiple channels is relevant here since it motivates faculty about the change (Kotter, 2012). Posters, screenplays, electronic announcements, email distribution and face to face meetings will be used to share the new vision.

The weekly meetings will start in May and continue until the end of the project. The champions group and I will design the survey and distribute it in September.

Phase Three

This phase corresponds with steps six and seven in the Kotter model (Kotter,1996) and relates to the proposed solution: Building a professional training program for faculty. The focus here is two folds; first celebrate small milestones by positively contributing to advance with the change, strengthen people's engagement and reduce anxiety (Cawsey et al., 2016). Second, reach active participation of faculty that involves increasing their efficacy and knowledge on educational technology adoption. The communication will be designed to encourage faculty to participate in the professional training and alleviate stress about the change. The timeframe will extend from October to May. The communication channels will involve:

- Announcing the celebration events online (on Yammer) and by email.

- Announcing the technology professional training by email and during the weekly meetings with the faculty committee.

- Holding bi-weekly information sessions with the champions group to provide details on the professional training.

Phase Four

This is the last phase of the communication plan that is related to step eight in the Kotter Eight-Step process- routinization of change. This phase involves communicating the institutionalization of change through sharing information about the change achievements and celebrating successes (Kotter, 2012). Communication in this phase of the Kotter model is instrumental in updating the audience on the new processes that might include training to sustain change commitment and competence (Massey and Williams, 2006). Furthermore, Buchanan et al

(2005) argue that communication in this phase should be provided in various forms such as visuals, seminars, newsletters and meetings to nurture the institutionalization of change.

Phase four starts in May and finishes in November where information is provided regularly with regards to change achievements. This includes regular meetings with the faculty committee and the champions group as well as sending email updates to the rest of faculty. In addition to releasing the professional training program on the HR website as well as on the university's main website. Additionally, official announcements about the training and one on one coaching sessions will be mentioned during the Town Hall meeting scheduled in May and posted on Yammer. Feedback from faculty will be invited during the meetings and online to ensure ongoing support for the institutionalization of change. Finally, the faculty committee, the champions group, interested faculty members and the leadership team will be invited to celebrate the initiation of the professional technology training.

Table 3.3
Communication Plan

Phases	Goals	Channels	Audience	Roles	Timeline
Phase one	Change Readiness	• Information sessions • Monthly Newsletter • Lunch and Learn series	• Faculty committee and leadership team • All faculty members	• Share information and deliver the information sessions • Interested faculty can sign up for the champions group	May to July

Phase Two	Change receptivity	• Weekly meetings • Email • Electronic announcement • Survey	• Faculty committee Champions group	• Share updates with their respective departments. • Assist in interpreting the survey results	July to September
Phase Three	Advancing the change	• Yammer • Email • Meetings • Information sessions	• Faculty committee • Champions group	• Participate in the meetings • Manage the announcements	October to May
Phase Four	Change institutionalization	• Meetings • Yammer • Email	• Faculty committee • Champions group • IT management team	• Inform change updates • Manage announcements • Communicate Change	May to November

This chapter presented a detailed structure of the implementation plan including the monitoring and evaluation process, communicating the need for change and analysis of change limitations. The eight stages of the Kotter model were used to discuss the steps of executing changes and the PDSA cycle was implemented to track and assess change activities. As for the communication strategies, the focus was on delivering consistent and efficient information incorporating the stakeholder's reactions and concerns. The following section discusses next steps and future considerations for sustaining change at Hall University.

Next Steps and Future Considerations

The purpose of this section is to discuss the steps needed to be taken by Hall university to maintain the institutionalization of the new practices. This can be achieved through continuous learning and providing supportive infrastructures to ensure long-term commitment to change

achievements. Additionally, enhancing the training structure and delivery are presented as future considerations.

