

Western University

Scholarship@Western

The Organizational Improvement Plan at
Western University

Education Faculty

7-15-2022

Building Educator e-Pedagogy Skill Efficacy and Capacity to Successfully Engage Students in the Online Learning Environment

Karen M. Roeck

Western University, kroeck@uwo.ca

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



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Educational Technology Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Online and Distance Education Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roeck, K. M. (2022). Building Educator e-Pedagogy Skill Efficacy and Capacity to Successfully Engage Students in the Online Learning Environment. *The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University*, 286. Retrieved from <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/oip/286>

This OIP is brought to you for free and open access by the Education Faculty at Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Organizational Improvement Plan at Western University by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

Abstract

Students around the world are increasingly seeking options for completing their learning in an online format due to its convenience, flexibility, and opportunity for innovative experiences. Higher education institutions need to adapt their course offerings to include robust online programs and train their faculty with the necessary skills to successfully engage their virtual learners to remain competitive in today's market. This Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) identifies gaps of inadequacy of infrastructure to support online learning, limited knowledge of e-pedagogy, lack of clarity about teacher identity, and lack of focus on equity and humanity in the online classroom at a Christian liberal arts university in British Columbia (BC). Theoretical frameworks of social constructivism and humanism frame the approaches to leadership and the proposed change process by centering on serving the needs of others, building authentic relationships, and engaging social capital and collective efficacy to drive change. Through partnerships between faculty and e-pedagogy experts, a professional learning community (PLC) emerges to support faculty in building e-pedagogy skills while increasing capacity to engage students in the online learning environment. Change agents draw on an organizational vision of understanding who we are (e.g., identity), what we believe (e.g., knowledge), and what we are called to do in the world (e.g., action) to create alignment between organizational values and the proposed change process. The outcome creates opportunities for stakeholders to engage with a modernized approach to education while expanding their identity as an educator and serving the diverse needs of learners across the globe.

Keywords: online learning, e-pedagogy, humanism, servant leadership, relational leadership, distributed leadership

Executive Summary

As technology plays an increasingly central role in our society, the field of education must become flexible and adapt approaches to teaching and learning to ensure students are equipped to become engaged, skilled, and contributing 21st century citizens. The demand for online teaching and learning is growing at a rapid pace, yet many teachers and educational leaders refuse to acknowledge the validity of the online learning environment and its potential to serve the needs of diverse learners in comparison to its brick-and-mortar counterpart (Atchison et al., 2019; Fullan, 2012; Irvine, 2020). Additionally, many educators assume they can employ the same pedagogical approaches in a virtual classroom as they do in a physical one, resulting in a disengaged, static learning experience for online students (Darby & Lang, 2019; Serdyukov, 2015). This OIP advocates for the development of educator e-pedagogy skills and capacity to engage students in the online learning environment as crucial elements of propelling the field of education towards equipping and empowering students with much needed 21st century skills. The organizational context is framed within Pacific Coastal University (PCU; a pseudonym), a private Christian liberal arts university in BC. The university's executive leadership team identified the need for a robust online teaching and learning program as part of its long-term strategic plan (Pacific Coastal University, 2016), so PCU serves as an ideal environment to explore this problem of practice (POP). Members of the Dedicated Online Learning Department (DOLD) are identified as key change leaders because of their deep knowledge of online teaching and learning practices and agency and role in the change process.

As an organization, PCU is rooted in theoretical frameworks of social constructivism and humanism, with servant leadership as the guiding leadership approach. To ensure alignment between the organization, the POP, and the proposed change process, the OIP incorporates social

constructivist and humanist lenses throughout each chapter by emphasizing the influence of the community on the learning process and ensuring stakeholders are invited to be active participants in collaborating to reach the desired state (Jacobs et al., 2010; MacCoy, 2014; Schwandt, 1994). The POP focuses on the role of technology in education and the need to build e-pedagogy skills while exploring faculty identity as online teachers and ways to nurture an inclusive and holistic virtual learning community. To achieve the envisioned outcomes, the POP conceptual framework proposes developing PCU faculty as e⁴ online educators who are effective, efficient, engaging, and equitable (Merrill, 2009; Veletsianos, 2021). The e⁴ online educator framework is an intersection of identity, knowledge, and action, aligning with the three elements of the PCU renewed vision statement focused on guiding students to understand who they are, what they believe, and what they are called to do in the world (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.c.).

PCU has several change drivers located both within and external to the organization (Deszca et al., 2020). Drivers of the need for change include: (a) an increased demand for online classes from both domestic and international students; (b) the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic; and (c) the aforementioned PCU renewed vision statement. Through analyzing a change readiness assessment, it is determined that PCU is ready to engage in the POP change process, relying on the strength of openness to change and credible leadership and change champions and being mindful competing internal and external forces impacting change.

To guide the change process, PCU change leaders will embrace a three-pronged approach to leadership through combining elements of servant, relational, and distributed leadership theories. Change agents will empathize with the needs of stakeholders while gaining buy-in and trust through building authentic relationships and utilizing social capital to distribute professional expertise (Donohoo et al., 2018; Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017; Spears, 2010). The selected

change framework of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is deeply rooted in social constructivism and humanism by emphasizing the role of collective efficacy through a strengths-based, cyclical, reflective approach (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010). AI is well-suited to the online teaching and learning environment, which requires a flexible and fluid approach to match the rapid and unpredictable rate of change. Three potential solutions are presented to address the POP of building e-pedagogy skills and increasing student engagement online: (a) outsourcing development to an online program manager (OPM); (b) creating an e-pedagogy task force; and (c) developing an e-pedagogy trial project. The solutions are discussed and compared in light of required resources, strengths, limitations, and key OIP considerations. The chosen solution of developing an e-pedagogy trial project addresses the POP by inviting a group of PCU faculty to partner with DOLD members to develop e-pedagogy skills, apply them in online classes with students, and refine the change implementation plan before rolling it out across the university with all faculty. Ethical, equity, and social justice considerations are discussed throughout the OIP, including ways to meet the needs of diverse learners in the virtual classroom and considerations for infusing equity and humanity while building a relational online community (Coleman, 2012; France, 2021; Future Design School, 2022).

Long-term impacts of this OIP research include reflections on the sustainability of the change process within PCU and across other higher education institutions undertaking similar initiatives to build robust online teaching and learning programs to serve their increasingly diverse student populations. Future considerations also incorporate expanding research of e-pedagogy skill development to serve the needs of students and teachers in the kindergarten to Grade 12 (K-12) environment.

Acknowledgements

Researching and writing on the topic of online teaching and learning in the midst of a global pandemic has proven to be an interesting, challenging, and rewarding endeavour for me personally, professionally, and academically. I am thankful to the faculty of the Western University Doctor of Education (EdD) program, especially Dr. Katie Maxwell, for helping me narrow my POP and make critical lightbulb connections; Dr. Erin Keith, for her enthusiastic encouragement of my research and OIP proposal; and Dr. Ken MacKinnon, for his gracious guidance and thorough feedback as my OIP advisor. As faculty within an online teaching and learning environment, I appreciate your efforts in creating an inclusive and engaging learning community for myself and my cohort members.

To my EdD cohort: congratulations on completing this journey! I am grateful for the opportunity to be encouraged by each of you and the way you continue to lead your school communities through the global pandemic. A particular thank you to Amy Villneff, for being my critical friend and comrade throughout these past three years. Another shout out to Nina Pak Lui, for encouraging me to apply to the EdD program when it was not even close to being on my radar and to Melanie Laurie, for being my creative partner-in-crime. I am excited to continue sharpening one another through our professional collaboration and personal friendships.

Lastly, to my family: my two children, Kayte and Ben, for continually understanding when mom had to read, write, and work and for doing so much to help out around the house. I hope this work will inspire you as learners, thinkers, and creators throughout your lives. To my husband, Aaron: you sacrificed so much for us to undertake this journey together. Thank you for encouraging me so consistently, for asking important questions to challenge my perspectives, and for being the best chef I could ask for. School is (finally) out of session.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xii
List of Figures.....	xiii
Acronyms.....	xiv
Definitions.....	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem of Practice.....	1
Organizational Context.....	2
Organizational and Leadership Frameworks.....	4
Social Constructivism.....	4
Humanism.....	4
Servant Leadership.....	5
Organizational Aspirations and Potential Limitations.....	5
Leadership Position and Lens Statement.....	7
Positionality.....	7
Agency and Role in the Change Process.....	8
Personal Leadership Lens.....	8
Servant Leadership.....	9
Relational Leadership.....	10
Distributed Leadership.....	10

Leadership Problem of Practice.....	11
Framing the Problem of Practice.....	13
The Need to Develop Online Learning Infrastructure.....	13
Faculty Beliefs about Teacher Identity.....	14
Unique Qualities of e-Pedagogy.....	14
Integrating Equity and Humanity in the Online Classroom.....	15
Social Justice Context of the Problem of Practice.....	15
Conceptual Framework.....	16
Identity.....	18
Knowledge.....	18
Action.....	20
Guiding Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice.....	21
The Role of Technology and Building e-Pedagogy Skills.....	21
Faculty Identity and Nurturing Online Community.....	23
Leadership-Focused Vision for Change.....	24
Gaps Between Current and Desired Future State.....	25
Gap 1: Inadequacy of Infrastructure to Support Online Learning.....	25
Gap 2: Limited Knowledge of e-Pedagogical Practices.....	26
Gap 3: Lack of Clarity About Teacher Identity.....	26
Gap 4: Lack of Focus on Equity and Humanity in the Online Classroom.....	27
Priorities for Change: Balancing Organizational and Stakeholder Interests.....	29

Identified Change Drivers.....	30
Drivers of the Need for Change.....	30
Drivers of the Implementation of Change.....	31
Organizational Change Readiness.....	32
Pacific Coastal University Change Readiness Assessment.....	32
Addressing Competing Internal and External Forces Impacting Change.....	33
Chapter 1 Conclusion.....	35
Chapter 2: Planning and Development.....	36
Leadership Approaches to Change.....	36
Servant Leadership.....	36
Relational Leadership.....	38
Distributed Leadership.....	38
A Three-Pronged Leadership Approach to Change.....	40
Framework for Leading the Change Process.....	41
Comparing and Analyzing Relevant Change Frameworks.....	43
Three-Stage Theory of Change.....	43
Eight-Stage Model of Organizational Change.....	45
Appreciative Inquiry 4-D Cycle.....	45
Critical Organizational Analysis.....	49
Inputs.....	50
Transformation Process.....	52
Outputs.....	53
Solutions to Address the Problem of Practice.....	56

Proposed Solution 1: Outsource to an Online Program Manager.....	57
Proposed Solution 2: Create an e-Pedagogy Task Force.....	58
Proposed Solution 3: Develop an e-Pedagogy Trial Project.....	59
Comparison of the Proposed Solutions.....	61
Leadership Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice Challenges in Organizational Change.....	64
Conceptualizing Leadership Ethics.....	64
Organizational Ethical Responsibilities, Considerations, and Challenges.....	66
Social Justice Lens.....	68
Chapter 2 Conclusion.....	69
Chapter 3: Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication.....	71
Change Implementation Plan.....	71
Identifying e-Pedagogy Pilot Project Participants.....	73
Stage 1: Appreciative Inquiry Summit.....	75
Stage 2: e ⁴ Online Educator Professional Learning Community.....	78
Stage 3: Applying e ⁴ Online Educator Skills in an Online Classroom.....	79
Potential Limitations and Challenges.....	80
Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation.....	82
Making Monitoring and Evaluation Meaningful.....	83
The Plan, Do, Study, Act Model.....	84
Plan: Envisioning the Desired State and Developing Objectives.....	86
Do: Engaging Stakeholders and Monitoring Key Measurables.....	87
Study: Analyzing Data to Gauge Progress and Make Adjustments.....	88
Act: Communicating Results and Developing Efficacy.....	89

Refining the Change Implementation Plan.....	90
Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and Change Process.....	91
Building Awareness of the Need for Change.....	91
Framing Issues and Responding to Anticipated Stakeholder Reactions.....	93
Knowledge Mobilization.....	96
Channels and Paths for Communicating Milestones.....	98
Next Steps and Future Considerations.....	99
References.....	103
Appendix A: Organizational Change Readiness Questionnaire.....	128
Appendix B: Comparing Frameworks for Leading the Change Process.....	131
Appendix C: Summary of the Eight Principles of Appreciative Inquiry.....	134
Appendix D: Checklist for Quality Online Courses at Pacific Coastal University.....	135
Appendix E: Comparison of the Proposed Solutions.....	137
Appendix F: Conceptualizing Leadership Ethics Within the OIP.....	138
Appendix G: Example of an Appreciative Inquiry Interview Guide.....	140
Appendix H: Example of an e-Pedagogy Faculty Professional Development Program.....	142
Appendix I: Professional Learning Community Progress Chart.....	144
Appendix J: Online Student Connectedness Survey.....	145

List of Tables

Table 1: Five Key Principles of Distributed Leadership.....	40
Table 2: Short-, Medium-, and Long-Term Goals of the Change Plan.....	72
Table 3: Appreciative Inquiry Summit.....	77

List of Figures

Figure 1: Connections Between PCU Core Values and Servant Leadership Characteristics.....	6
Figure 2: Problem of Practice Conceptual Framework.....	17
Figure 3: Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge Framework.....	19
Figure 4: Theory of Individual and Organizational Identity Toward Social Justice.....	28
Figure 5: A Three-Pronged Leadership Approach to Change.....	41
Figure 6: The Congruence Model.....	50
Figure 7: Monitoring and Evaluating the PCU Change Process with the PDSA Model.....	85
Figure 8: Stakeholder Map.....	94
Figure B1: The Three-Stage Theory of Change.....	131
Figure B2: The Eight-Stage Process of Creating Major Change.....	132
Figure B3: Appreciative Inquiry 4-D Cycle.....	133
Figure F1: An Ethical Framework of Relational Leadership for Sustainability.....	138
Figure F2: An Ethical Framework Combined with OIP Frameworks and Approaches.....	139

Acronyms

AI	(Appreciative Inquiry)
BC	(British Columbia)
COVID-19	(Coronavirus disease 2019)
DOLD	(Dedicated Online Learning Department)
ID	(Instructional designer)
IPTF	(Institutional Priority Task Force)
K-12	(Kindergarten to Grade 12)
KMb	(Knowledge mobilization)
LMS	(Learning management system)
MA	(Master of Arts)
MSc	(Master of Science)
OIP	(Organizational Improvement Plan)
OPM	(Online program manager)
PCU	(Pacific Coastal University)
PDSA	(Plan, Do, Study, Act)
PLC	(Professional learning community)
PM&E	(Participatory monitoring & evaluation)
POP	(Problem of practice)
SOE	(School of Education)
TPACK	(Technological pedagogical and content knowledge)

Definitions

Appreciative Inquiry (AI): A strengths-based framework for leading change, consisting of four iterative stages: (a) Discovery; (b) Dream; (c) Design; and (d) Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) Summit: A gathering where stakeholders meet to intentionally engage in the four stages of AI to work on a task of strategic purpose and creative value to the organization (Cooperrider, 2012).

Asynchronous Learning: Learning that occurs outside the boundaries of face-to-face time between instructor and student (Darby & Lang, 2019).

Collective Efficacy: When a group of individuals collectively believe they can overcome obstacles and produce measurable outcomes through unified efforts towards a common vision (Donohoo et al., 2018).

Congruence Model: A model for conducting a critical organizational analysis, consisting of inputs, transformation process informed by strategy, and outputs while relying on continuous feedback loops to inform the process of identifying needed changes (Nadler & Tushman, 1980).

Crisis Schooling: The forced online education model seen during the COVID-19 pandemic, where educators and students were not allowed to meet face-to-face.

Distance Learning: Learning that takes place when the teacher and students are physically separated.

Distributed Leadership: A leadership model where people contribute to the overall vision of their organization by using their skills to complement those of others (Elmore, 2000).

Domestic Students: Canadian students taking courses either at the physical PCU campus or in an online format.

Drivers for the Need for Change: Change drivers that are both internal and external to an organization (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010).

Drivers of the Implementation of Change: Change drivers that are usually found within the organization and support the implementation of change (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010).

e⁴ Online Educators: The OIP conceptual framework, where educators are effective, efficient, engaging, and equitable, built upon an intersecting foundation of identity, knowledge, and action (Merrill, 2009; Veletsianos, 2021).

e-Pedagogy: Instructional methods and teaching practices specific to the online learning environment (Serdyukov, 2015).

Heutagogy: The study of self-determined learning where the educator's role is to guide the student toward their own path of discovery through a series of engaging and meaningful learning experiences (Hase & Kenyon, 2000; Selwyn, 2014).

Humanism: A theoretical approach that sees the intrinsic value and future potential of each student and emphasizes the importance of recognizing students as three-faceted beings (e.g., intellectual, social, and emotional), both within and beyond their experience within the institution (Ambrose et al., 2010).

Hybrid: A modality of learning where students have the choice of attending face-to-face or online synchronous classes or complete their learning asynchronously through a learning management system (Irvine, 2020).

International Students: Students from a country other than Canada enrolling in courses at a PCU microcampus in their home country and those taking PCU online courses from abroad.

Knowledge Mobilization (KMb): The process of sharing research with a variety of academic and non-academic audiences with the goal of building connections between theory and praxis

through creating actionable messages for real-world application (Cooper et al., 2018; Malik, 2020; Lavis et al., 2003; Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 2019)

Learning Management System: A virtual platform where online courses are tracked and assessed, and students interact in a virtual community.

Microcampuses: In-class learning experiences at a physical location in one country led by local facilitators with courses overseen and assessed by university faculty in another country (White, 2017).

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) Approaches: When stakeholders are invited to become active participants in the monitoring and evaluation process, capturing personal reflections and the perspectives of others while adapting the process as needed to ensure it remains relevant to priorities and mid-, medium-, and long-term goals (Jacobs et al., 2010; MacCoy, 2014).

Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Framework: A four-stage, iterative process for monitoring and evaluating change, engaging with three guiding questions: (a) What are we trying to accomplish?; (b) How will we know when a change is an improvement?; and (c) What change can be made that will result in improvement? (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015).

Professional Learning Community (PLC): A group of stakeholders who meet regularly to discuss milestones, challenges, and enduring questions about a specific area where all stakeholders are working on growing and developing their skills (DuFour et al., 2008).

Relational Leadership: A leadership approach based on the belief that human beings are created to work in connection with one another and emphasizes the value of individual and collective identity to foster authentic, long-lasting change (McCauley & Palus, 2021; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2019; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Servant Leadership: A leadership approach where leaders are motivated to serve the needs of others and help them achieve their full potential (Page, 2009; Spears, 2010).

Social Capital: The connections and common understandings that allow individuals and groups to trust one another and collaborate towards a common goal (Keeley, 2007).

Social Constructivism: The belief that learning occurs through analyzing and reconstructing information based on existing knowledge structures (O'Donoghue, 2017). When individuals engage in the learning process, they develop strategies for applying knowledge to real-life contexts, allowing them to build connections with the content (Dixson, 2015).

Synchronous Learning: Real-time learning where the instructor and student meet together, whether face-to-face or online through a virtual platform (e.g., Zoom) (Darby & Lang, 2019).

Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem of Practice

Education is undergoing rapid changes as online teaching and learning become an integral part of how teachers interact with and relate to their students. Technology allows educational institutions to meet the needs of a variety of learners from across the globe by offering personalized, meaningful learning experiences while building a virtual community of connection with others (Hill, 2021; Ubell, 2021). In the field of higher education, university leadership teams are rethinking the role online teaching and learning plays within the long-term strategic vision of their respective organizations; however, many faculty members continue to view face-to-face instruction as a superior format and refuse to upgrade their approaches to teaching to include specific online teaching strategies (e.g., e-pedagogy). As a long-time online student, educator, and administrator, I have an enthusiasm for building online educator self-efficacy and capacity to engage students in the virtual learning environment. Like many online educators and researchers, I advocate for online teaching and learning as a legitimate modality of education where skilled teachers support learners with engagement opportunities while intentionally developing a supportive learning community (Hodges et al., 2020). In the context of macro-level philosophical shifts in higher education, it is an ideal time to propose a change plan to advance online teaching and learning.