Next steps are related to attending the new technology training program and adopting educational technology implementations to warrant continuous learning and change sustainability (Valikangas & Hamel, 2003). Efforts to improve organizational learning are considered influential in sustaining new behaviors (Sherer & Spillane, 2011). Organizational learning needs supportive infrastructures such as organizational procedures, decision-making criterion and operational systems that are continuously revised (Sherer & Spillane, 2011). Hall University needs to continuously review-through evaluation measures-the delivery of the educational technology training program to ensure change sustainability. Providing robust training and receiving relevant feedback from faculty members about Hall's policies and procedures with regards to educational technology decisions will help in sustaining the changes.

This OIP outlined a change management plan for Hall University to improve educational technology adoption by faculty members. The main goal of the plan is to create a professional development technology training that promotes technology adoption in teaching and enhances faculty's confidence about technology use. As mentioned previously, one of the limitations to this change plan is the absence of evaluation metrics to asses whether faculty members are using the university's educational technology tools in the classroom. A future recommendation would be implementing a full-fledged training evaluation program based on a structured approach. Perhaps, using the Kirkpatrick levels of evaluation that measures the effectiveness of the training and individuals' performance on the job (Kirkpatrick, 1994). This training evaluation framework has been used widely by many organizations (Bates, 2004). Kirkpatrick level of evaluation

consists of four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and results (Kirkpatrick, 1994). The reaction

level measures the immediate reactions of trainees to the training program. The learning level

assesses what the participants learned in the training, a new skill or a new practice. The behavior

level evaluates if the participants applied these new skills or practices in their daily work routine.

The results level which is the last one in the framework measures the change improvement for

the individual and the organization. If Hall University incorporates such a framework, the extent

of faculty's technology use in teaching can be determined to have a better idea about the change

outcomes.

Another future recommendation relates to providing a technology training to Hall's staff.

As mentioned in the limitations section of chapter three, currently the technology training

program involves faculty members only. Training staff on the basic use of educational

technology tools promotes effective change since staff can speak the new language and become

familiar with the new resources. Staff needs a specialized training to respond to questions from

faculty or enroll students using a specific technology platform (Bennet et al., 1999).

Conclusion

This Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) addresses a PoP related to faculty's

resistance towards technology use in teaching. The goal of this OIP is to encourage faculty

members to participate in the educational technology training to improve their technology skills

and knowledge. This entails promoting trust relationships and collaboration between the

leadership team and faculty members through adopting distributed and adaptive leadership

practices. Also, these practices involve creating a clear and genuine technology vision to garner

faculty's support for the change process. The utilization of the Kotter Model (1996) facilitates

the implementation of the change plan efficiently ensuring that the change solution is enacted and sustained.

The change solution involves building a professional training program for faculty which is based on strengthening people's engagement and reducing anxiety towards the change. The strength of this solution lies in achieving vigorous faculty's participation in the educational technology training that potentially enhances their proficiency in incorporating technology into their profession. This involves creating an environment of trust and collaboration between the leadership team and faculty members. Also, the change efforts presented in this OIP will help Hall University to provide a great learning experience for students by continuing to support their faculty's professional development.

References

Abadi, F. E., Jalilvand, M. R., Sharif, M., Salimi, G. A., & Khanzadeh, S. A. (2011). A study of influential factors on employees' motivation for participating in the in-service training courses based on modified expectancy theory. *International Business and Management, 2*(1), 157-169.

An, Y.-J., & Reigeluth, C. (2011). Creating technology-enhanced, learner-centered classrooms: K–12 teachers' beliefs, perceptions, barriers, and support needs. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 28*(2), 54-62.

Andrews, J. G. (2006). How We Can Resist Corporatization. *Academe, 92*(3), 16-19.

Appelbaum, S. H., Habashy, S., Malo, J. L., & Shafiq, H. (2012). Back to the future: revisiting Kotter's 1996 change model. *Journal of Management Development*.

Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of organizational change management*.

Austin, I., & Jones, G. A. (2015). Governing the Managed Enterprise *Governance of Higher Education* (pp. 179-196): Routledge.

Bamford, D. R., & Forrester, P. L. (2003). Managing planned and emergent change within an operations management environment. *International journal of operations & production management*.

Bates, T. (2000). Teaching, learning, and the impact of multimedia technologies. *Educause Review, 35*, 38-43.

Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J. (2003). Distributed Leadership. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International journal of management reviews, 13*(3), 251-269.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*: John Wiley & Sons.

Breese, R. (2013). Conceptualising the nature of work: revisiting Luther Gulick's theories of organisation. *Journal of Management History*.

Bridges, W. (2009). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*: Da Capo Press.

Bristow, P. (2009). *The digital divide: Is it an age old question?* Paper presented at the 2009 ITI 7th International Conference on Communications and Information Technology (ICICT).

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 97*(2), 117-134.

Brownell, J. (2008). Exploring the strategic ground for listening and organizational effectiveness. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 8*(3), 211-229.

Bryan, R. L., Kreuter, M. W., & Brownson, R. C. (2009). Integrating adult learning principles into training for public health practice. *Health promotion practice, 10*(4), 557-563.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*: Russell Sage Foundation.

Buabeng-Andoh, C. (2012). Factors influencing teachersâ adoption and integration of information and communication technology into teaching: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 8*(1).

Buchanan, T., Sainter, P., & Saunders, G. (2013). Factors affecting faculty use of learning

      technologies: Implications for models of technology adoption. *Journal of Computing in*

      Higher education, 25(1), 1-11.

Buller, J. L. (2015). The Only Thing We Have to Change Is—Change Itself. *Change Leadership*

      in Higher Education: A Practical Guide to Academic Transformation, 1-27.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal. *Journal of*

      Management studies, 41(6), 977-1002.

Busch, L. (2017). *Knowledge for sale: The neoliberal takeover of higher education*: MIT Press.

Butko, M. (2012). Kouzes, JM, & Posner, BZ (Eds.).(2011). Credibility: How Leaders Gain and

      Lose It, Why People Demand It. *Adult Learning, 23*(3), 158.

Carey, J. (1991). Plato at the keyboard: Telecommunications technology and education policy.

      The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 514(1), 11-21.

Carmeli, A., Ben-Hador, B., Waldman, D. A., & Rupp, D. E. (2009). How leaders cultivate

      social capital and nurture employee vigor: Implications for job performance. *Journal of*

      Applied Psychology, 94(6), 1553.

Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining

      employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human resource management review,*

      16(2), 199-208.

Caruso, J. B., & Kvavik, R. B. (2005). ECAR study of students and information technology,

      2005: Convenience, connection, control, and learning: ECAR.

Cawsey, T. F., Deszca, G., & Ingols, C. (2015). *Organizational change: An action-oriented*

      toolkit: Sage Publications.

Cervone, H. F. (2013). Organizational change models and digital library projects. *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives*.

Change, L., & is Melting, O. I. (1996). John Kotter. *Harvard Business School Press, Boston*.

Cleghorn, G. D., & Headrick, L. A. (1996). The PDSA cycle at the core of learning in health professions education. *The Joint Commission journal on quality improvement, 22*(3), 206-212.

Clifford, P., Friesen, S., & Lock, J. (2004). Coming to teaching in the 21st century: A research study conducted by the Galileo Educational Network. *Report for Alberta Learning. February, 15*, 2007.

Coburn, C. E., & Russell, J. L. (2008). District policy and teachers' social networks. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 30*(3), 203-235.

Compora, D. P. (2003). Current trends in distance education: An administrative model. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 6*(2).

Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., & Brown, K. G. (2016). Unfreezing change as three steps: Rethinking Kurt Lewin's legacy for change management. *Human relations, 69*(1), 33-60.

Cunningham, J. B., & Kempling, J. S. (2009). Implementing change in public sector organizations. *Management Decision*.

Daly, A. J. (2010). Mapping the terrain: Social network theory and educational change. *Social network theory and educational change*, 1-16.

Datta, L.-e. (2007). Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications, by Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Anthony J. Shinkfield. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007. 768 pp. $70.00. *American Journal of Evaluation, 28*(4), 573-576.

De Jong, B. A., & Elfring, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 535-549.

Deming, W. E. (2000). The new economics for industry, government, education. 2nd: Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: The MIT Press.

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher education, 58*(4), 491-504.