Chapter 1 of the Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) investigates the current state of the online teaching and learning environment at Pacific Coastal University (PCU; a pseudonym) through discussing organizational context, identifying and framing the problem of practice (POP), developing questions to guide the change process, and analyzing organizational change readiness. The chapter also includes an exploration of my personal leadership position, lens, and agency situated within a leadership-focused vision for change at PCU.

Organizational Context

PCU is a mid-sized private Christian liberal arts university in British Columbia (BC), serving nearly 5,000 students in over 100 undergraduate and graduate degree programs (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.d.). The organization is guided by a board of governors composed of Canadian and American Christian leaders, university faculty, and student representatives (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.a.). On a provincial level, the university is categorized as a private theological institution by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training and is authorized to deliver degree programs rooted in a Christian worldview under the Degree Authorization Act (Province of British Columbia, 2021).

PCU was founded in the late 1950s with the goal of establishing an accredited Christian university in southwestern BC. Since its inception, the university has attracted students to its small class sizes and emphasis on a Christian worldview. Over the past ten years, PCU has seen significant growth in international student enrolment from 20% of the total student population in 2010-2011 to nearly 50% in 2019-2020 (Pacific Coastal University, 2020). This growth can be attributed to a variety of factors, such as a growing global desire to study in Canada and an intentional effort by PCU to build partnerships with international higher education institutions (Pacific Coastal University, 2016; Statistics Canada, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). For the purposes of this OIP, international students are defined as students from a country other than Canada enrolling in courses at a PCU microcampus in their home country and those taking PCU online courses from abroad.

Though PCU has not prioritized online education and faculty e-pedagogy development in the past, the need for a robust online program is seen in two aspects of the long-term PCU strategic plan: investing in international student growth through creating international

microcampus partnerships and increasing the domestic student community through offering online and hybrid course options in addition to traditional on-campus programming (Pacific Coastal University, 2016). Microcampuses are defined as in-class learning experiences at a physical location in one country led by local facilitators with courses overseen and assessed by university faculty in another country (White, 2017). Through the use of online tools, microcampus partnerships allow universities to expand their influence and serve the needs of other universities that may not have the resources to adequately support their student populations. In addition, the number of domestic online course offerings across undergraduate and graduate programs will likely remain well above pre-coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) levels as students prioritize the flexibility and accessibility afforded through the online learning environment (Schaffhauser, 2021; Villasenor, 2022; Wan, 2021). For PCU to serve its increasing online student population, organizational leaders must invest in developing faculty e-pedagogy skills, or instructional methods and teaching practices in the online learning environment (Serdyukov, 2015), and equipping faculty to design and teach effective online courses that engage students on intellectual, social, and emotional levels (Ambrose et al., 2010; Future Design School, 2022).

A key department in relation to the POP is PCU's Dedicated Online Learning Department (DOLD; a pseudonym), launched in mid-2019 with an Executive Director and a dedicated staff of existing and newly hired employees, including myself. As part of the PCU strategic plan for growth, DOLD was implemented so that the institution can expand internationally and online (Pacific Coastal University, 2020). In addition to hosting faculty e-pedagogy skill development workshops, the department has influence over online course development projects and potential microcampus partnerships.

Organizational and Leadership Frameworks

PCU is driven by two organizational frameworks: social constructivism (Creswell, 2014; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Schwandt, 1994) and humanism (Ambrose et al., 2010; Decarvalho, 1990; Schultz & Schultz, 2017; Starratt, 2011). Servant leadership is the guiding leadership framework for the organization (Greenleaf, 1970; Page, 2009; Smith et al., 2004; Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011; Winston & Fields, 2015; Winston & Patterson, 2006). As a leader, I will situate my POP and my role within existing organizational and leadership frameworks so I can better understand historical and current factors affecting the change process.

Social Constructivism

Using social constructivist theory, learning is understood as analyzing and reconstructing information based on existing knowledge structures (O'Donoghue, 2017). When individuals engage in the learning process, they develop strategies for applying knowledge to real-life contexts, allowing them to build connections with the content (Dixson, 2015). Social constructivists emphasize the importance of drawing knowledge from the learner's standpoint and value the influence of the community on the learning process (Schwandt, 1994). In the context of PCU, faculty guide students in discovering what they believe, who they are, and what they are called to do in this world. In current face-to-face learning environments, PCU faculty strive to employ teaching practices that emphasize critical thinking, reflective practice, and connections to prior knowledge.

Humanism

A humanist approach focuses on one's strengths, aspirations, and pursuit of personal fulfillment (Schultz & Schultz, 2017). Educational humanists see the intrinsic value and future potential of each student and emphasize the importance of recognizing students as three-faceted

beings (e.g., intellectual, social, and emotional) both within and beyond their experience of an institution (Ambrose et al., 2010). Humanism is deeply foundational to how PCU cares for the student body and greater community, as evidenced in the organization's mission, vision, and values statements (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.b.; Pacific Coastal University; n.d.c.). As PCU faculty already value educational humanism, a critical part of the change process towards developing e-pedagogy efficacy will be demonstrating the importance of incorporating humanism into the online classroom through prioritizing equity and humanity over technology (France, 2020, 2021).

Servant Leadership

As a Christian university, PCU strives to model its leadership after the life and service of Jesus Christ, who came to serve others and not be served Himself (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001). A servant leader's primary motivation is to serve the needs of the person they are leading and help them achieve their full potential (Page, 2009; Spears, 2010). To lead effectively, servant leaders must listen empathically, build trust, and develop a community of support.

PCU's core values closely align with servant leadership principles (see Figure 1). The university's core values emphasize providing students with high academic standards while developing leaders capable of having an impact on a global scale (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.d.).


Organizational Aspirations and Potential Limitations

PCU's mission and vision statements are based on Matthew 28:19-20 and Micah 6:8 respectively, which call Christian leaders to serve God and others through thinking truthfully, acting justly, and living faithfully (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001). As online

student populations continue to grow (Veletsianos et al., 2021), PCU has the opportunity to fulfill its mission and vision statements with a significantly larger population than ever before; however, without equipping faculty with e-pedagogy skills and adapting current programs and courses to meet the demand for robust online learning opportunities, PCU will continually struggle to align with the changing needs of its growing student body.

Figure 1

Connections Between PCU Core Values and Servant Leadership Characteristics



As post-secondary education becomes increasingly globalized, PCU is in a strategic position to serve international students well by building infrastructure to support online teaching and learning at the higher education level (Bound et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). By investing in faculty e-pedagogy skill development and improving online student engagement, PCU will situate itself as a leader in Canadian higher education virtual instruction, expanding its ability to fulfill its mission and vision statements on a global scale.

Leadership Position and Lens Statement

Deszca et al. (2020) outline two critical aspects of change process management: recognizing individual and organizational readiness for change and understanding one's own positionality, lens, and agency within the change process. While I will discuss PCU's current change readiness later on in Chapter 1, I will explore my personal leadership position, potential role in the change process, and theoretical and experiential approaches to leadership practice in this section.

Positionality

Similar to PCU's organizational frameworks, I adhere to social constructivist and humanist worldviews. I believe the process of learning can be viewed as an active construction that involves personal interpretation and application (Creswell, 2014; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Snowman & Biehler, 2012). I believe it is important to value individual perspectives and to recognize the potential of every individual (Decarvalho, 1990; Schultz & Schultz, 2017; Starratt, 2011). The alignment between existing PCU organizational frameworks and my own positionality as a leader will hopefully prove to be an asset as the POP change process unfolds.

I have extensive experience with e-pedagogy as a learner, educator, and leader. My Master of Arts (MA) in Leadership research focused on fostering cultural change through digital literacy and technology integration (Roeck, 2017), and I regularly lead e-pedagogy professional development workshops for teachers and educators in both Kindergarten to Grade 12 (K-12) and higher education modalities. I am personally invested in this OIP because of my passion to empower educators to develop their e-pedagogy skills and create high-quality, inclusive, and engaging learning experiences for their online students.

Agency and Role in the Change Process

As a successful graduate of the PCU MA in Leadership program and current sessional lecturer and DOLD member, I am well situated to participate as a leader in the change process. I have developed an understanding of organizational context from a variety of perspectives (e.g., student, alumna, teacher, staff member), which has enhanced my credibility as an expert in e-pedagogy and online education. Three DOLD members, including myself, are completing terminal degrees in the field of online teaching and learning, which increases the validity of our roles as change agents in the PCU change process.

Within DOLD, I hold the role of instructional designer (ID). Some duties of an ID are: (a) supporting faculty in developing online courses; (b) evaluating online education curriculum and assessment methods; (c) leading professional development sessions on e-pedagogy skills and online student engagement strategies; (d) implementing feedback from student surveys; and (e) researching new innovations in online teaching and learning (Purdue Online, 2021). Being involved in a variety of areas pertaining to the PCU online teaching and learning environment grants me additional agency over the proposed change process.

Personal Leadership Lens

I grew up with a Christian perspective on leadership and was influenced by the guidance of Biblical teaching and modeling of my parents since childhood. I learned the significance of leading by building relationships, working as a collaborative team, and serving others through sacrificial giving of personal time, talent, and treasure. Throughout his career as a youth worker, my father spoke into the lives of thousands of youth across Canada, many of whom credit their career successes and personal accomplishments to his guidance and support (Youth Unlimited, 2019). I witnessed the power of serving others and prioritizing relationships through watching

my father coach and mentor athletes, lead teams of adolescents on international missions trips, and build networks of support with youth in times of crisis. My father's approach to leadership taught me the fundamental difference between leadership as something done *with* others rather than something done *to* others, following the example set by Jesus Christ as his work with his 12 disciples (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001). These experiences during my formative years greatly influence my theoretical approaches to leadership today, which are well-aligned to PCU leadership approaches as a Christian higher education institution.

As my leadership experience increases, I continue to learn that people should be prioritized over tasks when dealing with change (Cialdini, 2021; Cockerell, 2008; McCauley & Palus, 2021; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017; Uhl-Bien, 2006). Though I am a naturally task-oriented person, I have consciously made an effort to invest in others' personal and professional growth through building relationships and nurturing their leadership capacities. To ensure a well-rounded leadership approach and build capacity for change, I adhere to three leadership approaches: (a) servant leadership; (b) relational leadership; and (c) distributed leadership.

Servant Leadership

The primary motivation for servant leaders is to serve those in need and to help them grow as people (Spears, 2010). Servant leadership is intricately woven into the fabric of PCU (see Figure 1) and is a natural fit as a guiding framework for the change process. Under a servant leadership model, each individual is valued for their potential as a whole person, not solely for what they can produce or achieve for the organization. Through implementing Dinwoodie et al.'s (2015) three-level change approach considering self, others, and organization, change agents can identify other stakeholders who embody a servant approach to leadership to increase collective efficacy as change agents.

Relational Leadership

Relational leadership is underpinned by social constructivism and based on the belief that human beings are created to work in connection with one another (McCauley & Palus, 2021; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2019; Uhl-Bien, 2006). As opposed to social exchange theory, which assumes that people behave in a way that maximizes rewards and avoids punishment (Saks, 2006), relational leaders emphasize the value of individual and collective identity to foster authentic, long-lasting change (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Relational leadership theory considers how individuals function within a system, and how the system of relationships can benefit the organization as a whole (McCauley & Palus, 2021). Effective leadership involves a two-way relationship of dependency in which both the leader and followers work together towards a shared purpose (White, 2000). Relational leadership intersects with servant leadership because of its focus on building community and empathetic listening (Spears, 2010) and overlaps with distributed leadership through valuing the expertise and experience of each member of the organization (Elmore, 2000), as explained in the next section.

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership presents an opportunity for people to utilize their strengths to complement an organization's needs and the skills of others on the team (Elmore, 2000). By demonstrating a growth mindset when they are learning new skills themselves, leaders demonstrate accountability (Dweck, 2007). Distributed leadership encourages each member of the organization to contribute to the overall goal through the way in which their skills complement those of others (Elmore, 2000). Change leaders can leverage a core group of motivated and skilled followers by inviting them to speak sustainably into the change process (Hargreaves & Harris, 2015).

Distributed leadership is closely related to a Biblical worldview, as seen in the Apostle Paul's discussion of the body of Christ in 1 Corinthians 12 (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001). In this passage, Paul outlines that just as the physical body has many distinct parts working together to help the body function (e.g., foot, hand, eye), the collective body is composed of people with unique skills and talents that, when combined, propel the organization toward a shared vision of the future. Combining servant, relational, and distributed leadership approaches to change will equip PCU change agents and stakeholders to work collaboratively in transforming institutional and individual leadership principles and practices to address the POP and achieve a new vision.

Leadership Problem of Practice

Distance learning, or learning that takes place when the teacher and students are physically separated, has been in existence for nearly 300 years (Harting & Erthal, 2005). As the internet became widely available in the late 1990s, the definition of distance learning expanded to include digital tools used to facilitate online teaching and learning across both K-12 and higher education. Learning modalities are evolving to include online, hybrid, and multi-access offerings; however, teacher training continues to focus on face-to-face pedagogical approaches with little or no consideration for e-pedagogy principles. (Irvine, 2020; Serdyukov, 2015). Specifically at PCU, four gaps have emerged within the organization revealing the POP: (a) a lack of online learning infrastructure; (b) faculty identity as researcher, not educator; (c) the need to establish specific e-pedagogy skills distinct from face-to-face teaching approaches; and (d) a lack of community in PCU online classes. These gaps are explored in-depth throughout Chapter 1.

The POP under investigation is the lack of faculty e-pedagogy skill development at PCU to meet the growing demand for online course offerings. Faculty are content to stay in the familiar environment of face-to-face learning and will remain hesitant to move out of their comfort zone to participate in e-pedagogical skill development initiatives without strong institutional support or inducement to change (Frass et al., 2017; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020). Many faculty members were unimpressed with the COVID-19 quick pivot to online learning in March 2020 and were eager to return to their physical classrooms and former teaching methods while completely avoiding online instruction in the post-pandemic world (Ubell, 2021). Faculty, on the whole, are not pedagogical experts, and many find their scholarly identity in the progression of their research rather than developing their teaching skills (Cutri & Mena, 2020). This is due to the deeply rooted systemic nature of elevating quality scholarship over teaching in higher education and is a possible constraint to the POP to keep in mind when developing the change implementation plan.

PCU system leaders influence change in the area of faculty e-pedagogy capacity building, quality online course design, and student engagement metrics in alignment with the university's long-term strategic plan. To successfully meet the rising demand for online courses, PCU must invest in the development of faculty e-pedagogy skill efficacy while building a broad understanding amongst faculty of why online education requires a specific pedagogical approach and how effective online teaching and purposeful online course design contributes to PCU's long-term strategic plan through increasing online student engagement and success. To do this effectively, PCU change agents must frame the POP within overarching internal and external considerations.

Framing the Problem of Practice

The POP is situated within the social constructivist and humanist frameworks of PCU and requires framing to address four existing gaps, as mentioned in the previous section. Next, I analyze broader contextual forces shaping the practices that form the problem, followed by an exploration of the social justice context of the POP and a discussion of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework developed to address the POP.

The Need to Develop Online Learning Infrastructure

Ubell (2021) discusses the importance of a robust infrastructure to support the needs of online learners while creating an inclusive, accessible learning environment. Though PCU leadership established DOLD to support the beginning stages of developing online learning infrastructure at PCU, faculty did not value the role of the department until the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty and students were forced to pivot to online crisis schooling, which catapulted online learning to the spotlight and identified crucial gaps in what is needed to support student learning in the virtual environment (Shin & Hickey, 2020; Veletsianos, 2021). Though gaps in faculty e-pedagogy skill development existed before the global pandemic, higher education institutions—including PCU—did not prioritize establishing infrastructure to train and support faculty teaching online (Cutri & Mena, 2020; Fusarelli, 2020; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020). It is not sufficient to expect faculty to know how to design quality online courses and engage students from a distance without providing guidance and ongoing support from a team of skilled professionals (e.g., IDs, graphic designers, videographers, program managers), as this creates a gap in quality of online course design (Darby & Lang, 2019; Ubell, 2021). This is an important consideration when planning the PCU change process and will inform the critical organizational analysis and possible solutions to address the POP in Chapter 2.

Faculty Beliefs about Teacher Identity

As mentioned in the POP statement, PCU faculty often emphasize their scholarship and publication portfolio over their teaching responsibilities, resulting in a lack of pedagogical knowledge and a passive, disengaging learning experience for students. A crucial step in developing e-pedagogy skills is for faculty to realize why becoming a better teacher is important in the first place. As 21st century teaching practices shift from teacher-led instruction to student-centred learning, faculty need support from university leadership teams to become professionally vulnerable and devote time towards upgrading their approaches to teaching and learning (Frass et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2019; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020). Faculty will only disrupt their primary identity as researchers if PCU leadership supports the process with time, financial investment, and recognition of teaching as an equally valid contribution to the university (Cutri & Mena, 2020).

Unique Qualities of e-Pedagogy

Once faculty are aware of their important roles as teachers, the next step is to emphasize specific skills needed to become a competent online educator. Online courses require distinct approaches to engage students in both synchronous (e.g., occurring at the same time) and asynchronous (e.g., occurring at different times) learning opportunities involving individual and collaborative activities (Darby & Lang, 2019; Serdyukov, 2015). Effective online educators must be persistently present in the virtual classroom and communicate frequently to ensure students are actively engaged with material and understand what is needed to succeed in the course (Allen et al., 2013). Students who study online tend to have a different profile than their campus counterparts (e.g., workload, family responsibilities, time zone challenges), so it makes sense that online faculty require different skills than their face-to-face colleagues to meet the needs of

their online learners (Ubell, 2021). Currently, PCU faculty are not required by leadership to engage in professional development to upgrade their pedagogical approaches when teaching across a variety of modalities, resulting in a gap in preparedness to teach online courses and engage students in the virtual learning environment.

Integrating Equity and Humanity in the Online Classroom

Online learning can be an isolating, lonely experience, since there is the illusion that others are not there to help and support (Darby & Lang, 2019; France, 2020, 2021; Shin & Hickey, 2020). Offering online courses is important to meet the needs of a variety of learners at PCU, and educators must prioritize both the development of digital literacy skills and building community through integrating emotional intelligence and opportunities for relationship in the virtual classroom (Valkovicova, 2021). Infusing humanism in the online classroom requires a focus on three potential relationships to create a meaningful learning environment for students to develop as well-rounded citizens: teacher to student, student to teacher, and student to student (Darby & Lang, 2019). Currently, not all PCU online faculty are intentional in creating a welcoming community through setting up a clear and inviting learning management system (LMS) (e.g., the virtual classroom), providing accommodations for students with exceptional learning needs, communicating frequently, and encouraging students to share about themselves and who they are apart from what they are learning in the course, leading to varied learning experiences for virtual students.

Social Justice Context of the Problem of Practice

While online education has the potential to break down certain barriers to learning (e.g., geographic location, transportation challenges, social conditions), there are equity gaps to consider when framing the POP. As educators, PCU faculty have a duty to provide an accessible

education for all students. Without building e-pedagogy skills, faculty will not have the necessary knowledge and skills to adapt digital content, provide alternative assessment options, and present virtual material in an accessible way, resulting in an inequitable learning experience for students who rely on flexible, adaptive approaches (ABLE Research Consultants, 2020; Johnson et al., 2020; Villasenor, 2022). As students balance academic, social, and emotional pressures, supporting healthy student mental well-being needs to be a top priority for faculty, especially in the potentially isolating online learning environment. If PCU faculty remain unwilling to develop their e-pedagogy skills and learn how to intentionally build an online community, online students may feel increasingly dehumanized and isolated and seek alternative university education at an institution with more robust online learning infrastructure and better equipped faculty (France, 2020, 2021; Inglis, 2022).

Conceptual Framework

Jabareen (2009) defines a conceptual framework as an interconnected network of concepts that provides a holistic approach to understanding a given subject matter. The POP is framed by a conceptual framework that is an intersection of identity, knowledge, and action in developing as an e⁴ online educator (see Figure 2). According to Merrill (2009), an e³ educator should be effective, efficient, and engaging. Veletsianos (2021) adds equitable as a fourth key element. The overlapping circles draw from the Japanese concept of ikigai, where concepts of equal value from each circle simultaneously bring personal fulfillment and benefit to others (Gaines, 2021).

PCU recently announced a renewed organizational vision statement based on three key characteristics and guiding questions (M. Husbands, personal communication, May 5, 2021):


- Identity: Who am I?

- Knowledge: What do I believe?
- Output: What am I called to do in the world?

The POP conceptual framework is based on interconnections between these three influencing factors, resulting in a multi-fold approach to guide the PCU change process and achieve the desired state. Each of the three characteristics and their connections to the concept of developing as an e⁴ online educator are discussed in further detail below.

Figure 2

Problem of Practice Conceptual Framework




Identity

According to humanist psychologists Robert Maslow and Carl Rogers, a person is self-actualized, or working at their full potential, when they demonstrate awareness of all experiences, are open to positive and negative feelings, trust in their own behaviours and experiences, and recognize a continual need to grow and learn (Schultz & Schultz, 2017). These characteristics are closely tied to developing one's identity as an e⁴ online educator, as one must be self-aware of the need to develop e-pedagogy skills and demonstrate a growth mindset when experimenting with new teaching approaches in the online classroom. An e⁴ online educator does not find their identity solely in scholarly research; rather, they focus on meeting student learning needs and building skills to be effective, efficient, engaging, and equitable in the online learning environment. At PCU, this means a shift in how faculty view their role within the university and a change in how leadership values the contributions of faculty in a variety of learning modalities, not solely face-to-face classroom teaching.

Knowledge

e⁴ online educators are well versed in two e-pedagogy frameworks: Technological pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK) (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) and heutagogical approaches to learning (Hase & Kenyon, 2000).

Mishra and Koehler (2006) believe technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and content knowledge exist as separate entities, but are most effective when they overlap and create a distinct approach to online teaching and learning (see Figure 3). Currently at PCU, most faculty have a robust level of content knowledge, minimal pedagogical knowledge, and little or no technical knowledge, resulting in a gap between current and desired states of overlap between the three knowledge areas.

Figure 3*Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge Model*

Note. Adapted from “Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge,” by P. Mishra and M. J. Koehler, 2006, *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), p. 1025. Copyright 2001 by Teachers College Record. Adapted with permission.

Heutagogy is a relatively new approach to teaching and learning. Coined by Hase and Kenyon (2000), the term refers to the study of self-determined learning. Heutagogy is rooted in social constructivism, as the approach emphasizes active construction of knowledge on the part of the learner and recognizes the centrality of self-efficacy in the learning process (Davis, 2018; Future Design School, 2022). Heutagogy is well-suited to the online learning environment where the e⁴ online educator’s role is to guide the student toward their own path of discovery through a series of engaging and meaningful learning experiences (Selwyn, 2014). Students who choose to take courses online have unique learning needs compared to many of their face-to-face counterparts (e.g., live internationally, work during the day, have family responsibilities). Online

students need flexibility to explore concepts and complete assignments at their own pace while developing personal connections to course content to make it meaningful and applicable in their lives. By integrating heutagogical approaches with e-pedagogy skill development, e⁴ online educators build their abilities to design purposeful, meaningful learning experiences and give students the opportunity to take ownership of their learning in the virtual space.

Action

Once an e⁴ online educator develops their identity in the virtual learning environment and deepens their knowledge of e-pedagogical frameworks, they are prepared to actively engage in developing quality, inclusive, and accessible online courses. Considering aforementioned social justice contexts, e⁴ online educators use digital tools to carefully construct online learning communities to be accessible and welcoming while fostering student persistence and success (Darby & Lang, 2019). At PCU, faculty must take action to integrate the new vision statement to ensure online learning spaces prepare students to discover who they are, what they believe, and what they are called to do in the world.

The e⁴ online educator conceptual framework will serve as a foundational element of the planning and development and implementation, evaluation, and communication of the PCU change process, as outlined in subsequent chapters. Additionally, the framework will equip change agents to address identified gaps in developing online learning infrastructure, reframing faculty beliefs about teacher identity, highlighting strengths of e-pedagogical approaches, and developing inclusive, vibrant online learning communities. PCU change leaders will use these identified broader contextual forces to frame guiding questions to direct their work towards achieving the desired state.

Guiding Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice

The POP focuses on the current gap in PCU faculty e-pedagogy skill development in connection with meeting the needs of domestic and international online students. By framing the POP through broader contextual forces, considering social justice contexts, reviewing relevant literature, and applying the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework, four guiding questions emerge:

1. How will universities develop infrastructure to support online learning in the post-pandemic world?
2. How does e-pedagogy enhance traditional teaching methods?
3. What are faculty beliefs about their identity as a teacher?
4. What are strategies for integrating equity and humanity in the online learning environment?

Informed by the literature, organizational context, and POP framing, each research question guides the process of planning and developing the POP for eventual implementation, evaluation, and communication of the change process at PCU. Challenges, potential factors of influence, and possible lines of inquiry for each guiding question are explored further below.

The Role of Technology and Building e-Pedagogy Skills

Over the past few decades, developments in technology have shifted the global landscape and revolutionized our culture, norms, and values through how we work, interact, and live in the world. Originally designed as a tool for information exchange, the internet has developed into a complex system which empowers individuals to create, collaborate, connect, and communicate across the globe (Dentzel, 2014). As of July 2021, 4.8 billion people, or nearly 61% of the world's population, are connected to the internet (Kepios, 2021). American company SpaceX

plans to offer high-speed, low latency broadband internet access to rural and remote communities worldwide by the end of 2021 (Starlink, 2021). Political, economic, social, and educational initiatives that were once restricted by geographic, financial, or time constraints are now possible through technological innovations as society looks to build digital efficiencies on a global scale.

Domestic students who were forced to participate in online courses during the COVID-19 pandemic discovered the unexpected benefits afforded to them through the virtual classroom, such as: (a) flexibility and variety when selecting courses (Johnson et al., 2020; Shin & Hickey, 2020); (b) increased equity amongst peers (France, 2021; Veletsianos, 2021); and (c) accommodations of learning needs (Frass et al., 2017; Openo, 2020). Continued access to online learning options after the pandemic is a high priority for many students (McKenzie, 2021; Schaffhauser, 2021; Seaman & Johnson, 2021).

As seen at PCU, the globalization of higher education has brought a significant influx of international students to Canada. According to the Canadian Bureau for International Education (2020), over 530,000 international students studied in Canada in 2020 with 22%, or nearly 120,000, of international students choosing to study in BC. In addition to travel restrictions, delays in student visa and study permit application processing can prevent international students from attending face-to-face classes on campus (Statistics Canada, 2020). By creating a robust offering of online courses, PCU can serve the needs of international students in creating options to study from their home country for part or all of their post-secondary education, making Canadian education more affordable and realistic for a wider audience of international students. This line of inquiry is connected to the knowledge and action sections of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework.

Faculty Identity and Nurturing Online Community

There is a longstanding tension in academia between the act of teaching and the act of engaging in scholarly research (Cutri & Mena, 2020; Fusarelli, 2020; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020; Ubell, 2021). Though tenure-track faculty portfolios generally consist of research, teaching, and service, research is traditionally given top priority because of the financial benefits and associated prestige (Fusarelli, 2020). As a result, university faculty do not place high priority on developing their pedagogical skills in the face-to-face classroom, and much less so for online teaching. e-Pedagogy skill development initiatives will fail unless institutional leadership repositions teaching as a valued aspect of a faculty member's role and provides adequate resources to build the necessary skills.

Some PCU faculty struggle with teaching in the virtual classroom due to concerns about how technology affects one's identity formation and ability to form deep relationships in community (Smith et al., 2020). In a Christian education setting, both identity formation and relationship building are foundational elements of guiding students towards who God is calling them to be (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001). Research shows it is possible to create a human-centred virtual learning community through establishing cognitive, social, and teaching presence with students (Darby & Lang, 2019; France, 2021); however, some PCU faculty do not see the potential for infusing humanism into the online classroom and believe students can only develop their identity and develop meaningful relationships when learning in a physical classroom. PCU change agents need to integrate ways of building authentic connections in the virtual classroom when planning the change process. This line of inquiry is connected to the identity section of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework. PCU change agents will

frame the four guiding questions through a leadership-focused vision for change, as discussed in the following section.

Leadership-Focused Vision for Change

One of the characteristics of servant leadership theory is conceptualization (Spears, 2010). Effective servant leaders have the ability to balance big-picture conceptual thinking with day-to-day practical responsibilities. Relational leadership theorists believe a collaboratively generated vision is a foundational element of the change process, as it grounds stakeholders in working together towards a common goal and acts as a narrative throughline when there are inevitable changes in leaders and environmental considerations (McCauley & Palus, 2021; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017; Uhl-Bien, 2006). Distributed leaders set a vision for change by integrating expertise from key stakeholders instead of solely relying on the opinions of those in formal positions of power (Elmore, 2000). Since the PCU change process is guided by intersections of these three leadership approaches, the leadership-focused vision for change is appropriately framed within the three theories and the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework.

The PCU vision for change is that the organization will invest in equipping faculty to develop and teach high quality online courses to meet market demands and equip students with competencies needed to succeed in the 21st century. Faculty will explore their identities as teachers through upgrading e-pedagogy skills, learning about strategies specific to teaching in the online learning environment, and integrating social constructivist, humanist, and equitable approaches to empower students in developing individual identities toward social justice. The change process will align with the university's mission to make a global impact through capacity building, academic excellence, service, and leadership development (Pacific Coastal University, 2020).

Gaps Between Current and Desired Future State

Identified gaps are based on the four POP guiding questions as discussed in the previous section. Each gap is described below, and the related desired future state is connected to PCU change agent leadership theories and the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework.

Gap 1: Inadequacy of Infrastructure to Support Online Learning

The quick pivot to online crisis schooling during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic magnified PCU's inability to adequately support faculty and students in the online teaching and learning environment. DOLD, which was initially created to help fulfill PCU's strategic vision to expand international and online course offerings, was suddenly responsible for overseeing a university-wide transition to 100% online learning. At the time, DOLD members did not have the capacity to focus on international microcampus partnerships while simultaneously creating and implementing learning sessions and ongoing support for disinterested faculty members at the end of a busy semester. This resulted in a dilution of efforts and effectiveness for the department and a lack of much needed support for PCU faculty.

Another misalignment of infrastructure is the wide variety of online platforms being used by faculty in the virtual classroom. PCU provides Microsoft accounts to all faculty and students, yet few understand how to effectively use the available tools (e.g., Forms, OneDrive, OneNote, Stream, Teams). Since the organization does not currently provide digital onboarding or orientation to teach faculty and students how to use these accounts, many faculty turn to third-party digital platforms with which they are personally comfortable but are not necessarily familiar to students nor supported by DOLD. In an anecdotal conversation with an online student, they shared that they were expected to use 15 unique digital platforms between their different professors in one term (S. Macklin, personal communication, 2020). Many faculty

incorrectly assume that since the majority of students are digital natives (e.g., have grown up immersed in technology) (Prensky, 2001), they have innate knowledge of how to use every available technological platform; however, students need to be taught how to use technology as tool to research, present, and communicate in the online environment (Darby & Lang, 2019).

Gap 2: Limited Knowledge of e-Pedagogical Practices

As outlined in the previous section, faculty currently have low levels of understanding of the two theoretical frameworks outlined in the knowledge section of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework. Most faculty currently approach online teaching and learning in the same way they approach face-to-face learning without much time or attention spent on learning research-based approaches to what is effective practice when teaching online students. As a result, there is a gap in the effectiveness of technology integration to engage students in online classes.

In the desired future state, faculty development sessions will be guided by the TPACK framework and heutagogical approaches to teaching and learning. As discussed previously, heutagogy emphasizes self-determined learning in which students become active synthesizers and analysts of information (Davis, 2018). According to this model, the learner is provided with resources by the teacher, who supports their efforts to discover knowledge and to form new understandings. A proactive learning process emerges, geared toward solving problems and strengthening self-efficacy in students (Hase & Kenyon, 2000; Moore, 2020).

Gap 3: Lack of Clarity About Teacher Identity

There are some faculty members that view themselves as content experts rather than learning facilitators, which often results in overlooking the importance of learner-centred practices (Cutri & Mena, 2020). Some faculty base their online teaching and learning practices

on outdated approaches, resulting in lower engagement amongst students (Dumford & Miller, 2018; Openo, 2020; Wagner, 2015). Faculty at PCU will develop their identity as educators while incorporating 21st century approaches to teaching and learning, connected to the passion element of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework (e.g., the intersection of identity and knowledge). Ideally, PCU change leaders will frame the role of a teacher through a Biblical lens by discussing how the Apostle Paul defines teaching as a gift and an integral part of the work of one who leads others (*The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*, 2001) and exploring Christian perspectives on how technology has the potential to bring change to the world (Smith et al., 2020).

Gap 4: Lack of Focus on Equity and Humanity in the Online Classroom


For the majority of PCU faculty, their only experience with online teaching and learning is pandemic pedagogy during COVID-19, where they were overly focused on content dissemination and not on creating an inviting community of learning or building relationships with or amongst students. In the desired future state, faculty will intentionally create a learning environment to serve the development needs of the whole student (e.g., intellectual, social, emotional) (Ambrose et al., 2010) while providing differentiation and adaptations to support students with exceptional learning needs (Openo, 2020). The combination of developing an identity as an online educator, learning e-pedagogical practices, and designing quality, inclusive, and accessible online courses focused on holistic student development encompasses the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework.

According to France (2020), online teachers need to cultivate a sense of belonging to invite students to be vulnerable, honest, and advocates for justice. In the desired future state, PCU faculty will have a broader understanding of their role in the online classroom and the

intersection of various types of identity development on micro and macro levels. To create a learning environment where students can develop their potential as agents of social justice, faculty must centre their teaching within an intersecting framework of five levels of identity development: (a) organizational; (b) leader; (c) staff; (d) student; and (e) community (Capper, 2018). According to Capper (2018)'s theory of individual and organizational identity toward social justice, individuals experience identity formation across the five levels in a nonlinear fashion (see Figure 4). Effective online educators are mindful of each of the five levels and give students opportunities to explore how their individual identity intersects with the other four levels while learning in a holistic, inclusive community, which is strongly tied to the identity, knowledge, and action aspects of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework.

Figure 4

Theory of Individual and Organizational Identity Toward Social Justice



Note. Adapted from *Organizational Theory for Equity and Diversity: Leading Integrated, Socially Just Education* (p. 220), by C. A. Capper, 2018, Routledge. Copyright 2018 by Routledge. Adapted with permission.

Priorities for Change: Balancing Organizational and Stakeholder Interests

PCU's vision statement focuses on achieving academic excellence, serving the community, and developing leaders (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.c.). The vision statement helps develop a cohesive understanding amongst staff and faculty concerning the organization's objectives, goals, and purpose (Deszca et al., 2020). In alignment with the strategic plan, PCU endeavors to establish partnerships with microcampuses and increase its visibility in the online marketplace while continuing to grow its domestic and international online student populations. Following Zhao's (2015) recommendations, this strategy embraces global perspectives, global networks, and global competencies in both domestic and international contexts to fulfill PCU's mission statement of preparing students with needed 21st century skills to help and work with others.

Change priorities on the individual level refer to both PCU faculty and students. As mentioned before, faculty will develop according to the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework. In the ideal future state, PCU's working environment will transition from an individualistic, internally focused climate to a collaborative atmosphere, centered on deep student learning to develop 21st century competencies. Faculty will emphasize the distribution of expertise and the building of relationship trust through the use of social capital (Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017) in addition to becoming change agents themselves through collaborative professional development (King & Stevenson, 2017). As a result of the POP change process, heutagogy will be integrated into the online learning environment to enhance the student learning experience. Students will become active participants in their learning, seeking areas of uncertainty and complexity while being guided by trained faculty in the online learning environment (Davis, 2018). A major component of the learning outcomes will be the

development of skills and competencies based on deliverables from learning artifacts (Moore, 2020), enabling students to take control of their learning and graduate from PCU equipped with the necessary skills to create impact on a global scale (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.b.).

Identified Change Drivers

Change drivers are located both within and external to an organization (Deszca et al., 2020). When identifying change drivers to the PCU POP, Whelan-Berry and Somerville (2010) suggest differentiating between drivers of the need *for* change and drivers of the implementation *of* change.

Drivers of the Need for Change

Drivers of the need for change are both internal and external to PCU. The first driver is the increasing demand for online classes from both domestic and international students. According to Matias et al. (2021), the COVID-19 pandemic caused 54% of 2,800 surveyed international students to defer admission to face-to-face Canadian universities. By offering quality online courses, PCU opens its admissions to a wider audience, as students gain the ability to study from anywhere in the world.

The second driver is the COVID-19 pandemic itself. The pandemic launched online teaching and learning to the centre stage of academia and, in effect, rescued conventional higher education in a time of crisis (Ubell, 2021). As a result, many university leaders are rethinking the role online learning plays in their organizations' long-term strategic visions. As higher education undergoes a period of widespread philosophical shifts, it is an ideal opportunity to propose a change plan for online teaching and learning.

The third driver is the renewed PCU vision statement. The organization is focusing on equipping students to answer three key questions: (a) who am I? (identity); (b) what do I believe?

(knowledge); and (c) what am I called to do in the world? (action). Faculty e-pedagogy development initiatives should be designed around intentionally infusing these three guiding questions into online course design to invite students on a journey of self-discovery and meaning making.

Drivers of the Implementation of Change

Drivers of the implementation of change are usually found within the organization and support the implementation of change (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). PCU has three change drivers in this category: (a) DOLD; (b) the PCU executive leadership team; and (c) professional development opportunities.

In the context of my OIP, the change process will be led by DOLD e-pedagogy experts and PCU faculty who are innovators and early adopters in their own e-pedagogical skill development. Innovators and early adopters are people in an organization who buy into the change process early and are willing to take risks and experiment with new ideas (Rogers, 2003).

The PCU executive leadership team is responsible for casting the overall organizational vision and setting the budget for professional development initiatives. As the POP change process rolls out, the executive leadership team is a key change driver in supporting change initiatives from a senior management level. DOLD can partner with the PCU executive leadership team through employing relational and distributed leadership strategies (e.g., reciprocity of accountability and capacity (Elmore, 2000); emphasizing the value of personal and collective identities (Uhl-Bien, 2006)). Finally, e-pedagogy professional development is a type of change-related learning (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). PCU change leaders will intentionally design professional development centred in the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework to provide PCU faculty with an overview of what the change initiative requires in

terms of skills, values, and frameworks. After PCU change leaders identify and define priorities for change, drivers of the need for change, and drivers of the implementation of change, it is essential to determine organizational change readiness.