Dirks, K. T. (1999). The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(3), 445.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization science, 12*(4), 450-467.

Duck, J. D. (2001). *The change monster: The human forces that fuel or foil corporate transformation and change*: Currency.

Education, U. D. o. (2017). Reimagining the role of technology in education: 2017 national education technology plan update: Office of Educational Technology Washington, DC.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 42.

Finkle, L. (2011). Motivating Employee Performance Through Year End Bonuses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 6*, 18-32.

Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2006). The symbolic management of strategic change: Sensegiving via framing and decoupling. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1173-1193.

Friel, T., Britten, J., Compton, B., Peak, A., Schoch, K., & VanTyle, W. K. (2009). Using

pedagogical dialogue as a vehicle to encourage faculty technology use. *Computers & Education, 53*(2), 300-307.

Fuller, H. L. (2000). First teach their teachers: Technology support and computer use in

academic subjects. *Journal of research on computing in education, 32*(4), 511-537.

Gaur, A. S., Mukherjee, D., Gaur, S. S., & Schmid, F. (2011). Environmental and firm level

influences on inter-organizational trust and SME performance. *Journal of Management studies, 48*(8), 1752-1781.

Gautreau, C. (2011). Motivational factors affecting the integration of a learning management

system by faculty. *Journal of Educators Online, 8*(1), n1.

Georgina, D. A., & Olson, M. R. (2008). Integration of technology in higher education: A review

of faculty self-perceptions. *The Internet and Higher Education, 11*(1), 1-8.

Gillard, S., Bailey, D., & Nolan, E. (2008). Ten reasons for IT educators to be early adopters of

IT innovations. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research, 7*(1), 21-33.

Ginsberg, A., & Venkatraman, N. (1995). Institutional initiatives for technological change: From

issue interpretation to strategic choice. *Organization studies, 16*(3), 425-448.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The

university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard educational review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Gist, M. E., Schwoerer, C., & Rosen, B. (1989). Effects of alternative training methods on self-

efficacy and performance in computer software training. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(6), 884.

Glover, J., Friedman, H., & Jones, G. (2002). Adaptive leadership: When change is not enough

(part one). *Organization Development Journal, 20*(2), 15.

Gonos, J., & Gallo, P. (2013). Model for leadership style evaluation. *Management: journal of contemporary management issues, 18*(2), 157-168.

Gordon, J., & Hartman, R. L. (2009). Affinity-seeking strategies and open communication in peer workplace relationships. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 17*(3), 115-125.

Graetz, F., Rimmer, M., Lawrence, A., & Smith, A. (2006). *Managing organisational change*: John Wiley & Sons.

Green, M. G. (2014). *Caring leadership in turbulent times: Tackling neoliberal education reform*: IAP.

Gumport, P. J. (2012). Strategic thinking in higher education research. *The organization of higher education: Managing colleges for a new era*, 18-41.

Hall University. (2019). Strategic Plan. Retrieved from https://www.hall.ca/provost/files/provost/20170509_final_provosts_strategic_academic_plan_2017.pdf

Handford, V., & Leithwood, K. (2013). Why teachers trust school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: leading or misleading? *Educational management administration & leadership, 32*(1), 11-24.

Harris, R. T., & Beckhard, R. (1987). *Organizational transitions: Managing complex change*: Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hartman, R. J. (1994). *Incentive programs to improve transit employee performance*: Transportation Research Board.

Heifetz, R. A., & Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers* (Vol. 465): Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R. A., Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*: Harvard Business Press.

Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. *Educational technology research and development, 55*(3), 223-252.

Hirschi, G., & Jones, M. (2009). Affects of strategic leadership on business success-a cross-cultural analysis from a resource based view.

Holste, J. S., & Fields, D. (2010). Trust and tacit knowledge sharing and use. *Journal of knowledge management*.

Huang, T. (2012). Agents' social imagination: The 'invisible'hand of neoliberalism in Taiwan's curriculum reform. *International Journal of Educational Development, 32*(1), 39-45.

Husain, Z. (2013). Effective communication brings successful organizational change. *The Business & Management Review, 3*(2), 43.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., & Ryland, K. (2012). Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34*(1), 67-78.