Organizational Change Readiness

There are two levels of change readiness to consider: individual change readiness, which pertains to stakeholder beliefs, attitudes, and openness to change (Mahendrati & Mangundjaya, 2020; Rogers, 2003), and organizational change readiness, which refers to overall institutional preparedness to undertake the complex, iterative process of change (Armenakis et al., 1993; Judge & Douglas, 2009; Lannes & Logan, 2004; Weiner, 2009). This section will specifically discuss the latter level of change readiness, while the former is unpacked more deeply in Chapter 3.

Pacific Coastal University Change Readiness Assessment

When considering organizational change readiness, I reflectively evaluated PCU using Deszca et al.'s (2020) change readiness questionnaire (see Appendix A). I selected this measurement tool because the six assessment categories are closely linked to current areas of strength and growth at PCU. I appreciate how the authors have adapted the questionnaire over the various editions of the text in response to the need for a more nuanced and accurate tool. In earlier editions, scores were a single number (e.g., Score +1), but the authors recently adjusted measurement options to allow for a wider range of assessment (e.g., Score 0 to +3).

Deszca et al. (2020) advise that scores will range from -25 to +50, with higher scores correlating to a higher organizational readiness for change. PCU's result from this formative assessment exercise is +17. The highest results are seen in the categories for openness to change (+8) and credible leadership and change champions (+5), while the lowest results fall in previous

change experiences (-2) and rewards for change (+1). Executive support (+2) and measures for change and accountability (+3) score in the middle of the results. PCU change leaders can analyze these results to better understand strengths and anticipated challenges when planning and communicating the proposed change process to stakeholders.

In their seminal article on organizational change readiness, Armenakis et al. (1993) outline four possible combinations of organizational change readiness based on how urgently the change is needed and how ready the organization is for the change:

- Aggressive (low urgency/low readiness)
- Crisis (high urgency/low readiness)
- Maintenance (low urgency/high readiness)
- Quick Response (high urgency/high readiness)

When considering the POP, PCU falls between the Crisis and Quick Response categories. The need to build faculty e-pedagogy skills is urgent as the demand for online courses continues to grow in both domestic and international contexts. The score of +17 out of a possible +50 on the change readiness questionnaire indicates a mid-level of organizational change readiness. PCU change leaders should rely on the strength of the openness to change and credible leadership and change champions categories when planning possible solutions to the POP to ensure the change process focuses on strong areas of organizational change readiness.

Addressing Competing Internal and External Forces Impacting Change

Deszca et al. (2020) assert organizational change readiness must be purposefully constructed within a system of supportive structures; however, deep rooted beliefs that are firmly embedded within an organization may impede the change process (Lewis, 2011). At PCU, many faculty adhere to the worldview that research and scholarship are superior to developing

effective teaching practices. Other faculty members view face-to-face teaching as the only legitimate method of education and refuse to consider the potential impact of developing robust online courses to serve the learning needs of a wider student population. Faculty members who are open to developing e-pedagogy skills are generally younger and less established than their tenured counterparts, and do not possess positional power and influence over their colleagues (Northouse, 2012). Lewis (2011) advises change leaders to consider what type of resistance is present (e.g., cognitive, emotional, behavioural), and avoid downplaying the value of dissent to the change process. Rather, change agents should view internal resistance from stakeholders as an opportunity to obtain insightful input and valuable feedback from a wider audience.

A competing external force is the COVID-19 pandemic and its influence on how faculty view online teaching and learning. The vast majority of faculty did not teach in the online environment prior to the quick pivot during March 2020 and were not equipped or supported to implement digital tools and build a virtual learning community using research-based e-pedagogical approaches. Instead, faculty attitudes towards online teaching quickly soured because they believed it was insurmountably difficult to recreate the physical classroom environment in the online setting. As a result, some faculty have narrowed their definition of online teaching and learning to what they experienced during COVID-19 crisis schooling and refuse to consider the potential of learning through intentionally constructed online courses taught by faculty trained in e-pedagogical practices.

A third competing force is the current and future PCU student population. This group can be considered both an internal and external force that impacts change. Internally, some current students are frustrated and discouraged by the lack of clarity, guidance, and communication when taking online courses at PCU during the COVID-19 pandemic. According to informal

conversation data, several students felt isolated and confused because faculty were not equipped with the skills and knowledge needed to successfully engage students in the online learning environment. These students may lose patience and leave the university to enroll elsewhere before PCU has the opportunity to address the POP and embark on the change process.

Externally, domestic and international students who prefer to learn online may choose to apply to other universities who have more established virtual learning options and better trained faculty members. PCU's strategic plan to build microcampus partnerships with overseas universities could be adversely impacted if international student numbers decline.

Chapter 1 Conclusion

To address the POP, Deszca et al. (2020) implore change leaders to first consider the question of "Why change?" When this question is addressed in a meaningful way, change leaders and stakeholders are more likely to align under a shared vision of the desired future state. To position itself as a leader in online teaching and learning, PCU must address key gaps in building a robust online learning infrastructure, shifting faculty identity to include both educator and researcher, establishing e-pedagogy skill-building opportunities, and developing meaningful and inclusive online learning communities. As described throughout Chapter 1, the "why" of the PCU change process is informed by organizational context, accurate framing of the POP, a leadership-focused vision for change, and an examination of organizational change readiness. After a common framework of "Why change?" is established, change leaders can proceed with "What to change?" and "How to change?" which are presented in Chapters 2 and 3 of the OIP, respectively.

Chapter 2: Planning and Development

Chapter 2 of the OIP discusses specific leadership approaches to change, presents a framework for leading the change process, reviews organizational context to determine the best change path, and compares and contrasts potential solutions to address the POP. The chapter concludes with a discussion surrounding ethics, equity, and social justice considerations of the POP.

Leadership Approaches to Change

Effective leadership is rooted in the ontological assumption that humans are complex beings with individual thoughts, perspectives, and attitudes (Wright, 2000). Since people are the catalyst for long-lasting change, leadership approaches should focus on developing people to their fullest potential while functioning as a unified team within a network of relationships. To propel change forward at PCU, change leaders will employ a combination of three human-centred leadership approaches to change: (a) servant leadership; (b) relational leadership; and (c) distributed leadership.

Servant Leadership

In his seminal writing, Greenleaf (1970) defined servant leaders as those who are servant first and leader second. By this definition, servant leaders are primarily driven by the opportunity to equip, encourage, and empower those around them through adopting an others-centred approach. They are not motivated by self-recognition or acquisition of power or material possessions (Luenendonk, 2020); rather, to a true servant leader, leadership is not a result of holding an official position or attaining a status symbol, but a calling to serve others and helping them achieve their full potential (Smith et al., 2004).

Servant leadership is closely connected with humanism through its emphasis on committing to the growth and development of others (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2007; Winston & Fields, 2015) and intentionally building community (Luenendonk, 2020; Schwantes, 2015; Spears, 2010). This holistic perspective on human development aligns with PCU's renewed vision statement of preparing students to discover who they are, what they believe, and what they are called to do in the world. By incorporating a servant leadership approach into the POP change process, PCU change leaders can model how to help others grow as a whole person (Beck, 2014), which may encourage faculty to adopt similar strategies with their students in the online learning environment.

There is debate among scholars as to the true antecedents of servant leadership (Beck, 2014). Some believe servant leadership stems from ethical leadership theory (Parris & Peachey, 2013; Reed et al., 2011), while others argue the motivation to serve others is a result of possessing specific personality traits (Claar et al., 2014; Hunter et al., 2013). Many researchers agree that servant leadership originates from the life and work of Jesus Christ, who modelled how to care for others in a self-sacrificing, altruistic manner (Beck, 2014; Clark, 2021; Greenleaf, 1970; Luenendonk, 2020; Osborne, 2018; Page, 2009; Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011). Through this lens, servant leadership is seen as a way of life, not simply a management strategy (Parris & Peachey, 2013).

Servant leadership alone is not sufficient to support the envisioned change, as it does not address the need for a collaborative network of various stakeholders to address gaps and reach the desired state. For this reason, I propose a three-pronged leadership approach, where servant leadership theory is combined with relational and distributed approaches to leadership.

Relational Leadership

Relational leadership theory looks beyond the development of the individual and focuses on the collective power of relationships and networks within and beyond an organization (McCauley & Palus, 2021). Meaning is developed and sustained through the interactions of people working together towards a collective vision, aligning with a social constructivist view (Schwandt, 1994). A potential drawback of relational leadership is the possible breakdown between one or more of these three elements. For example, if the learners are not open to developing new skills, it will be difficult for leaders to engage them in the change process. This deficit of relational leadership will be supplemented through a combination with servant and distributed leadership and the selected framework for leading the change process, as discussed in the next section.

Relational leadership theory is particularly appropriate for this OIP because of the integral element of incorporating humanism and intentional community into the online learning environment. PCU faculty will be expected to build meaningful relationships with their online students, so the change process needs to prioritize opportunities for connection and ongoing interaction at the individual, group, and organizational levels. This aligns with the action element of the e⁴ educator conceptual framework, as relational leadership theory empowers faculty to develop an intentional community of student-led learning (Ambrose et al., 2010; France, 2021).

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership occurs when responsibility is mobilized throughout the organization, tapping into the strengths and talents of a variety of people to increase opportunities for change and enhance potential for growth (Harris, 2014; Starratt, 2011). A key characteristic of distributed leadership is that leadership is not assigned based on formal

positions of power; instead, there is a shared responsibility of leading and decision making based on knowledge, experience, and capacity (Elmore, 2000; Luenendonk, 2020). Considering the POP, research on effective faculty e-pedagogy development highlights the importance of creating a supportive learning network where faculty feel empowered to take action, share knowledge, and collaborate (Brancato, 2003; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Hord, 2009). When learning a new skill, such as e-pedagogy, people are most engaged and willing to take risks in their practice when they have the opportunity to reflect and refine their skills with a group of peers and work towards evoking lasting change within the organization (Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017; VanLeeuwen et al., 2020). Donohoo et al. (2018) describe this process as collective efficacy, which is supported by the principles of distributed leadership.

The main limitation of distributed leadership theory is associated with flattening the hierarchical structure of organizational leadership. There may be times during the change process when change needs to be driven by stakeholders in formal leadership positions (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010); however, when leadership is distributed amongst people throughout the organization, it may prove difficult to implement change using the resources and positional power of senior leadership members.

PCU change leaders will employ the five key principles of distributed leadership in combination with servant leadership and relational leadership (see Table 1). In the ideal future state, PCU faculty will utilize social capital to distribute professional expertise, build relational trust (Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017), and develop self-efficacy through working under cooperative professional learning models defined by a distributed leadership approach (Atchison et al., 2019; King & Stevenson, 2017).

Table 1*Five Key Principles of Distributed Leadership*

Key Principles (Elmore, 2000)	Connection(s) to Other Leadership Approaches
No matter what role one plays, the purpose of leadership is improving instructional practices and performance.	Relational leadership Servant leadership
Continuous learning is critical to improving instruction.	Relational leadership
Modeling is essential for learning.	Relational leadership Servant leadership
Leaders' roles and responsibilities are informed by their expertise in learning and improving, not by institutional mandates.	Servant leadership
Mutuality of accountability and capacity is required when exercising leadership authority.	Relational leadership Servant leadership

A Three-Pronged Leadership Approach to Change

Through combining servant, relational, and distributed leadership theories, PCU change agents will propel change forward at both microscopic and macroscopic levels. Servant leadership addresses the needs of the individual, relational leadership connects a system of individuals, and distributed leadership drives the collective efficacy of the system of individuals (see Figure 5). This combined leadership approach to change is well-suited for the POP, as the combination of the three leadership philosophies allows PCU change agents to effectively address the identified gaps and challenges. As mentioned in Chapter 1, servant leadership is woven into the fabric of PCU's core values and faculty already understand and embody an others-centered way of thinking. A relational leadership approach emphasizes a shared, relational perspective between leader and follower (van Dierendonck, 2011), and creates pathways for

ongoing communication as the change process unfolds. Finally, distributed leadership provides opportunities for people in informal positions of leadership to have a meaningful role in the change process based on their expertise and knowledge of e-pedagogy.

Figure 5

A Three-Pronged Leadership Approach to Change



Note. The hands at the bottom of the image represent the supportive, people-centred approach of servant leadership. The lines represent the interconnected network approach of relational leadership. The placement of the people icons throughout the image represents the non-hierarchical approach of distributed leadership.

The next step in planning and development of the OIP is to combine the three-pronged leadership approach with a suitable framework for leading the change process. The next section compares and contrasts three potential change frameworks before discussing the selected framework that best aligns with servant, relational, and distributed leadership approaches.

Framework for Leading the Change Process

The POP at hand is the lack of faculty e-pedagogy skill development at PCU to meet the growing demand for online course offerings. Since the change process hinges on engaging

stakeholders through shifting perspectives and gaining buy-in for the collaborative work ahead, the proposed framework needs to embody a participative approach (Deszca et al., 2020), incorporating elements of social constructivism and humanism, and aligning with the three-pronged leadership approach as described in the previous section. The chosen framework for leading the change process must address the POP and help PCU re-evaluate the role of online teaching and learning with the organization by starting over with a renewed change implementation plan. Before identifying the most appropriate framework for leading the change process, PCU leaders need to determine what type of organizational change best describes the POP.

Deszca et al. (2020) describe two main types of organizational change: anticipatory and reactive. The authors further categorize each domain with subcategories, depending on whether the change is incremental (continuous) or radical (discontinuous). Prior to the global pandemic, PCU established DOLD to support e-pedagogy development for faculty involved in developing and teaching online courses for international students at microcampus partnerships with overseas universities. Creating e-pedagogy support initiatives for this situation would be classified as radical anticipatory organizational change, as the change was a proactive response to predicted environmental changes and the process was motivated by the senior management team; however, the global pandemic dramatically moved the change into the category of discontinuous reactive organizational change, or overhauling/re-creating. Faculty were forced to move their courses online and engage in e-pedagogical practices regardless of their readiness, perspectives, or attitudes towards online learning. Change of this kind requires the organization to undergo a revisioning process while focusing on a wide range of organizational components with the goal of expedient, system-wide change (Deszca et al., 2020). Gaps in faculty preparedness to teach

online emerged when the entire university shifted to online learning during the pandemic and, in response, PCU needs to re-evaluate its strategic plan and quickly adapt to meet the needs of all learners and ensure the university stays relevant in the 21st higher education market.

Comparing and Analyzing Relevant Change Frameworks

Selecting a framework for leading the change process is a critical step of the OIP. The PCU POP encompasses elements of psychological, cultural, and systems philosophies of organizational change (Smith & Graetz, 2011). The chosen framework needs to consider how individual perspectives influence collective experiences within the interconnected system of the entire organization. These philosophical elements align with the three-pronged approach of servant (e.g., individual), relational (e.g., system), and distributed (e.g., collective) leadership theories, so the selected change process framework must encompass these tenets in design and implementation.

When researching change process frameworks for this section of the OIP, I considered three potential options: (a) Lewin's (1947) Three-Stage Theory of Change; (b) Kotter's (2012) Eight-Stage Model of Organizational Change; and (c) Cooperrider et al.'s (2008) Appreciative Inquiry (AI) 4-D cycle. The next section presents an analysis of each model, culminating with a discussion and rationale for which framework is best suited for guiding the PCU change process.

Three-Stage Theory of Change

Lewin's model consists of three stages: (a) unfreezing; (b) changing; and (c) refreezing (see Appendix B, Figure B1). In the unfreezing phase, leaders generate a motivation for change through encouraging stakeholders to examine the systems, processes, perspectives, and attitudes that make up the current norms of organizational operations (Deszca et al., 2020). Lewis (1947) advises leaders to deliberately challenge the status quo by stirring up people's emotions to garner

interest and buy-in for the proposed change process. The unfreezing step of the model sets the stage for new learning, better preparing and equipping stakeholders for the anticipated upcoming change (Burnes, 2020). During the changing stage, leaders implement the change plan with active stakeholder participation. This process can be unpredictable and uncertain, so leaders need to ensure goals are established and clearly communicated to encourage movement towards the desired state (Burnes, 2020; Deszca et al., 2020). In the final phase, newly developed structures, beliefs, and habits become the new norm for the organization. At this point, the organization will likely need to adjust existing policies, vision statements, and procedures.

The greatest criticism of Lewin's stage theory of change is it is too simplistic for today's complex organizations in need of rapid change (Burnes, 2020; Cummings et al., 2015; Deszca et al., 2020; Hussain et al., 2016). Another downfall of the model is its linear design, which does not naturally lend itself to an iterative process of change (Cummings et al., 2015).

Lewin's model is not an ideal fit for the PCU POP for several reasons. Firstly, technology is constantly evolving and educators need to adapt and improve their practices on an ongoing basis. If PCU change leaders implemented Lewin's model, stakeholders would need to cycle through the unfreezing–change–refreezing stage far too often to keep up with technological advances, resulting in confusion and frustration. Secondly, Lewin's model does not give enough attention to the humanistic, affective components of the change process. The e⁴ online educator conceptual framework and three-pronged leadership approach depend on a change model that has people at the centre of its design. Finally, though the unfreezing stage is helpful in generating stakeholder interest in the change process, the freezing stage is too permanent and rigid for the proposed POP. Once the desired state is reached, PCU needs a more flexible, ongoing process for assessing, monitoring, and evaluating change.

Eight-Stage Model of Organizational Change

Kotter's model of organizational change consists of eight steps, from establishing a sense of urgency (step 1) to anchoring new approaches in culture (step 8) (see Appendix B, Figure B2). The model has been successfully implemented as a guiding change framework in many organizations across a wide variety of disciplines, including higher education (Kang et al., 2020). There are many attractive aspects of the model that are well matched to the PCU change process, such as the focus on people as the centre of the change process, the emphasis on communication and empowering stakeholders, and aligning new practices to organizational culture to ensure long-term implementation of change. However, like Lewin's three-stage theory of change, Kotter's approach is too fixed and linear for a technology-focused change initiative, as it must be followed in the exact order as designed to ensure success throughout the change process (Kotter, 2012). Change leaders need the freedom to revisit stages in the change process as new innovations unfold. Additionally, there is misalignment between the POP conceptual framework and Kotter's initial motivation for change. While the COVID-19 pandemic certainly establishes a sense of urgency, the PCU change process needs to be motivated by a reflective shift in personal beliefs, attitudes, and perspectives, particularly around what it means to be an online educator serving student needs in the virtual learning environment. Kotter's model does not invite stakeholders to engage in a reflective shift due to the strict linear progression of the model. Reflection requires a more fluid, cyclical process, which we see in the third proposed framework as discussed in the next section.

Appreciative Inquiry 4-D Cycle

AI was founded in the mid-1980s by David Cooperrider and his faculty mentor Suresh Srivastva when the two scholars were exploring new ways of conducting action research

(Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010). Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) discovered that the human experience is what makes organizational change effective and long lasting through sharing stories, creating collaborative knowledge, and forming new identities with and in relation to one another through social capital. Social capital is defined as the connections and common understandings that allow individuals and groups to trust one another and collaborate towards a common goal (Keeley, 2007). AI is deeply rooted in social constructivism and humanism through its emphasis on developing social capital to catalyze change while striving to support people in reaching their full potential (Bushe, 2013; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

The AI 4-D cycle consists of four iterative stages: (a) Discovery; (b) Dream; (c) Design; and (d) Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008; see Appendix B, Figure B3). During the Discovery stage, organizational members engage in a process of reflecting on what the organization does best and what they truly value. A crucial factor of this stage is ensuring each question is framed in a positive manner (Cooperrider, 2012). One method of collecting this reflective data is through conducting appreciative interviews, which is further discussed in Chapter 3. In the Dream stage, stakeholders are invited to create a collective, results-oriented vision for the desired future state (Cooperrider, 2012). Next, organizational members determine the structures needed to reach the renewed vision during the Design stage. Evans et al. (2012) highlight the importance of discussing the details and qualities of the structures (e.g., specific resources; professional development needs) to ensure successful implementation. In the final Destiny phase, stakeholders commit to transformative action towards a collective vision of the desired state. Relationships between individuals and departments create generative, interconnected pathways to action through building social capital focused on shared ideals (Bushe, 2013; Cooperrider et al., 2008; Cockell & McArthur-Blair, 2020). Change is not seen as fixed; rather, stakeholders are

encouraged to innovate and improvise according to the shared positive image of the desired state (Cooperrider, 2012).