Kaiser, R. B., Lindberg, J. T., & Craig, S. B. (2007). Assessing the Flexibility of Managers: A comparison of methods 1. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*(1), 40-55.

Keengwe, J., Kidd, T., & Kyei-Blankson, L. (2009). Faculty and technology: Implications for faculty training and technology leadership. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18*(1), 23-28.

Kennedy, G. E., Judd, T. S., Churchward, A., Gray, K., & Krause, K.-L. (2008). First year

students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives? *Australasian*

journal of educational technology, 24(1).

Kezar, A. (2014). Higher education change and social networks: A review of research. *The*

Journal of Higher Education, 85(1), 91-125.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2011). *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: An examination of*

grassroots leaders in higher education: Stanford University Press.

Khan, A. (2010). The Dilemma of Leadership Styles and Performance Appraisal: Counter

Strategies. *Journal of Managerial Sciences, 4*(1).

Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*:

Association for Talent Development.

Kitana, A. (2016). Overview of the managerial thoughts and theories from the history: Classical

management theory to modern management theory. *Indian Journal of Management*

Science, 6(1), 16.

Klein, S. M. (1996). A management communication strategy for change. *Journal of*

organizational change management.

Knowles, M. (1978). The adult learner: a neglected species 2nd. *Houston: Gulf Publishing*

Company, Book Division.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of*

Management Journal, 37(3), 656-669.

Kotelnikov, V. (2010). Reward systems & reward motivation (effective reward systems:

Increasing performance & creating happier employees). *Retrieved from*.

Kotter, J. (2007). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review, 86*, 97-103.

Kotter, J. P. (2000). What leaders really do. *The Bottom Line*.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*: Harvard business press.

Lakes, R. D., & Carter, P. A. (2011). Neoliberalism and education: An introduction. *Educational Studies, 47*(2), 107-110.

Lance Frazier, M., Johnson, P. D., Gavin, M., Gooty, J., & Bradley Snow, D. (2010). Organizational justice, trustworthiness, and trust: A multifoci examination. *Group & Organization Management, 35*(1), 39-76.

Langer, R., & Thorup, S. (2006). Building trust in times of crisis. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*.

Langley, G. J., Moen, R. D., Nolan, K. M., Nolan, T. W., Norman, C. L., & Provost, L. P. (2009). *The improvement guide: a practical approach to enhancing organizational performance*: John Wiley & Sons.

Legood, A., Thomas, G., & Sacramento, C. (2016). Leader trustworthy behavior and organizational trust: The role of the immediate manager for cultivating trust. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(12), 673-686.

Levidow, L. (2002). Marketizing higher education: neoliberal strategies and counter-strategies. *The virtual university*, 227-248.

Lewin, K. (1997). *Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science*: American Psychological Association.

Lewin, Kurt (2010). *Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science. Washington*, D*C*: American Psychological Association.

Lewis, L. K. (2000). Communicating change: Four cases of quality programs. *The Journal of Business Communication (1973), 37*(2), 128-155.

Lewis, L. K. (2007). An organizational stakeholder model of change implementation communication. *Communication Theory, 17*(2), 176-204.

Lines, R., Selart, M., Espedal, B., & Johansen, S. T. (2005). The production of trust during organizational change. *Journal of Change Management, 5*(2), 221-245.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2010). Toxic leadership: a conceptual framework *Handbook of top management teams* (pp. 214-220): Springer.

Lonn, S., & Teasley, S. D. (2009). Saving time or innovating practice: Investigating perceptions and uses of Learning Management Systems. *Computers & Education, 53*(3), 686-694.

Luu, K., & Freeman, J. G. (2011). An analysis of the relationship between information and communication technology (ICT) and scientific literacy in Canada and Australia. *Computers & Education, 56*(4), 1072-1082.

Manchester, J., Gray-Miceli, D. L., Metcalf, J. A., Paolini, C. A., Napier, A. H., Coogle, C. L., & Owens, M. G. (2014). Facilitating Lewin's change model with collaborative evaluation in promoting evidence based practices of health professionals. *Evaluation and program planning, 47*, 82-90.