The main critique of AI is that the positive, strength-based approach of the framework is a shallow, warm-and-fuzzy approach to complex organizational problems (Fitzgerald et al., 2001); however, Cooperrider et al. (2008) explain that upon closer inspection, the model leans more heavily towards the inquiry component versus the seemingly lighter appreciative aspect. AI embodies inquiry through its main goal of learning about and understanding a given topic, leading to a true value of the topic, rather than merely expressing appreciation for it.

Another potential downfall is the fact that effective use of AI may require special expertise (Evans et al., 2012), adding time and additional resources to the proposed change process. To combat this challenge, PCU change leaders can either engage an existing AI facilitator within the organization or undertake AI facilitation certification before embarking on the change process itself.

AI is the ideal framework for leading the change process at PCU, as it aligns with existing organizational frameworks of social constructivism and humanism and the three-pronged leadership approach. It is not bound by linear progression like Lewin's model or fixed stages like Kotter's approach. PCU change agents will employ the eight principles of AI (see Appendix C) at strategic moments throughout the change implementation process to frame the change process within social capital construction and identity formation, aligning with the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework. Through AI, we see how social discourse creates opportunities for productivity and collaboration toward a common worthy ideal (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010), which aligns with relational and distributed leadership approaches and will help propel change forward. AI is well-situated to address the POP of e-pedagogy skill

development, as it allows for strengths-based framing, flexibility in design, cyclical reflection, and feedback loops needed for the rapidly evolving and unpredictable technological environment. Since AI is an inquiry-based process, it is a natural fit for transforming teacher practice to align with the principles of online teaching strategies.

Building faculty e-pedagogy skills can be an overwhelming and frustrating task due to the complex and ever-changing nature of technology and digital tools (Allen & Seaman, 2012; Georgina & Olson, 2008; Serdyukov, 2015). Without careful, strategic planning, the PCU change process could quickly be soured by negative comments, attitudes, and perspectives of faculty members who fall under the late majority and laggard categories of Rogers (2003) diffusion of innovations continuum. By selecting AI as the framework for leading the change process, PCU change leaders will frame e-pedagogy skill development in a positive, strengths-based manner. This does not mean problems will be glossed over or ignored; rather, instead of problems being used as the starting point for analysis and actions, AI leaders employ servant leadership techniques through listening, validating, and reframing problems in an effort to collaboratively envision the desired future state (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

AI fits with the three-pronged leadership approach through placing utmost importance on the experience of the people within the system through acknowledging the social aspects of organizational change and focusing on the individual and collective strengths people bring to the organization. In the next section, a critical organizational analysis will show how the success of the change process depends upon the collective efficacy of change agents and stakeholders to transform current gaps (e.g., inputs) to the desired state (e.g., outputs) on organizational, group, and individual levels.

Critical Organizational Analysis


A critical organizational analysis provides valuable insights for leadership and stakeholders by expanding their understanding of the scope and impact of proposed changes within the organization and external environments (Nadler & Tushman, 1989). From a psychological change perspective, leaders wishing to introduce change need to collect data, then adjust organizational components based on the results to maximize efficiency of outputs (Deszca et al., 2020; Smith & Graetz, 2011). Nadler and Tushman's (1980) Congruence Model provides a framework for seeing an organization as a complex system producing outputs within the context of an environment consisting of available resources and affected by past history and current cultural considerations (see Figure 6). According to the authors, effective organizations are characterized by congruence between the informal organization, external organization, task, and people and alignment to the external environment (Deszca et al., 2020). By analyzing PCU using the Congruence Model, change leaders can better understand the organization as an interconnected system, explore how various factors contribute to and affect each other, and consider how change management impacts organizational interactions and future performance.

Nadler and Tushman (1980) view outputs, or change priorities, on macro-to-micro levels: (a) organization (macro); (b) group (meso); and (c) individual (micro). The model is built upon a foundation of systems theory. Systems theory focuses on relationships, interactions, and feedback loops between elements within a system and between the system and its surrounding environment (Conradie, 2013; Von Bertalanffy, 1950). The Congruence Model is a suitable analysis framework for PCU because of its humanistic and systematic emphasis on interconnectivity of all parts of the organization (Nadler & Tushman, 1980) and belief that organizations are dynamic, relational entities where ongoing change is inevitable (Sabir, 2018).

These aspects relate closely to my POP, since the online teaching and learning is constantly changing, and the organizational change framework needs to be able to adjust to meet fluctuating needs.

Figure 6

The Congruence Model



Note. Adapted from *A Model for Diagnosing Organizational Behavior* (p. 47), by D. A. Nadler and M. L. Tushman, 1980, *Organizational Dynamics*. Copyright by D. A. Nadler and M. L. Tushman. Adapted with permission.

Inputs

According to the Congruence Model, organizational inputs alert change leaders to multiple factors about the organizational context that affect the change and transformation process (Deszca et al., 2020). The learning environment at PCU continues to shift from a solely campus-based, face-to-face model to one that incorporates hybrid, synchronous, and asynchronous online learning spaces. Currently, there is a disconnect between faculty who are willing to develop their identity and knowledge as an online educator and those who disregard

upgraded approaches to teaching and learning in the online environment (Grenon et al., 2019). This gap was magnified by the external environmental factor of the COVID-19 global pandemic when all courses moved online. Many faculty struggled to adapt to the online teaching and learning environment, as the majority of courses were previously solely offered face-to-face, and faculty had little preparation and experience teaching in the virtual classroom.

Nadler and Tushman (1980) describe resources as a range of assets available to the organization (e.g., human, technology, capital, information). Two key human resources in relation to the POP are DOLD e-pedagogy experts and PCU faculty who are innovators and early adopters in respect to the online learning environment. Through implementing distributed leadership approaches, change agents can leverage the knowledge and skills of these groups to equip and coach other PCU faculty members in developing their own e-pedagogy skills.

PCU is lagging behind in terms of technology resources. Currently, there are no mandatory digital skill development programs for either faculty or students. This presents a gap in the online learning environment, as faculty expect students to arrive in their online classes already knowledgeable and equipped to use required platforms and digital tools. Some faculty do not want to teach students how to use technology because they do not understand how to use it themselves (C. Madland, personal communication, 2020). Many faculty believe their role is to disseminate content and refuse to take on the task of building digital literacy skills in their students. As part of the Dream stage of the AI framework, PCU change agents will implement the servant leadership characteristic of conceptualization to help faculty develop their understanding of the need to support student learning and development in a wide variety of areas, not solely their knowledge of course related content (Ambrose et al., 2010).

The final section of the Congruence Model inputs is organizational history and culture, which assists leaders in understanding how the organization evolved, the way it currently functions, and potential gaps in need of change (Deszca et al., 2020). At PCU, there is a culture of elevating face-to-face education as more valid and legitimate than its online counterpart. Many PCU faculty are hesitant to develop their e-pedagogy skills because they believe education must be face-to-face to be credible, a sentiment shared widely across higher education (Irvine, 2020; Ubell, 2021). Only a small portion of PCU deans and academic leaders report faculty acceptance of the value and legitimacy of online education (Pacific Coastal University, 2016).

A second historical/cultural consideration is how PCU faculty operate in a culture of silos, with little cross-departmental sharing of knowledge and resources (Pacific Coastal University, 2020). Nadler and Tushman (1980) believe the work of any organization is ultimately accomplished by people in collaboration with each other. When implementing the change plan, PCU leaders need to employ a relational leadership approach to encourage faculty to build a culture rooted in clear communication and engaged collaboration.

Transformation Process

The transformation process consists of four elements: (a) task; (b) people; (c) formal organization; and (d) informal organization (Deszca et al., 2020). The transformation process is informed by the organization's strategy, which determines how the organization defines its mission and vision while working towards specific performance objectives (Nadler & Tushman, 1980).

In response to both the COVID-19 pandemic and an increase of international and online student enrolment, faculty are tasked with designing and teaching online courses in accordance with the Checklist for Quality Online Courses at PCU (see Appendix D). DOLD staff members

are available to support before, during, and after the semester; however, faculty are not mandated to collaborate with DOLD staff and may reach out on an as-needed basis. Rincón-Gallardo (2019) emphasizes the importance of collaboration and continuous feedback loops when navigating the change process. Under distributed leadership theory, both formal and informal leaders can act as change agents when addressing the POP (Deszca et al., 2020).

As a Christian liberal arts university, both formal and informal organizational aspects of PCU are based on servant leadership principles. PCU aims to develop leaders who simultaneously attain academic success and build competencies and skills to have a significant impact on people across the world (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.c.). Some faculty are hesitant to adapt their teaching practices for the online learning environment, despite explicit instruction from the PCU executive leadership team through sharing researched-based guidelines to support the need for change. These organizational politics are a blend of self-serving actions and surreptitious motives (Connolly et al., 2011) that do not align with PCU espoused beliefs and values. Change leaders need to focus on changing behaviours rather than assumptions (DuFour et al., 2008), and developing a strategy for building e-pedagogy skills in resistant faculty members.

Outputs

To reach the ideal future state, PCU change leaders need to capitalize on the organization's strengths in openness to change and credible leadership and change champions, according to findings from Deszca et al.'s (2020) change readiness questionnaire in Chapter 1. Outputs are the tangible artifacts of the change process that show alignment between organizational mission and goals. Outputs are framed on three different levels: (a) organizational; (b) group; and (c) individual.

Economically, online courses give universities access to markets that they would not otherwise be able to access through face-to-face delivery methods. Online learners can work at their own pace to complete programs, gaining access to knowledge, tools, and resources while utilizing digital tools to produce high-quality results in real-time with an authentic audience (Bartley & Golek, 2014; Boss, 2015). Additionally, online learning creates equity and accessibility for students who have difficulty engaging in the face-to-face learning environment. During the change process, PCU change leaders should draw on the knowledge portion of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework (e.g., TPACK and heutagogical approaches to learning) to reframe how technology and virtual learning are perceived by PCU faculty and demonstrate how technology enables students to actively participate in the creation, consumption, and demonstration of their knowledge (Moore, 2020).

At the group level, PCU change leaders need to enact the AI 4-D cycle to transform the working environment from an individualistic, internally focused climate to one of collaboration, focused on deep student learning to develop 21st century competencies and skills. According to Saks (2006), it is imperative that employees engage themselves more fully in their work roles in response to an organization's actions and commit greater cognitive, emotional, and physical resources. The proposed three-pronged leadership approach can assist change leaders in equipping faculty in utilizing social capital to distribute professional expertise and build relational trust (Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017). In turn, faculty will have the opportunity to become change agents themselves through working in collaborative, relational, ongoing professional development (King & Stevenson, 2017).

The individual output of the Congruence Model closely aligns with the identity section of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework. PCU change agents should enact relational

leadership specifically when helping faculty navigate the affective considerations of developing an identity as an online educator and becoming aware of their strengths and areas of growth when developing e-pedagogy skills (Palmer, 2000; Scazzero, 2015).

In summary, the critical organizational analysis highlights the need for the following changes, which are closely related to the four guiding questions from Chapter 1:

1. Creating e-pedagogy skill development programs for faculty and students.
2. Fostering an environment where faculty buy-in to the need to develop their identity and knowledge as an online educator through building e-pedagogy skills in a collaborative environment of continuous feedback loops.
3. Establishing online education as a valid, legitimate modality of teaching and learning at the university level.
4. Creating opportunities for integrating equity and humanism into the virtual learning environment.

Organizations are complex, interconnected systems that can only truly change through intentionally planned initiatives (Deszca et al., 2020). In combination with the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework, the three-pronged leadership approach, and the AI framework for leading the change process, the Congruence Model allows PCU change leaders to identify key inputs and desired outputs when considering ways to build a culture where e-pedagogy is valued and seen as a relevant tool in fulfilling organizational vision and goals. This critical organizational analysis prepares change agents to investigate three proposed solutions to address the POP, as discussed in the next section.

Solutions to Address the Problem of Practice

The POP targets improving faculty e-pedagogy skills through implementing an e⁴ online educator framework and developing faculty ability to engage students in the online learning environment. The chosen solution needs to align with a social constructivist and humanist approach to change while supporting the development of e⁴ online educators within a strengths-based AI framework. In this section of the OIP, I discuss three proposed solutions. Firstly, PCU should consider outsourcing online learning infrastructure development to an experienced online program manager (OPM) to assist with launching and delivering virtual courses. Next, change leaders will look at forming an e-pedagogy task force to lead the change process. The final solution examines the possibility of piloting e-pedagogy skill development with one department of PCU faculty members before rolling the change out across the entire organization. I will compare and contrast proposed solutions using a variety of factors to determine which solution best solves the POP through addressing described gaps and symptoms and answering the guiding questions from Chapter 1.

Continuing with status quo is not a viable solution to the POP, as the change at hand is discontinuous reactive organizational change, which necessitates a re-evaluation of the organization as a whole with the goal of achieving long-lasting change on a system-wide level (Deszca et al., 2020). If PCU were to maintain status quo, they would fail to meet current market demands for online and hybrid modalities of learning, resulting in a potential decline in student enrolment and danger of falling behind more innovative counterparts in the field of Canadian higher education (Ubell, 2021; Veletsianos et al., 2021).

Proposed Solution 1: Outsource to an Online Program Manager

OPMs are for-profit companies available to support universities in developing, implementing, and maintaining online education programs (Silberman, 2021; Ubell, 2021). OPMs evolved from for-profit colleges in the United States in the 1970s, and have grown in popularity in recent years with the rise in demand for the flexibility and accessibility afforded to students through online learning platforms (Newton, 2016; Springer, 2018). There are currently over 60 OPMs in the global marketplace (HolonIQ, 2019). In a typical university-OPM partnership, the university maintains control of academic program offerings and faculty teaching assignments while the OPM is responsible for building technological infrastructure, developing faculty as online educators, marketing to domestic and international students, and providing student support (Conradson, 2014). In return for supplying capital upfront to cover expenses associated with designing and launching online programs, OPMs collect an average of 50% of tuition from students enrolled in virtual courses (Newton, 2016). As PCU is already in a precarious place as a private university with higher-than-average tuition fees, the tuition sharing model is a significant factor when considering this solution.

The PCU senior leadership team would work directly with OPM managers and staff to develop a change plan to meet the growing demand for online courses; however, outsourcing to an external partner presents risks to the success of the change implementation plan. Springer (2018) describes four areas of potential friction in a university-OPM partnership: (a) decision making; (b) aligning expectations; (c) collaboration; and (d) accountability. Silberman (2021) adds the potential concern of a loss of faculty trust when OPM staff lack terminal degrees, previous higher education work experience, and an understanding of the academic discipline they are supporting. Additionally, OPM managers and staff may not fully grasp PCU's mission,

vision, and values and, as a result, could approach organizational change from a different perspective than desired for this OIP.

Proposed Solution 2: Create an e-Pedagogy Task Force

One alternative to outsourcing is insourcing, where institutions develop their own internal capabilities to support change initiatives (HolonIQ, 2019; Ubell, 2021). Proposed Solution 2 involves creating an e-pedagogy task force to identify needs and create a plan of action to achieve a desired state within an organization (Grigsby, 2008). Task force members generally have expertise in a specific area and use their collaborative knowledge to develop a comprehensive plan for approaching the change process. It is important that task force members are diverse in their perspectives on the given topic and representative of a cross-section of the entire organization, not just a portion of it (Mrig & Sanaghan, 2014).

Task forces have been implemented successfully in the past, both within PCU and e-learning in general. In 2020, PCU created an Institutional Priority Task Force (IPTF; a pseudonym) to assess current program offerings and make recommendations to the president regarding projected growth and alignment to the university's strategic plan. This indicates PCU is already familiar with the process of using task forces to diagnose a situation, discuss findings, and form a plan to guide the change process. Western University (2013) developed an e-learning task force to create a three-year action plan regarding the organization's approach to developing e-learning across a wide variety of considerations (e.g., faculty engagement, student experience, pedagogical support). PCU change leaders could use Western University's e-learning task force report as an exemplar for their own efforts to improve faculty e-pedagogy skill efficacy and ability to engage students in the online learning environment.

Proposed Solution 3: Develop an e-Pedagogy Trial Project

Pilot studies are widely used by scholars conducting qualitative research to determine whether an initiative that works in a small, controlled setting could be effectively implemented at a larger scale (Burns, 2019; Gudmundsdottir & Brock-Utne, 2010; Malmqvist et al., 2019; Samson, 2004). There are many benefits to using a pilot study. Firstly, there is safety in testing research in a small environment (Burns, 2019; Malmqvist et al., 2019). Pilot studies are designed to provide both early hints about what issues may arise in the research process and to help redesign the research focus, questions, and methods to better align with the desired outcome (Gudmundsdottir & Brock-Utne, 2010). Secondly, pilot studies help leaders identify needs that may not have been thought of previously (Malmqvist et al., 2019). Specifically in an online learning context, pilot studies can serve as an early indicator about technological barriers and e-pedagogical concerns through identifying roadblocks in course design and implementation (Burns, 2019). Lastly, successful pilot studies can be used to convince stakeholders of the validity and importance of the change initiative while ensuring change is manageable in terms of required resources (Gudmundsdottir & Brock-Utne, 2010; Ubell, 2021).

The majority of qualitative researchers who use pilot studies collect data through conducting interviews to determine the lived experiences and reflections of participants in the study (Malmqvist et al., 2019). Burns (2019) advises change agents to thoughtfully develop key questions and criteria, while Sampson (2004) encourages interviewers to be mindful of coaching participants to assume an objective, analytical posture when reflecting on the process of the pilot study. Once interview data is collected and analyzed, leaders can use the findings to support their original change plan or alter and strengthen their approach in response to feedback from pilot study participants.

PCU previously piloted online learning with their MA in Leadership and Master of Science (MSc) in Nursing programs, albeit with lukewarm success. The MA program was looking to expand to the international audience, while MSc students needed flexible hours due to their current employment as nurses. Online courses were developed within each department without support from DOLD, and faculty did not participate in e-pedagogy skill development programs prior to launching the online courses. As a result, courses are not fully aligned with the PCU Checklist for Quality Online Courses (see Appendix D) and faculty members have a wide range of e-pedagogy skills based on prior experience or self-directed skill development. A successful pilot project to address the POP needs to be intentionally framed, strategically implemented, and carefully assessed by a team of e-pedagogy experts who are knowledgeable of the current state of online courses at PCU. This team would implement the three-pronged leadership approach of servant, relational, and distributed leadership theories while partnering with faculty in building their capacity as e⁴ educators.

The emphasis of using interviews to collect data is consistent with the appreciative interview approach of the AI change framework. Conducting appreciative interviews also ties in with relational leadership theory, where change is the result of a collaborative, reflective process (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Pilot project participants would engage in the AI 4-D cycle to collaboratively plan the change process, then regularly gather as a group (e.g., professional learning community) to share their successes, struggles, and questions about developing e-pedagogy skills and creating inclusive online classrooms. By choosing this proposed solution, PCU change leaders can better understand how to roll change out across the organization by listening to real life experiences of both faculty and students, then use this data to inform future decisions.