Manning, K. (2017). *Organizational theory in higher education*: Routledge.

Markiewicz, A., & Patrick, I. (2016). *Developing monitoring and evaluation frameworks*: Sage Publications.

Marshall, S. J. (2006). *Issues in the development of leadership for learning and teaching in higher education.* Paper presented at the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program 2006.

Mascall, B., Leithwood, K., Strauss, T., & Sacks, R. (2009). The relationship between distributed

leadership and teachers' academic optimism *Distributed leadership* (pp. 81-100):

Springer.

Massey, L., & Williams, S. (2006). Implementing change: the perspective of NHS change

agents. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Matzler, K., & Renzl, B. (2006). The relationship between interpersonal trust, employee

satisfaction, and employee loyalty. *Total quality management and business excellence,*

17(10), 1261-1271.

McAleese, I., Creed, A., & Zutshi, A. (2013). A response to critique of the refreeze step in

Lewin's model of organizational change from the viewpoint of organizational behavior.

International Journal of the Academy of Organizational Behavior Management(4), 104-

124.

McBride, K. (2010). Leadership in higher education: Handling faculty resistance to technology

through strategic planning. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal, 8*(4), 41.

McClellan, J. (2014). Developing trusting relationships in academic advising: A review of the

literature with recommendations for practices. *The Mentor: Innovative Scholarship on*

Academic Advising, 16.

McEwan, A. B., Tsey, K., McCalman, J., & Travers, H. J. (2010). Empowerment and change

management in Aboriginal organisations: a case study. *Australian Health Review, 34*(3),

360-367.

Mehra, P., & Mital, M. (2007). Integrating technology into the teaching-learning transaction:

Pedagogical and technological perceptions of management faculty. *International Journal*

of Education and Development using ICT, 3(1).

Miller, A. (2015). Leadership theory analysis: Adaptive leadership: Azusa Pacific University.

Retrieved from: http://www. andrewemiller. com/wp ….

Miller, J. W., Martineau, L. P., & Clark, R. C. (2000). Technology infusion and higher

education: Changing teaching and learning. *Innovative Higher Education, 24*(3), 227-

241.

Moen, R. (2009). *Foundation and History of the PDSA Cycle.* Paper presented at the Asian

network for quality conference. Tokyo. https://www. deming.

org/sites/default/files/pdf/2015/PDSA_History_Ron_Moen. Pdf.

Moen, R. D., & Norman, C. L. (2010). Circling back. *Quality Progress, 43*(11), 22.

Mohrman, S. A., Tenkasi, R. V., & Mohrman Jr, A. M. (2003). The role of networks in

fundamental organizational change: A grounded analysis. *The Journal of Applied

Behavioral Science, 39*(3), 301-323.

Morris, A. K., & Hiebert, J. (2011). Creating shared instructional products: An alternative

approach to improving teaching. *Educational Researcher, 40*(1), 5-14.

Moseley, S. (2015). Implications of one-to-one computing initiatives on education: A policy

brief. *The William & Mary Educational Review, 3*(2), 6.

Murphy, J. (2015). Creating communities of professionalism: Addressing cultural and structural

barriers. *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and

organizational change. *California management review, 32*(2), 77-97.

Nelissen, P., & van Selm, M. (2008). Surviving organizational change: how management

communication helps balance mixed feelings. *Corporate Communications: An

International Journal*.

Njanja, L. W., Maina, R., Kibet, L., & Njagi, K. (2013). Effect of reward on employee

performance: A case of Kenya Power and Lighting Company Ltd., Nakuru, Kenya.

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*: Sage publications.

O'Sullivan, P. S., & Irby, D. M. (2011). Reframing research on faculty development. *Academic Medicine, 86*(4), 421-428.

Olssen*, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of education policy, 20*(3), 313-345.

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European journal of work and organizational psychology, 15*(1), 73-101.

Paulsen, M. B. (2001). The economics of human capital and investment in higher education. *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy, and practice*, 55-94.