Comparison of the Proposed Solutions

While each of the proposed solutions is a viable possibility, it is necessary to compare and contrast the three options to determine which is best suited to address the POP within selected frameworks and approaches previously described in the OIP. The table comparing the three possible solutions (see Appendix E) illustrates several factors for consideration. In terms of time resources, each solution would take approximately 12 months, with time allotted for communication of findings and recommendations for Proposed Solutions 2 and 3. Human resources are also similar across the three proposed solutions, with Proposed Solution 1 as the sole solution involving people external to PCU. In looking at fiscal resources, Proposed Solution 1 is by far the most expensive, as OPMs take a significant percentage of tuition in return for providing upfront capital to develop courses, recruit students, and launch online programs (Hill, 2021; Newton, 2016; Ubell, 2021). With PCU tuition rates already higher than their public counterparts, students could not afford more tuition to cover OPM fees and would likely enroll at a less expensive institution. In addition, many programs require the OPM provider to invest millions of dollars before they become profitable, often taking three to five years (Hill, 2021).

Each of the proposed solutions has similar needs for information resources, but there is wider variance for technology resources. Proposed Solution 1 requires the greatest overhaul of technological infrastructure across the entire university, which is positive considering POP guiding question 1, but has significant financial implications for the small university. All three solutions meet the need for developing faculty e-pedagogy skills, yet Proposed Solution 3 is the only solution to connect closely with faculty and students to answer both POP guiding questions 2 and 4.

With universities outsourcing a variety of services (e.g., food service, bookstore, counselling, janitorial), it is certainly worth considering the viability of outsourcing the development of a robust online education program by partnering with an OPM as described in Proposed Solution 1 (Springer, 2018; Wekullo, 2017). Outsourcing online course development would free faculty from creating robust virtual courses themselves and give them more time to focus on e-pedagogy skill development and creating an engaging learning environment; however, depending on the structure of the OPM's existing professional development program, PCU may not have the freedom to integrate humanity and equity in the online classroom in a way that aligns with organizational mission, vision, and values. Additionally, outsourcing in general is risky due to the danger of losing control of program operations and drifting from the mission, vision, values, and core identity of the organization (Wekullo, 2017). Since the change process is deeply rooted in building faculty capacity as e⁴ educators through actively involving them in the change process and employing an others-centred, relational, and shared approach, I reject Proposed Solution 1 for this OIP.

Findings and recommendations from the task force in Proposed Solution 2 would give the PCU senior leadership team a clear understanding of current practices, challenges, and opportunities for developing its online program to meet identified needs in the domestic and international higher education markets; however, much of the work of a task force will already be achieved through writing this OIP (e.g., identifying a problem, making recommendations for change, developing an actionable plan, creating a clear communication strategy). In addition, a task force does not align with the three-pronged leadership approach, as the efforts of the change leaders would be internally focused and not involve the impacted stakeholders (e.g., faculty, students) until recommendations are implemented. The selected solution needs to approach the

POP with immediate action, due to the urgent nature of the discontinuous reactive organizational change at hand. Since the task force will take months to analyze data and make recommendations, Proposed Solution 2 is not the optimal choice to implement in this OIP.

Based on the alignment to selected OIP frameworks, findings in research- and practice-based evidence, personal leadership agency, and stewardship of available resources, I select Proposed Solution 3 as the chosen solution to address the POP. By piloting an e-pedagogy trial project with one PCU department, DOLD e-pedagogy experts can strategically walk alongside a small group of faculty members and their students, fine tune the change implementation plan, and build trust and create buy-in from stakeholders across the university through demonstrating successful integration of e-pedagogy skill development initiatives while building an intentional and inclusive online learning community. The three-pronged leadership approach is well-suited to a trial project, as change agents can utilize servant leadership to invest in the growth of others, relational leadership to build connections with and amongst faculty members and their students, and distributed leadership by inviting faculty members to share their knowledge, experiences, and expertise to influence the change process on a larger scale. DOLD and the selected faculty department will engage in the AI 4-D cycle to establish what strengths already exist, envision the desired state, co-create a realistic plan, and build efficacy for long-lasting change (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Since DOLD is an existing department at PCU, the group has a deep understanding of organizational mission, vision, and values, and can naturally incorporate these foundational elements when engaging in the AI process and guiding faculty in developing the three main components of the e⁴ educator framework (e.g., identity, knowledge, action). DOLD change leaders will engage in the Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) inquiry cycle (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015)

as part of change process monitoring and evaluation, which is discussed in more detail in the change process monitoring and evaluation section of Chapter 3.

Leadership Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice Challenges in Organizational Change

Ethics are closely linked to leadership and organizational change through examining the effect of one's beliefs, attitudes, and actions on others (Demirtas, 2015; Zhu et al., 2004). Starratt (2014) defines leadership ethics as a philosophical approach examining the morality of decisions and actions to uncover why some choices and actions are defined as worthy, while others are seen as wrong. Lawton and Páez (2015) argue the two most influential factors of leadership ethics are integrity and authenticity. Integrity is when leaders demonstrate consistency between intentions and actions (Zhu et al., 2014), while authenticity is connected to self-awareness, reliability, honesty, and vulnerability (Reddy & Kamesh, 2016). In this section of the OIP, I will outline my personal approach to leadership ethics, explore PCU ethical responsibilities, considerations, and challenges, and conclude with a discussion on social justice considerations of the POP change process.

Conceptualizing Leadership Ethics

Sharif and Scandura (2014) assert leadership ethics are a foundational consideration of organizational change. Leaders who persevere and maintain ethical conduct throughout the change process are likely to appear credible and trustworthy, leading to positive emulation in stakeholder attitudes and behaviours. According to social constructivism, learning occurs when people pay attention to and take on the beliefs, values, and actions of role models they find trustworthy (Anderson et al., 2017; Brown & Treviño, 2006; Demirtas, 2015). PCU change leaders must emphasize the centrality of high ethical standards when implementing the change process to encourage buy-in and reciprocity from stakeholders.

Before knowing what to do as a leader, one must first define who they are and what they believe (Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017). Lawton and Páez (2015) suggest three guiding questions to assist leaders in developing their ethical identity:

- What are the characteristics of ethical leaders?
- How do ethical leaders positively influence organizational change?
- What are the outcomes of ethical leadership?

Research shows a close connection between certain personality traits and effective ethical leaders. According to the Five Factor model (DeYoung et al., 2007), the most effective ethical leaders are highly agreeable (e.g., altruistic, trusting), highly conscientious (e.g., dependable, responsible), and low in neuroticism (e.g., anxious, impulsive) (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Reddy & Kamesh, 2016). These characteristics also play a role on how ethical leadership behaviour is connected to organizational commitment and trust (Zhu et al., 2014). Based on my personal Five Factor model results, I fit with the description of an ethical leader through my high conscientiousness and low neuroticism; however, it is important to have highly agreeable leaders as part of the change process leadership team to fill this gap in my personal profile.

Interestingly, Resick et al. (2006) discovered four dimensions of ethical leadership that are universally accepted and understood across different cultures in the world: (a) morality; (b) selflessness; (c) collaboration; and (d) motivation. These findings are particularly applicable to ethical implications of PCU's microcampus partnerships, as leaders can implement these characteristics when building partnerships with global stakeholders to gain trust and demonstrate authenticity of intent.

Effective ethical leaders are able to serve a diverse group of stakeholders through considering the experiences of those oppressed by systemic barriers (Lawton & Páez, 2015).

According to Brown and Treviño (2006), change is best achieved when leaders have a reciprocal relationship of trust with stakeholders versus a top-down hierarchy of influence. This approach aligns with relational leadership theory, where leaders evoke change by prioritizing relationships, listening to the needs and perspectives of others, and focusing on whole person development (e.g., intellectual, social, emotional) (Ambrose et al., 2010; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017). By emphasizing the importance of considering and learning from the lived experiences of others, ethical leaders model an others-centred, or servant leadership, approach to organizational change and infuse humanism and equity into the change process.

Nicholson and Kurucz (2017) outline an ethical framework for change combined with a relational approach to leadership where personal identity is inextricably interwoven into behaviours and actions (see Appendix F, Figure F1). The model emphasizes the importance of interactivity between the ethical leader and how they model, interact, engage, and care for those affected by the change at hand, ultimately guiding the trajectory of the change process. As seen in Appendix F, Figure F2, the Nicholson and Kurucz (2017) ethical framework is closely connected to OIP frameworks and approaches. PCU change leaders will integrate leadership ethics into the change implementation plan by incorporating Nicholson and Kurucz's (2017) model with the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework, AI 4-D cycle, and three-pronged approach to leadership to ensure stakeholders are cared for, listened to, and invited to participate throughout the change process.

Organizational Ethical Responsibilities, Considerations, and Challenges

Unlike the K-12 education sector, there are currently no professional standards to which university faculty must adhere when teaching in the physical or virtual classroom setting; however, PCU faculty sign both a community covenant and statement of faith upon hiring and

commit to honouring the principles and standards throughout their employment with the university. PCU change leaders have an ethical obligation to ensure the change process follows what is outlined in both of these documents and avoid potential conflicts between university ethical guidelines and the change implementation plan.

In terms of the POP, there are several ethical responsibilities, considerations, and challenges to consider. Firstly, change leaders are under high scrutiny by stakeholders who may be wary of the change process. Faculty who are hesitant to upgrade their e-pedagogy skills may actively look for ethical or moral compromises on the part of the change leaders, which they could use to justify resistance towards the change process (Lawton & Páez, 2005). To counteract this potential challenge, PCU change leaders must have a clearly defined approach to ethical leadership and implement a unified process of assessing and comprehending differences amongst stakeholders while modelling respect for the perspectives of others (Bown et al., 2006).

A second ethical consideration is to what extent stakeholders are invited to be actively involved with change efforts. When implementing the e-pedagogy pilot project, DOLD leaders will implement elements of servant, distributed, and relational leadership approaches to ensure faculty are invited to voice their opinions and concerns in a trust building environment. The AI 4-D cycle supports a collaborative approach to organizational change, which encourages stakeholders to take ownership of their role in the change process and work towards a shared vision of the desired future state (Lawton & Páez, 2005).

Lastly, ethics plays a critical role in the digital classroom. When designing online courses, faculty need to consider technoethics, or the study of moral, legal, and social concerns surrounding technology (Gearhart, 2014). Virtual learning has a wide range of positive factors, but students are faced with ethical dilemmas of using technology to support or hinder academic

freedom, acceptance of diverse learners, and infusing equity and humanity in the online classroom (Coleman, 2012; France 2021; Future Design School, 2022). To counteract ethical challenges in the online learning environment, faculty need to consciously incorporate elements of digital citizenship into their courses. For example, students could co-create a digital code of conduct at the beginning of the semester. By engaging students in inquiry, evaluation, and reflection of online ethical practices, faculty will encourage students to take ownership of their digital presence and behaviour and build a deep comprehension of the consequences of violating the agreed upon codes (Aldosemani, 2020; Coleman, 2012).

Social Justice Lens

When discussing social justice in the context of change, Collins (2018b) divides her suggested approach into two parts: social justice action and socially just practice. In terms of the POP, social justice action includes advocating for stakeholders (e.g., faculty, students) who struggle to fully engage in the online learning environment while working towards structural or policy change to break systemic barriers and purposefully integrate humanity and equity into the virtual classroom (France, 2020). For example, building accessibility considerations for students who would otherwise not be able to engage in the online classroom (e.g, including alt-text for visuals, removing timed assessments, offering video lectures with closed captioning). Socially just practices involve paying attention to the opportunities for all students to contribute to the classroom learning environment to promote deep connection, critical reflection, and accountability (Aldosemani, 2020). Ethical change leaders must practice cultural humility and challenge personal assumptions and biases through recognizing the subjectivity of their personal worldview and adopting a flexible, responsive style of teaching and communicating in the online classroom (Collins, 2018b; France, 2021). This approach keeps student learning needs as the

central focus of the change plan by acknowledging the importance of engaging with all students in culturally responsive fashion to ensure they feel an authentic connection in the learning space.

When incorporating the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework in the change implementation plan, PCU change agents need to avoid imposing their own values, beliefs, and perspectives about online teacher identity on faculty; rather, change leaders will use servant leadership characteristics of humility and empathetic listening to learn about the worldview, narratives, and beliefs held by stakeholders while emphasizing the need to develop individual and organizational identity towards social justice (Capper, 2018; Collins, 2018a). It is only through this openness to listen to and learn from others that personal social justice identity development will contribute to the social justice identity development of the entire organization, effecting authentic, long-lasting change to meet the intellectual, social, and emotional needs of a diverse group of stakeholders while collectively implementing a solution to the POP at hand (Ambrose et al., 2010; Capper, 2018).

Chapter 2 Conclusion

This chapter outlined the need for a three-pronged leadership approach to change, followed by the recommendation of AI as the chosen framework for leading the change process. Through a critical organizational analysis, four needed changes were determined as priorities to be addressed in Chapter 3 through the change implementation plan. After comparing and contrasting three possible solutions to the POP, an e-pedagogy pilot project was identified as the most effective option to help PCU move towards the desired state of building faculty e-pedagogy efficacy and capacity to successfully engage students in the online learning environment. The change process will be guided by Nicholson & Kurucz's (2017) ethical leadership framework with consideration given to equity and social justice contexts of building inclusive, accessible

online courses at PCU. The final chapter of the OIP discusses how to implement, evaluate, and communicate the e-pedagogy pilot project as the chosen solution to address the POP and lead PCU to the identified desired state.

Chapter 3: Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication

This chapter engages in a robust discussion of the “how” of the PCU change process. First, the PCU change implementation plan is described through combining the AI change framework with the chosen solution of an e-pedagogy pilot project. Next, the monitoring and evaluation plan is outlined, featuring participatory and monitoring (PM&E) strategies designed with the OIP theoretical framework and three-pronged leadership approach in mind. Various elements of the communication plan are discussed while emphasizing the role of knowledge mobilization (KMb) potential within the PCU community to garner buy-in and interest for organization-wide rollout of e-pedagogy professional development. Lastly, Chapter 3 concludes with a reflection on next steps and future considerations of long-term hopes of this OIP research.

Change Implementation Plan

To address the POP of a gap in faculty e-pedagogy skill development and lack of authentic, human-centred community in online classes, the PCU change implementation plan is situated within social constructivist and humanist frameworks while aligning with the three-pronged leadership approach and e⁴ online educator conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 2. Using AI as the change process framework, PCU change agents will partner with key stakeholders and collaborate to determine short-, medium-, and long-term goals needed to catalyze lasting change across the organization. As seen in Table 2 and discussed throughout Chapter 3, the POP goals and priorities involve the implementation, evaluation, and communication of the change plan in partnership with selected e-pedagogy pilot participants within a strategically developed timeline. Finally, potential limitations and challenges are identified and addressed through servant, relational, and distributed leadership approaches.

Table 2*Short-, Medium-, and Long-Term Goals of the Change Plan*

Type of Goal	Goals and Priorities	Proposed Timeline
Short-Term	Use the AI Summit to establish a collective vision of the change implementation plan amongst SOE faculty and DOLD members	July-August
Short-Term	Develop SOE faculty e ⁴ online educator skills through regular PLC meetings, led by DOLD members	September-December
Medium-Term	Apply e-pedagogy skills in SOE online classes, monitored and supported by DOLD members	January-April
Medium-Term	Evaluate faculty and student feedback surveys	May
Medium-Term	Communicate findings of the e-pedagogy pilot project to the PCU senior leadership team and stakeholders, including KMB strategies and recommendations for future change implementation across PCU	June
Long-Term	Implement e ⁴ online educator professional development across PCU with all faculty members	September and beyond

The goals of the PCU change implementation plan are driven by a complex combination of increased demand for flexible (e.g., online) learning options both within the university itself and across the greater higher education landscape (Seaman & Johnson, 2021). The renewed PCU vision statement of empowering students to understand who they are, what they believe, and what they are called to do in the world is a key change driver, which aligns with social constructivist principles and will inform the change implementation plan around developing faculty as e⁴ online educators, particularly in the action element of quality, inclusive, accessible community of student-led learning focused on holistic student development. The long-term goal of the change implementation plan is to implement e⁴ online educator professional development across PCU with all faculty members. Throughout the e-pedagogy pilot project, PCU change agents and pilot project participants will take note of successes, challenges, and lingering

questions of the process and use these elements when communicating findings and recommendations for future university-wide implementation.

Identifying e-Pedagogy Pilot Project Participants

As mentioned in Chapter 2, pilot studies are intentionally designed around a small group chosen as a microcosmic representation of the larger organization (Burns, 2019; Malmqvist et al., 2019). Successes, roadblocks, and unexpected challenges encountered during the pilot process allow change leaders to adapt and refocus the implementation plan when it comes time to disseminate it across the entire institution through modeling, confirmation, practice, and dialogue (Gudmundsdottir & Brock-Utne, 2010; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017). Both AI and distributed leadership theory rely on cooperative structures, while servant leadership emphasizes the importance of listening to the lived experiences and feedback of others (Spears, 2010). These elements will inform the change process monitoring and evaluation plan discussed in the next section, so it is imperative to select participants who are willing to actively engage in the change process and share honest reflections of their experiences to improve the online teaching and learning experience for other social and organizational actors in the future.

To engage in a collaborative approach to change within the proposed solution, DOLD e-pedagogy experts need to partner with a selected department of PCU faculty members and apply the AI 4-D cycle to design e⁴ online educator professional development opportunities and guide faculty in developing individual and organizational identity toward social justice (Capper, 2018). I recommend that DOLD members partner with the undergraduate faculty in PCU's School of Education (SOE). As teacher educators, SOE faculty have a deep understanding of pedagogical practices and the importance of developing identity as a teacher, not solely as a researcher. This mindset is well-aligned with the identity section of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework

and is advantageous to building this aspect of becoming an e⁴ online educator. The SOE is relatively small, with fewer than 20 tenure-track, teaching-track, and part-time faculty and instructors teaching courses for approximately 200 domestic and international students. This size of faculty and student body is manageable for DOLD while providing a diverse representation of the university as a whole. Additionally, several SOE faculty teach in other disciplines (e.g., business, leadership) and can serve as change champions with other faculty members when the pilot project concludes and change is implemented across the university. A particular strength of selecting the SOE faculty is the opportunity to invite a specific faculty member to play a role as a key change agent, as they are a certified AI facilitator and can offer invaluable leadership and guidance during the AI 4-D cycle (J. Skelding, personal communication, 2020).

Through previous conversations, it is clear that the SOE dean is in favour of increasing faculty e-pedagogy skills and engaging students in the online learning environment, as they see the value in not only improving online learning at PCU, but the significant need to equip teacher candidates with necessary skills and knowledge to integrate e-pedagogy in their own future classrooms. By selecting the SOE for the e-pedagogy pilot project, this OIP will dually address the POP of developing PCU faculty e-pedagogy skill efficacy while inspiring future K-12 teachers to build digital literacy capabilities in preparation for teaching in their own post-pandemic classrooms.

Once the PCU SOE faculty are identified as the chosen e-pedagogy pilot group, DOLD change leaders will partner with faculty members and engage in the AI 4-D cycle to roll out the change implementation plan. Change agents will initially engage in the AI 4-D cycle through an AI summit but will revisit the four stages throughout the change implementation plan to ensure overall alignment and provide opportunities for reflection and refinement as needed.

Stage 1: Appreciative Inquiry Summit

An AI summit is an immersive, engaging, highly participatory opportunity for a group of stakeholders to jointly generate a change plan using AI 4-D cycle in a condensed period of time (Whitney & Cooperrider, 2011; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010). The AI summit structure aligns with multiple tenets of this OIP: (a) social constructivism, through inviting participants to engage in personal sensemaking and build real-life connections between theory and praxis (O'Donoghue, 2017); (b) humanism, through recognizing the transformative value of personal stories, lived experiences, and engaging the whole person (Bushe, 2013; Cooperrider et al., 2008; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017); (c) servant leadership, through emphasizing the importance of listening and conceptualization (Spears, 2010); (d) relational leadership, through building social capital and collective efficacy (Donohoo et al., 2018; McCauley & Palus, 2021); and (e) distributed leadership, through empowering participants and inviting contributions from all voices (Elmore, 2000).

The AI summit will take place over the summer when SOE faculty are not teaching courses and can give their full attention and energy to participating in the 4-D cycle process. As the summer months are traditionally a time for higher education faculty to engage in their research portfolios, a potential challenge at this stage is resistance from faculty who have plans to complete research in their area of expertise. To mitigate these concerns, the SOE dean will engage in conversation with individual faculty members and create an alternative plan (e.g., course relief during the year to create space for research and KMB initiatives).

DOLD members bring unique strengths to the change implementation plan through their e-pedagogy expertise and previous experiences with online education. This poses a potential limitation and threat to the change process, as DOLD members could overpower the change

process through forcing their own change agenda without consideration of the input of other stakeholders. DOLD members are passionate about e-pedagogy and have historically been frustrated with the lack of uptake and interest amongst faculty. To counter this potential threat, DOLD members must engage in a team-based change process and empower PCU SOE faculty members by adhering to the three-pronged leadership approach through listening with empathy, building a system of relationships to encourage collective efficacy, and leading with the goal of improving current instructional practices and investing in the growth of people (Donohoo et al., 2018; Elmore, 2000; Spears, 2010). DOLD members already have a strong understanding of servant leadership theory, as characteristics of this approach are woven throughout PCU core values (see Figure 1) and embedded in current leadership practices. The team currently employs distributed and relational leadership within their department, as seen in the flattened hierarchy model and regular collaborative meetings and partnerships (S. Macklin, personal communication, 2021). The team can apply this approach during the change process to capitalize on the potential for collective efficacy and empower SOE faculty as change agents themselves.

Though the AI summit will cover all four stages of the AI 4-D cycle in a short time frame, pilot project participants may choose to revisit any of the stages at any point throughout the change implementation plan to reframe or redirect identified goals and priorities based on how the change process unfolds. During the Discovery stage, participants will explore positive examples of online education at PCU and use appreciative interviews to determine hopes and dreams for the future of online education at the university (see Appendix G). Next, the group will establish logistics and details of the change process during the Dream and Design stages (e.g., short-, medium-, and long-term goals, e⁴ online educator professional development structure). The final stage of the AI summit allows DOLD members and PCU SOE faculty to engage in the

Destiny process of envisioning the desired future state and committing to transformative action towards this collective vision. The Destiny stage also involves creating monitoring and evaluation structures. Markiewicz and Patrick (2015) encourage change leaders to develop their monitoring and evaluation plan early on during the change planning process to ensure close alignment between intended objectives and envisioned results. The entire structure of the AI Summit can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Appreciative Inquiry Summit

AI 4-D Cycle Stage	Objectives	Stakeholder Responsibilities	Outcomes
Discovery	Focus on positive examples of online education at PCU; determine hopes and dreams for the future of online education; identify skills of pilot project participants	DOLD: Conduct AI interviews with SOE faculty; build relational trust amongst e-pedagogy pilot project participants SOE faculty: Share highlight stories	Frame online teaching and learning in a positive light to legitimize the need to develop e-pedagogy skills and a human-centred virtual learning community
Dream	Envision the ideal future state for online education; define the framework for change in a positive manner	DOLD & SOE faculty: Engage in a Dream Dialogue (e.g., collaboratively build shared vision of the future); brainstorm potential positive impact of PCU in the world through online education	Establish parameters to guide the short-, medium-, and long-term goals of the change implementation plan
Design	Collaboratively build professional development structure; consider ways of building e4 online educator skills (e.g., identity, knowledge, action)	DOLD: Empower participants to use their skills to help each other grow DOLD & SOE faculty: Conceptualize e4 online educator framework as a tool to achieve short-, medium-, and long-term goals and change priorities	Build collective efficacy and social capital through collaborating to develop robust professional development opportunities centred on e-pedagogy skill development and online student learning needs
Destiny	Apply AI framework to work towards reaching the desired future state	DOLD & SOE faculty: Create a schedule of professional development opportunities for the upcoming semester; discuss possible strategies for monitoring and evaluation	Conceptualize the role of online teaching and learning in fulfilling the PCU long-term strategic vision

Note. Stakeholder responsibilities are divided between DOLD members and PCU SOE faculty, as listed in the table.

Stage 2: e⁴ Online Educator Professional Learning Community

Professional development initiatives for building e-pedagogy skills need to be driven primarily by student learning needs, then catalyzed through the integration of technology (Fullan, 2012; Future Design School, 2022). The partnership between DOLD members and PCU SOE faculty is an ideal match, as DOLD members bring expertise in how to use technology to enhance learning, while SOE faculty members have a solid understanding of the theory of learning and how to apply pedagogical approaches to support student learning. This combination will result in the creation of a robust framework for developing identity, knowledge, and action elements of becoming an e⁴ online educator as e-pedagogy pilot project stakeholders contribute insights from their areas of expertise and build collective efficacy for strengthening each other's instructional practices and performance (Elmore, 2000).

The e⁴ online educator professional development structure developed during the AI summit will be implemented throughout the fall semester to support SOE faculty in building their e-pedagogy skills. These gatherings will be structured as a professional learning community (PLC), where DOLD members and SOE faculty meet regularly to collaborate through collective inquiry aimed at building e-pedagogy skill efficacy and improving student learning in the online environment (DuFour et al., 2008). PLCs are rooted in social constructivism through emphasizing the influence of the community on an individual's learning and development process (Schwandt, 1994). Elements of servant, relational, and distributed leadership are woven into PLCs through the centrality of shared values, collective vision of the future state, and the

importance of vulnerably sharing personal strengths and challenges throughout the change process (Hellener, 2008). PLC participants will engage in Capper's (2018) five categories of identity development, emphasizing the role of identity toward social justice throughout the process.

PCU PLC activities will be jointly planned and led by DOLD members and SOE faculty, depending on the specific area of focus from the e⁴ online educator framework (e.g., TPACK, accessibility in the classroom). An example of e-pedagogy professional development structure is Serdyukov's (2015) e-pedagogy faculty professional development program (see Appendix H). The PCU professional development structure will likely have many similarities to Serdyukov's work, as it outlines elements of developing identity as an online educator, learning specific TPACK, and understanding how to interact and build relationships with students in a virtual community. During each PLC gathering, SOE faculty will develop their skills in various aspects of the e⁴ online educator framework and share successes, struggles, and questions with the group as they prepare to apply their newly developed e-pedagogy skills in a virtual setting. DOLD members will monitor and evaluate PCU SOE faculty skill development throughout the fall semester, as described in the next section of Chapter 3.

Stage 3: Applying e⁴ Online Educator Skills in an Online Classroom

Once SOE faculty build a foundational e-pedagogy skill set through PLC professional development, they will embark on applying the e⁴ online educator framework when teaching one of their existing online courses in the spring semester. DOLD members will provide support throughout the spring semester through continuing to meet with SOE faculty in PLC settings and coming alongside faculty to troubleshoot potential issues that arise during the semester. At the conclusion of the semester, students will be asked to complete an anonymous feedback survey to

provide insight as to whether their experiences in the online learning environment were improved as a result of the e-pedagogy pilot process. PCU students currently complete feedback surveys at the end of all on-campus and online courses to they are familiar with this process, but DOLD members and SOE faculty will collaborate to ensure the e-pedagogy pilot project survey allows for the collection of data specific to e⁴ online educator aspects (e.g., TPACK, inclusive learning community). Once evaluated, survey results will be evaluated and communicated to the PCU senior leadership team with recommendations for long-term implementation with the eventual goal of expanding learning beyond the initial e-pedagogy pilot group to create authentic, long-lasting change across the university.

Potential Limitations and Challenges

When carrying out the change plan, PCU change agents must be mindful of potential implementation issues that may occur and plan ways to address them. Firstly, generating a positive view of online education at PCU may prove difficult due to the negative experiences endured by both faculty and students during the COVID-19 pandemic quick pivot to online learning. Some faculty may be hesitant to engage in e-pedagogical skill development initiatives and wish to return to the physical classroom permanently. PCU change leaders will rely on the positive, strengths-based design of the AI framework to mitigate these concerns and potential push back. Additional support will come from the SOE faculty member who is a trained AI facilitator, as they can guide PCU change leaders in framing online teaching and learning as an important and necessary change within the context of the overall organizational strategy.

A second potential challenge is the wide variety of faculty beliefs about online education as a valid modality of learning. The change process will not successfully move toward the desired state unless stakeholders undergo an epistemological shift in their views on educational

technology and their willingness to learn how to use technology to support student learning and build community in the virtual classroom. Part of the implementation plan needs to be some work within the PCU change leadership team to ensure they are taking up the suggested three-pronged leadership approach in a unified manner. PCU change agents need to implement the servant leadership skills of persuasion and conceptualization in combination with building relational trust and encouraging faculty to consider student learning needs and embrace a growth mindset when developing e-pedagogy skills (Dweck, 2015; Holdsworth & Maynes, 2017; Luenendonk, 2020).

One limitation of the design of the PCU change implementation plan is the absence of student involvement and input during the AI summit and within the PLC e-pedagogy professional development structure. Student voices are invaluable in developing robust, inclusive, and accessible online learning environments (France, 2021; Shin & Hickey, 2020); however, the focus of this OIP is on building a foundation of e⁴ online educator skills and e-pedagogy self-efficacy in PCU faculty, so they are equipped and prepared to serve student learning needs and social justice issues in the virtual learning environment while living out PCU's vision statement. This approach is akin to putting on your own mask before helping those around you in an airline emergency (Horowitz, 2020). This philosophy may at first seem contradictory to the others-centred nature of servant leadership but, as identified by Stubblefield (2004), a key factor in serving others is to first focus inward and develop a collaborative culture of learning and growth. Inviting student involvement is an important aspect of Stage 3 of the change implementation plan, as data from student feedback surveys plays a significant role through informing the recommended next steps of the PCU change process.

To ensure the change implementation plan is effectively rolled out, PCU change leaders and SOE e-pedagogy pilot participants must carefully consider aspects of change process monitoring and evaluation while engaging in the change implementation plan and considering ways to refine the plan to meet short-, medium-, and long-term goals.

Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation

Authentic, long-lasting change occurs when initiatives are closely monitored, evaluated, and adjusted to maintain alignment with the desired future state. Change leaders need reliable, consistent, and understandable information to maintain an accurate pulse on the change process and persuade stakeholders to buy into proposed recommendations for long-term change (Delahaye Paine, 2011). Well developed, clearly defined monitoring and evaluation frameworks can address a range of change process priorities, including: (a) assessing expected and unexpected results; (b) developing a guide for managing progress and relationships between outputs; (c) providing accountability on the allocation and use of provided resources; (d) learning from both successful and failed initiatives; (e) optimizing a program's design and performance; and (f) using results to inform future decision making (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). For the purposes of this OIP, monitoring refers to ongoing analysis of progress during the change process, while evaluation refers to measuring and assessing the change outcomes and results (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). Both tools are essential in supporting change agents in leading and refining the implementation plan while working towards the desired future state of developing faculty e-pedagogy skills and building an inclusive and accessible online learning community at PCU.

Making Monitoring and Evaluation Meaningful

A common tenet of the theoretical and leadership frameworks of this OIP is the significance of doing something that matters in the scope of a greater context. Before they will buy into the proposed change initiative, stakeholders need to feel that their input is meaningful and will have a transformative impact on culture at both the local and global levels (Pacific Coastal University, n.d.b.). Social constructivism encourages change leaders to situate proposed changes within the context of the larger community, drawing on a variety of perspectives and influences to create meaning and construct new knowledge while rooting change in organizational mission and values (Nicholson & Kurucz, 2017; Schwandt, 1994). Under a servant leadership approach, leaders create meaningfulness in work through highlighting how serving others benefits not only the immediate surrounding network of people, but the greater organization and society as a whole (van Dierendonck & Sousa, 2016). In relational leadership theory, individuals are understood within a system of relationships and the systems' effect on a macro-level scale, while distributed leaders create meaning through inviting stakeholders to influence the change process through applying real-world expertise (Hargreaves & Harris, 2015; McCauley & Palus, 2021).

The PCU monitoring and evaluation tools must align with social constructivism and the three-pronged leadership approach to change to ensure stakeholders are engaged and supported throughout this stage of the change process. To accomplish this, PCU change leaders will employ PM&E methodologies. A PM&E approach invites stakeholders to become active participants in the monitoring and evaluation process, capturing personal reflections and the perspectives of others while adapting the process as needed to ensure it remains relevant to priorities and mid-, medium-, and long-term goals (Jacobs et al., 2010; MacCoy, 2014). Through

engaging stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation process, change leaders can create intentional opportunities for individuals to question preconceived assumptions, values, and beliefs while gaining a more comprehensive understanding of how the change process affects the organization on micro and macro levels (Coghlan et al., 2003). According to Lewis (2019), a PM&E approach has the following benefits for stakeholders: (a) lowered resistance to change; (b) increased satisfaction; (c) increased sense of control; and (d) reduced uncertainty about the change process. These four characteristics will help PCU change leaders when communicating with faculty about findings and future recommendations for future change implementation.

To monitor and evaluate the PCU change process of building faculty e-pedagogy skills and creating inclusive, engaging online learning environments, PCU change agents will integrate the PDSA framework with PM&E tools (e.g., PLC progress charts for faculty, feedback surveys for students). This approach allows change agents to monitor and evaluate the change process through determining what is being monitored and evaluated, how monitoring and evaluation is being carried out, and how this information is used in future decision making (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016; Waylen et al., 2019).

The Plan, Do, Study, Act Model


The PDSA model, also known as the Deming Wheel or the Shewart Cycle, outlines a four-step framework for leaders to follow when monitoring and evaluating change (Pietrzak & Paliszkiwicz, 2015). It is an iterative process, engaging with three guiding questions (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015):

1. What are we trying to accomplish?
2. How will we know a change is an improvement?
3. What change can be made that will result in improvement?

The PDSA model integrates AI as the change framework during the Plan stage, then lends itself to PM&E through focusing on how groups of people make meaning as they engage in the change process and ensuring measurement and evaluation tools are appropriate within the existing PCU culture (Coghlan et al., 2013; Lavis et al., 2003). PCU change agents will integrate the three-pronged leadership approach during each of the four stages to ensure stakeholders are engaged with the change process and invited to share their input on a consistent basis. The four stages are described in depth in the next section of this chapter and summarized in Figure 7. During the change implementation plan, DOLD members and SOE faculty will participate in one overriding iteration of the PDSA model, with the goal of re-engaging with the cycle multiple times once change is initiated across the university. It is important to note that the PDSA model allows for flexibility so PCU change agents can use what they learn throughout the monitoring and evaluation process to adjust and modify the change plan as needed.

Figure 7

Monitoring and Evaluating the PCU Change Process with the PDSA Model



Note. Adapted from “Framework of Strategic Learning: The PDCA Cycle,” by M. Pietrzak & J. Paliszkiwicz, 2015, *Management*, 10(2), p. 153. [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](#)

Plan: Envisioning the Desired State and Developing Objectives

Armenakis and Harris (2009) emphasize the importance of correctly diagnosing a problem before determining the desired solution and accompanying monitoring and evaluation strategies. Change initiatives centre on building faculty e-pedagogy skills, then using this newfound learning to address social justice issues through building inclusive learning communities in the online classroom. During the Plan stage of the PDSA model, DOLD members will identify PCU SOE faculty as the e-pedagogy pilot participants, then collaborate to conduct the AI summit (see Table 3). The focus of this summit will be on creating a collaborative vision of how equipping faculty as e⁴ online educators and developing robust online learning spaces can help PCU achieve its long-term strategic vision in both local and global contexts. Throughout this initial planning stage, DOLD members need to highlight the importance of asking questions and inviting discourse to ensure SOE faculty stakeholders feel that their voices are included and heard when determining how the change process will unfold (Coghlan et al., 2003). This initial stage would take approximately two months, depending on the length of the AI summit and the depth of collaborative planning. When planning PM&E tools, a key resource will be results from the AI interviews, particularly questions 1 and 4, where SOE faculty are asked to describe their best experiences with online teaching and learning and share their vision for the future of online education at PCU (see Appendix G). These answers will help create a baseline for PLC meeting topics and guide the collaborative work of moving towards the envisioned future state. By the end of the planning stage, DOLD members and SOE faculty will

establish monitoring tools and evaluation objectives to guide the remaining three stages of the PDSA model.

Do: Engaging Stakeholders and Monitoring Key Measurables

In the second stage of the PDSA model, change leaders and stakeholders actively implement change initiatives and document expected and unexpected outcomes (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015). At PCU, the Do stage involves two steps. Firstly, SOE faculty will develop e⁴ online educator skills through attending regular PLC meetings during the winter semester (e.g., September to December), led by DOLD members. These meetings provide opportunities for ongoing, iterative monitoring of progress of individual SOE faculty and growth of the collective group in building e⁴ online educator skills through reflecting using PM&E processes. SOE faculty will self-assess their learning at each meeting using the PLC progress chart (see Appendix I). Individual faculty members will record anecdotal observations and reflections on their progress for each of the e⁴ online educator characteristics (e.g., identity, knowledge, action) using the provided chart. As SOE faculty reflect, they may wish to revisit discussions and notes from the AI Summit to check if there are opportunities to integrate forgotten elements from previous planning or revise next steps based on unanticipated changes since the initial Plan stage. DOLD members will walk alongside SOE faculty through engaging them in strengths-based dialogue and employing servant leadership skills of empathetic listening and committing to individual growth (Spears, 2010). This approach aligns with Niyivuga et al.'s (2019) strategy of framing monitoring and evaluation in higher education as improvement oriented, generating positive outcomes and emphasizing relationships over control. DOLD members can use monitoring information from the PLC progress charts to guide decision making in planning subsequent e⁴ online educator professional development initiatives and maintaining an accurate

pulse on the affective needs of SOE faculty throughout the change implementation plan. It is crucial to follow PM&E strategies throughout the PLC process to ensure SOE faculty members are active participants in the monitoring process.

The second part of the Do stage occurs when SOE faculty apply their newly developed e⁴ online educator skills in one of their spring semester online courses (e.g., January to April). DOLD members will continue to monitor the change implementation plan through applying relational leadership approaches in ongoing interactions with SOE faculty and encouraging them to incorporate humanism and intentional community into the online learning environment. DOLD members and SOE faculty will continue holding PLC meetings, using the PLC progress chart to monitor faculty growth with the goal of reaching the deepening or sustaining categories for all aspects of the e⁴ online educator conceptual framework by the end of the spring semester. Once online courses conclude, students will be invited to contribute to the PM&E process through completing a feedback survey related to their experience in an online class taught by an SOE faculty member. PCU has a standard course evaluation survey disseminated to all domestic and international students; however, as part of e-pedagogy pilot project monitoring, DOLD members and SOE faculty will integrate elements of Bolliger and Inan's (2012) Online Student Connectedness Survey (see Appendix J). By including these additional questions, PCU change leaders can monitor and evaluate elements specific to the effectiveness of the e-pedagogy pilot project, then make changes and future recommendations based on the findings.