Pietersen, W. (2002). The Mark Twain Dilemma: the theory and practice for change leadership; the best time to change a company is when it's successful, but that's also the time when resistance to change is at its highest.(Change Management). *Journal of Business Strategy, 23*(5), 32-38.

Pietrazak, M., & Paliszkiewicz, J. (2015). Framework of Strategic Learning: The PDCA. *Management, 10*(2), 149-161.

Pirson, M., & Malhotra, D. (2011). Foundations of organizational trust: What matters to different stakeholders? *Organization science, 22*(4), 1087-1104.

Pless, N., & Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice. *Journal of business ethics, 54*(2), 129-147.

Popescu, C. R., & Popescu, V. A. (2015). The assessment methodology pdca/pdsa-a

methodology for coordinating the efforts to improve the organizational processes to

achieve excellence. *Challenges of the Knowledge Society*, 693.

Portelli, J. P., & Konecny, C. P. (2013). Neoliberalism, subversion and democracy in education.

Encounters in Theory and History of Education, 14, 87-97.

Prensky, M. (2007). How to teach with technology: Keeping both teachers and students

comfortable in an era of exponential change. *Emerging technologies for learning, 2*(4),

40-46.

Preskill, H., & Caracelli, V. (1997). Current and developing conceptions of use: Evaluation use

TIG survey results. *Evaluation Practice, 18*(3), 209-225.

Pucetaite, R., Lämsä, A.-M., & Novelskaite, A. (2010). Building organizational trust in a low-

trust societal context. *Baltic Journal of Management, 5*(2), 197-217.

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the

workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 85*(4), 612.

Purkayastha, D., & Chaudhari, A. (2011). Perfromance Management and Reward Systems. A

case study of Scottrade Inc. *IBS Center for management Research*.

Regine, B., & Lewin, R. (2000). Leading at the edge: How leaders influence complex systems.

Emergence, 2(2), 5-23.

Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Campbell, T. (2010). Organizational Behavior. Harlow: Pearson

Education Limited.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations.

Group & Organization Management, 31(2), 212-236.

Rose, K. H. (2002). Leading change: A model by John Kotter. *Retrieved December, 5*, 2006.

Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2009). *Evaluation in organizations: A systematic approach to enhancing learning, performance, and change*: Basic Books.

Sandhya, K., & Kumar, D. P. (2011). Employee retention by motivation. *Indian Journal of science and technology, 4*(12), 1778-1782.

Sangrà, A., & González-Sanmamed, M. (2010). The role of information and communication technologies in improving teaching and learning processes in primary and secondary schools. *ALT-J, 18*(3), 207-220.

Sarvadi, P. (2010). The best ways to reward employees. *Entrepreneur Magazine, 5*, 82-91.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems practice, 9*(1), 27-47.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2): John Wiley & Sons.

Schneckenberg, D. (2009). Understanding the real barriers to technology-enhanced innovation in higher education. *Educational Research, 51*(4), 411-424.

Schoeffler, B. (2005). Employee Incentive Plans. Make them Worthwhile. *Insurance Journal*.

Schroeder, J. (2017). Leadership Development Spectrum Tool: Applications for Designing Non-Linear Adaptive Leadership Training at an NYSE Financial Services Firm. *Performance Improvement, 56*(9), 12-17.

Schwartz, M. S. (2013). Developing and sustaining an ethical corporate culture: The core elements. *Business Horizons, 56*(1), 39-50.

Sclater, N. (2008). Large scale open source e learning systems at the open University of UK. research bulletin, issue 12. *Boulder, Colorado: Educause centre for applied research:. Retrieved Nov, 9*, 2016.

Sharif, M. M., & Scandura, T. A. (2014). Do perceptions of ethical conduct matter during

organizational change? Ethical leadership and employee involvement. *Journal of

business ethics, 124*(2), 185-196.

Sherer, J. Z., & Spillane, J. P. (2011). Constancy and change in work practice in schools: The

role of organizational routines. *Teachers College Record, 113*(3), 611-657.

Six, F. E. (2007). Building interpersonal trust within organizations: a relational signalling

perspective. *Journal of Management & Governance, 11*(3), 285-309.

Skinner, D. (2007). Evaluating SHRM: Why bother and does it really happen in practice.

Strategic human resource management. Contemporary issues, 117-149.

Smylie, M. A., Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and the development of

distributed leadership. *Journal of School leadership, 17*(4), 469-503.

Speroff, T., & O'Connor, G. T. (2004). Study designs for PDSA quality improvement research.

Quality Management in Healthcare, 13(1), 17-32.

Spotts, T. H. (1999). Discriminating factors in faculty use of instructional technology in higher

education. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 2*(4), 92-99.

Storberg-Walker, J., & Torraco, R. (2004). Change and Higher Education: A Multidisciplinary

Approach. *Online Submission*.

Stragalas, N. (2010). Improving change implementation: Practical adaptations of Kotter's model.

OD practitioner, 42(1), 31-38.

Strebel, P. (1996). *Why Do Employees Resist Change?.: Harvard Business Review*.

Supovitz, J. A., & Tognatta, N. (2013). The impact of distributed leadership on collaborative

team decision making. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 12*(2), 101-121.

Taylor, M. J., McNicholas, C., Nicolay, C., Darzi, A., Bell, D., & Reed, J. E. (2014). Systematic review of the application of the plan–do–study–act method to improve quality in healthcare. *BMJ quality & safety, 23*(4), 290-298.

Thomas, L. G., & Knezek, D. G. (2008). Information, communications, and educational technology standards for students, teachers, and school leaders *International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education* (pp. 333-348): Springer.

Thomas, S. L. (2000). Ties that bind: A social network approach to understanding student integration and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(5), 591-615.

Torrington, D. (2009). *Fundamentals of human resource management: managing people at work*: Pearson Education.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(2), 217-247.

van Vuuren, M., & Elving, W. J. (2008). Communication, sensemaking and change as a chord of three strands. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*.

Vlikangas, L., & Hamel, G. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(9), 52-63.

Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of business ethics, 105*(1), 1-16.

Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 458-495.

Wallace II, L. T. (2018). *Adaptive Leadership in High-Stress Occupations: Applications to the Military*: Northcentral University.

Wang, X., & Wan Wart, M. (2007). When public participation in administration leads to trust: An empirical assessment of managers' perceptions. *Public administration review, 67*(2), 265-278.

Weick, K. E. (1987). Theorizing about organizational communication. *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 97-122.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual review of psychology, 50*(1), 361-386.

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science, 4*(1), 67. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-67

Weston, T. J. (2005). Why faculty did—and did not—integrate instructional software in their undergraduate classrooms. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*(2), 99-115.

Whelan-Berry, K. S., & Somerville, K. A. (2010). Linking change drivers and the organizational change process: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Change Management, 10*(2), 175-193.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of management review, 23*(3), 513-530.

Whiteside, M., Tsey, K., McCalman, J., Cadet-James, Y., & Wilson, A. (2006). Empowerment as a framework for Indigenous workforce development and organisational change. *Australian Social Work, 59*(4), 422-434.

Williams, M. (2001). In whom we trust: Group membership as an affective context for trust development. *Academy of management review, 26*(3), 377-396.

Wilson, W. (2003). Faculty Perceptions and Uses of Instructional Technology A study at one university system revealed the current state of technology and some steps that could improve it. *Educause Quarterly, 26*(2), 60-64.

Yılmaz, E. (2010). The analysis of organizational creativity in schools regarding principals' ethical leadership characteristics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 3949-3953.

Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: practice and research, 62*(2), 81.

Zayim, N., Yildirim, S., & Saka, O. (2006). Technology adoption of medical faculty in teaching: Differentiating factors in adopter categories. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 9*(2), 213-222.

Zhang, H., & Agarwal, N. C. (2009). The mediating roles of organizational justice on the relationships between HR practices and workplace outcomes: an investigation in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20*(3), 676-693.

Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., Brewer, M. B., & Peng, Y. (1995). *Collaboration structure and information dilemmas in biotechnology: Organizational boundaries as trust production* (0898-2937). Retrieved from