Study: Analyzing Data to Gauge Progress and Make Adjustments

Markiewicz and Patrick (2016) discuss the importance of ensuring a close, aligned relationship between monitoring and evaluation throughout the change process. As e-pedagogy pilot participants move into the third stage of the PDSA model, they will analyze the initial AI 4-

D planning process, PLC progress charts, and online student feedback surveys to determine the effectiveness of the change implementation plan in fulfilling its priorities and goals. DOLD members and SOE faculty will take approximately one month to engage in collaborative review and discussion of the e-pedagogy pilot project monitoring initiatives. Engaging with PM&E and the three-pronged leadership approach is vital to this stage of the monitoring and evaluation process, as authentic participation requires those involved to listen to one another's experiences, implement needed changes, and share the decision-making power (Jacobs et al., 2010). Results from this evaluation process serve a dual purpose of providing SOE faculty an opportunity to set new goals and continue their own e⁴ online educator skill development journey and informing future recommendations for rolling out long-term change across the entire university.

Act: Communicating Results and Developing Efficacy

The final stage of the PDSA framework involves sharing results with organizational members and implementing strategies for sustained improvement (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015). This stage takes place before summer break so stakeholders can take ample time to consider and review information while developing any follow-up questions for the change implementation team. Change agents must be strategic when communicating the progress and transformative influence of the change process to gain and maintain trust as leaders and generate buy-in for organization-wide roll out (Delahaye Paine, 2011). Klein (1996) defines four objectives of an effective communication strategy:

1. Give accurate, data-driven information of current progress.
2. Offer ways for uninvolved participants to engage in the future.
3. Describe how change will affect existing and new roles and responsibilities.
4. Dispel rumours and false information about the change process or results.

A key factor in communicating monitoring and evaluation results is reframing problem or deficit-focused issues as solution or asset-focused questions (MacCoy, 2014). For example, instead of stating, “students feel isolated and disconnected in their online classes,” change leaders can ask, “what possibilities exist for building an inclusive, engaging community in the virtual learning environment?” This approach aligns with the strengths-based AI model and employs both constructionist and positive principles of the framework. The next section of Chapter 3 is dedicated to describing the plan to communicate the need for change and change process in greater detail.

Refining the Change Implementation Plan

Change leaders gain credibility and earn trust from stakeholders through demonstrating vulnerability in owning mistakes and sharing proposed revisions to change initiatives based on results and feedback (Klein, 1996). The participatory, iterative nature of both the PDSA model and AI change framework lend themselves well to ongoing adjustments based on the needs of the organization and various stakeholders and using results of monitoring and evaluation for future decision making (Coghlan et al., 2003). Throughout the monitoring and evaluation stage of the change plan, PCU change leaders will embody servant, relational, and distributed leadership approaches to ensure the process is framed through a human-centred, inclusive lens, responsive to the needs of those involved in the change process and valuing the voices and experiences of stakeholders as key factors in meeting short-, medium-, and long-term goals. Due to the cyclical, iterative nature of the change frameworks, PCU change agents can use findings from the monitoring and evaluation process to refine, adapt, and improve the change implementation plan as warranted. The final consideration for change leaders and e-pedagogy

pilot participants is how to communicate the need for change and change process to stakeholders across the organization, as discussed in the next section.

Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and Change Process

Effective communication can catalyze the change process by becoming a driver of the implementation of change rather than simply serving as a tool in the process (Beatty, 2016; Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). As the PCU change implementation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework both fall under social constructivist principles and relational, efficacious structures, it is logical to create a communication strategy rooted within the same concepts. Communication will be ongoing throughout the process, aligning with the cyclical design of AI and PDSA approaches and inviting regular feedback from stakeholders to influence goals and priorities. When developing the communication plan for the PCU POP, change leaders must consider how to communicate the need for change to all stakeholders across the organization and how to communicate with e-pedagogy pilot participants during the change process itself by employing the three-pronged leadership approach and framing change within a supportive, interpersonal lens. The next section of Chapter 3 integrates both levels of change communication through a discussion of building awareness of the need for change, framing issues and responding to anticipated stakeholder reactions, considering KMb potential, and selecting channels and paths for communicating milestones.

Building Awareness of the Need for Change

As identified in Chapter 1, the COVID-19 pandemic is a key driver of the need for change in strengthening faculty e-pedagogy skills and building inclusive, human-centred online learning communities. The proposed change process is not a reaction to the March 2020 COVID-19 quick pivot to online crisis schooling; however, many PCU faculty had negative experiences

teaching online during COVID-19 and may not be interested in continuing to develop e-pedagogy skills in a post-pandemic world. They may be keen to return to previous face-to-face teaching approaches where they feel most comfortable and resist engaging with the change plan altogether (Klein, 1996). When building awareness of the need for change, PCU change leaders need to convey the urgency and significance of why the change initiative is so important. To do so, they will enact servant leadership principles of foresight, conceptualization, and persuasion to paint a picture of the desired future state (Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011).

Communication will be framed through PCU's mission statement of making a global impact through capacity building, academic excellence, service, and leadership development, enacting the AI constructionist principle to frame change within a socially created lens (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

As noted in Chapter 1, the credible leadership and change champions category received one of the highest scores on Deszca et al.'s (2020) change readiness questionnaire. This shows that PCU senior leaders are trusted, view the change process as necessary, and can reliably disseminate information to persuade others to work towards collective goals. Though DOLD members serve as change leaders throughout the change process, they will use a distributed leadership approach and Lewis' (2019) autonomous/adaptive communication strategy by partnering with the PCU executive leadership team as spokespersons in the initial stages of communicating the need for change. Leaders use an autonomous/adaptive communication strategy to empower stakeholders at various levels within the organizational hierarchy in co-designing the optimal form and purpose of change (Lewis, 2019). The PCU executive leadership team act as sponsors in the change process, as they are senior executives committed to the change who provide resources and protection over the change implementation process, yet do not

need to actively participate as frontline change leaders (Deszca et al., 2020). Since the PCU strategic plan includes the need for a comprehensive online program across the university, executive leadership team members can justify their support of the proposed change process and build change awareness amongst all faculty members. According to the AI wholeness principle, engaging all stakeholders at once in a large group setting fosters creativity and enhances collective capacity (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010). The PCU executive leadership team and DOLD members will share initial communication at the annual faculty conference at the end of the summer break. Traditionally, this conference is where the executive leadership team employs a relational leadership approach through providing space for faculty to engage in discourse with leadership and each other while sharing updates, outlining goals, and casting a vision for the upcoming school year. In this sense, the conference is an ideal setting for building awareness of the need for change, as faculty are accustomed to hearing announcements about institutional change initiatives and will welcome opportunities to ask clarifying questions to better understand the proposed change process.


Framing Issues and Responding to Anticipated Stakeholder Reactions

Change leaders will communicate the need and vision for change to all stakeholders at the start of the change process, engaging the servant leadership characteristic of conceptualization as upfront communication increases transparency and likelihood for quick buy-in (Beatty, 2016; Cialdini, 2021; Spears, 2010). Change agents should be aware of potential opposition from faculty, which can impede organizational readiness. By anticipating resistance, change leaders can be ready to apply servant and relational leadership principles by listening empathetically and framing the change process through a humanistic lens.

When framing the POP during the communication process, change leaders need to consider how to address potential reactions from stakeholders using the three-pronged leadership approach. Beatty (2016) advises change leaders to identify stakeholders involved in change process communications and map the degree and influence for each stakeholder (see Figure 8). In doing so, change leaders can effectively determine the appropriate communication and involvement approach to take with each stakeholder. For example, SOE faculty participating in the e-pedagogy pilot project are situated within the high-high quadrant of the change process, as they are highly impacted and hold high influence. The PCU executive leadership team are categorized in the low-high category (e.g., low degree impacted, high degree of influence). As a result, they will be invited to be involved through consultation and championing the change communication plan, as explained in an earlier section. PCU staff members, such as office administration and maintenance crew, are examples of low-low stakeholders who are not highly impacted by or influential towards the proposed change for online teaching and learning. Change leaders will inform low-low stakeholders of the change process, but not involve them heavily throughout implementation.

Figure 8

Stakeholder Map



Note. Adapted from *Communication During an Organizational Change* (p. 8) by C. A. Beatty, 2015, Queen's University IRC. Copyright 2015 Queen's University IRC. Adapted with permission.

Since the proposed solution involves partnering with one department under an e-pedagogy pilot model, DOLD members will focus their efforts on these representative high-high stakeholders to ensure they are equipped to receive news of the change and feel confident to fully engage with the change process. This may create various levels of tension and uneasiness amongst other PCU faculty, as they were not selected to participate in the e-pedagogy pilot project and are classified as high-low stakeholders at this point of the change implementation plan (e.g., high degree impacted, low degree of influence). They may feel uninformed or left out of the discussion, resulting in potential apathy towards future change. To mitigate this concern, DOLD members and SOE faculty will provide regular updates of the e-pedagogy pilot project during scheduled monthly faculty meetings. In addition, an e-pedagogy pilot page will be maintained and updated on the PCU intranet. This is the central hub for inter-faculty communication and faculty are accustomed to referencing various pages and contributing their thoughts using forum and posting tools. Stakeholders will be invited to read, reflect, and respond to short-, medium-, and long-term updates throughout the change process and engage with change implementers and decision makers by sharing their perspectives and opinions on the process itself (Lewis, 2019). This creates a two-way method of communication, as supported by social justice and equity frameworks and servant, relational, and distributed approaches to leadership (Elmore, 2000; McCauley & Palus, 2021; van Dierendonck, 2011). Additionally, change leaders can use this information to determine whether communication is being received and interpreted in the way it was intended, and make necessary adjustments accordingly.

When communicating with SOE faculty, DOLD members may face challenges in defining the difference between crisis online education and the desired e⁴ online educator framework (Hodges et al., 2020; Irvine, 2020; Ubell, 2021). DOLD members need to carefully consider how to frame the change process by clarifying the desired state of serving the needs of students who choose to learn online, rather than those who are forced to be in the virtual classroom. A second challenge related to anticipated responses pertains to caring for the emotional side of faculty e-pedagogy skill development. Naylor and Nyanjom (2020) identify institutional support as a primary factor in successfully developing faculty e-pedagogy skills, with a positive correlation between increased institutional support and more positive emotions in stakeholders participating in the change initiative. By coming alongside faculty and acknowledging their fears and feelings of external pressure, PCU change leaders are better equipped to empathize with some faculty members' hesitation to engage with e-pedagogy skill development initiatives, aligning with relational leadership theory and a humanistic approach to the change process.

Knowledge Mobilization

KMb is a key factor in the PCU communication plan. As mentioned in Chapter 1, higher education faculty place significant value on their role as researchers (Cutri & Mena, 2020; Fusarelli, 2020; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020; Ubell, 2021). Change leaders can take advantage of the AI poetic principle of inviting stakeholders to choose what they study through combining efforts to build faculty identity as an e⁴ educator with an intrinsic motivation to conduct and share research.

KMb is defined as the process of sharing research with a variety of academic and non-academic audiences with the goal of building connections between theory and praxis through

creating actionable messages for real-world application (Cooper et al., 2018; Lavis et al., 2003; Malik, 2020; Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 2019). Though online teaching and learning has been a topic of research for a few decades, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused an explosion of research across diverse disciplines. The PCU POP has tremendous potential for informing and influencing similar change initiatives across both K-12 and higher education institutions on a local, national, and global scale. Lavin et al. (2003) outline five elements of a KMb framework: (a) the message; (b) the target audience; (c) the messenger; (d) the KMb communication infrastructure; and (e) the evaluation. Considering the PCU e-pedagogy pilot project, DOLD members and SOE faculty will initially communicate findings and results from the PM&E process to their target audience of PCU stakeholders during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting and through the e-pedagogy pilot project intranet page. Change agents will discuss the change implementation plan in detail, describing the AI Summit process and milestones, challenges, and lingering questions from the PLC professional development progress. Change leaders will also employ KMb to communicate how results from the Online Student Connectedness Survey will inform and improve future implementations of e-pedagogy development across PCU.

To engage more fully with KMb potential, e-pedagogy pilot participants will also explore opportunities to share the results of their research in both academic (e.g., Congress, conferences, journal publications) and non-academic settings (e.g., community K-12 partnerships, PCU alumni network). Since the long-term goal of the PCU change implementation plan is to implement e⁴ online educator professional development across PCU with all faculty members, KMb will grow exponentially as more faculty members across a variety of disciplines engage with the e⁴ online educator framework and discover applications in their unique contexts.

Malik (2020) posits that the success of KMb can depend on whether it aligns with the organization's mission. As an organization, PCU is passionately committed to having a transformative impact on culture while striving for excellence in university education (see Figure 1). Both of these core values align closely to KMb rationale, resulting in strong ties between the proposed change process and the potential influence of PCU change efforts on similar initiatives in other K-12 and post-secondary institutions.

Channels and Paths for Communicating Milestones

Change agents must be strategic when communicating the progress and transformative influence of the change process to gain and maintain trust as leaders (Delahaye Paine, 2011). Beatty (2016) advises change leaders to avoid frontloading communication with stakeholders, then disappearing as the change process unfolds; rather, it is important to maintain regular, transparent communication throughout the change process to invite stakeholder input and keep them well informed of progress on goals and priorities. As mentioned previously, PCU has an established schedule of monthly progress report meetings, led by the executive leadership team and well attended by faculty and staff. PCU has a database of slide decks and meeting agendas and minutes available to all faculty and staff on the university intranet. Change leaders can take advantage of this familiar communication infrastructure and resources to share milestones and challenges of the change process and engage in discourse with stakeholders on a regular basis. Information will be shared using both formal (e.g., official announcements; invitations for feedback) and informal (e.g., expressing hopes, wishes, intentions; sharing stories) methods of communication (Lewis, 2019). This approach aligns with the AI enactment principle, where positive change occurs when stakeholders have the opportunity to engage with a living model of change (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

Klein (1996) argues that face-to-face communication has the greatest impact on stakeholders. However, much has changed in over two decades since he published this article, including significant advances in personalized technology communication options and an increased comfort level with synchronous and asynchronous digital discourse. Since part of the PCU change process is learning how to build a relational, engaging online community with students, DOLD members and SOE faculty can model these skills through creating an inclusive, collaborative environment when communicating with PCU stakeholders.

Once the e-pedagogy pilot project concludes and participants share future recommendations with stakeholders, the university can share information about the e-pedagogy journey with a wider audience using KMb tools. Malik (2020) suggests engaging the greater community by using a variety of communication channels versus simply posting results on a website, as people often do not know a website exists or are unable to interpret research findings without assistance. In addition to previously mentioned KMb strategies, PCU leaders can engage distributed leadership theory by partnering with the PCU communications department to share information through social media channels and the alumni network (e.g., email blasts, mailouts), effectively broadening the scale and impact of communication about the change initiatives.

Next Steps and Future Considerations

Navigating organizational change of any kind is a complex endeavour, requiring strategic planning, careful framing of the POP, and intentional community development to build trust and generate buy-in amongst stakeholders. Writing this OIP on building faculty e-pedagogy efficacy and developing inclusive, human-centred online learning communities in the midst of a global pandemic proved to be a rigorous and exciting undertaking. As a result of my EdD journey, I feel more confident in using research to identify online teaching and learning as a robust modality of

education and believe this work will inform processes for change in terms of online learning. During the pandemic, the world turned to technology to continue providing academic instruction and, arguably more importantly, offering human connection between teachers and students. As society grew more physically isolated, the resilience, creativity, and empathetic nature of educators shone through as we collectively discovered the dynamic power of using technology as a tool to help our students build capabilities and develop efficacy as learners outside the four walls of the classroom. As PCU change leaders support faculty in developing their identity, knowledge, and action as e⁴ online educators, they can draw from COVID-19 quick pivot experiences to demonstrate the foundational importance of building e-pedagogy skills to best serve students and guide them in discovering what they believe, who they are, and what they are called to do in this world.

This OIP presented the what, why, and how of the PCU change process. As described in Chapter 1, PCU needs to establish e-pedagogy skill development initiatives and create inclusive, equitable online communities to serve the needs of students in both domestic and international contexts. Chapter 2 explored the selected leadership approaches of servant, relational, and distributed leadership in conjunction with the AI change framework and the chosen solution of an e-pedagogy pilot project to challenge preconceived beliefs and assumptions about online teaching and learning and overcoming barriers through coming alongside faculty and inviting their full voices throughout the change process. Finally, Chapter 3 outlined the change implementation plan and accompanying monitoring, evaluation, and communication processes to determine the effectiveness and scalability of the change process, both within PCU and across other K-12 and higher education institutions. Throughout the OIP, social constructivist and

humanist principles acted as through lines, connecting various elements of the plan, and ensuring stakeholders are cared for and listened to by change leaders.

Beatty (2016) urges change leaders to clearly communicate the what, why, and how of the change plan to stakeholders, who will not intuitively grasp the layered intricacies of the POP without an open invitation to engage in discourse as active participants in the change process (Beatty, 2016). Although developing a robust online teaching and learning infrastructure is clearly part of the PCU long-term strategic plan, stakeholders will likely attempt to return to what they define as pre-COVID-19 normal—what is known and comfortable—unless a clear vision is cast to frame the desired state of online teaching and learning as a positive and hopeful future for PCU (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

Future considerations for PCU in the context of the POP include sustainability of the change process and the need to revisit PCU policies and practices to integrate online teaching and learning considerations. Dudar et al. (2017) discuss six elements associated with sustainability of a change initiative: (a) evidence and feedback; (b) infrastructure and processes; (c) resources; (d) leadership; (e) professional development; and (f) visionaries. Most of these elements are deeply woven into the OIP design and will support sustainability through the AI and PDSA cycles, as needed. As the change process develops and long-term goals are achieved, PCU will need visionaries to continue advocating and walking alongside faculty as they grow their e⁴ online educator skills. As original change leaders, DOLD members can identify early adopter faculty to champion online teaching and learning within their respective departments, catalyzing the potential influence of the change process and KMB within and beyond PCU.

A second future consideration is to upgrade PCU policies and practices to account for online teaching and learning factors. For example, current student supports (e.g., registrar's

office, financial aid, learning commons) operate under BC business hours with on-campus offices and services. Current structures render these important aspects of PCU culture useless for online students, as they are unable to visit physical buildings or connect with staff due to time zone challenges. By rethinking how supports are offered and developing tools to serve online learners, PCU will be better positioned to equitably meet the needs of all students rather than just those who attend classes on campus.

Finally, as I conclude the OIP research and writing process, I feel a strong calling to expand this work and conduct future research into e-pedagogy skill development for teachers in the K-12 environment. As a mother of two school-aged children, I witnessed firsthand the vast range of online teaching skills in K-12 teachers throughout the past two years of the COVID-19 pandemic and the urgent need to build e-pedagogy skills with currently practicing and newly certified teachers. I look forward to investigating opportunities to extend the KMB of this OIP into the K-12 domain and challenging normative teaching practices as online teaching and learning assumes its place in our post-pandemic realities.

References

- ABLE Research Consultants. (2020). *Removing barriers to online learning through a teaching and learning lens*. BCCampus. <https://bccampus.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Report-Removing-Barriers-to-Online-Learning-Through-a-Teaching-and-Learning-Lens.pdf>
- Aldosemani, T. I. (2020). Towards ethically responsive online education: Variables and strategies from educators' perspective. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n1p79>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2012). *Digital faculty: Professors, teaching, and technology*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/DigitalFaculty.htm
- Allen, T. G., Starnes, D. B., & Lockwood, R. E. (2013). Relationship between personality characteristics of online instructors and student evaluations. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 16(2). https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer162/allen_starnes_lockwood162.html
- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., OIPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: 7 research-based principles for smart teaching*. Jossey-Bass.
- Anderson, H. J., Baur, J. E., Griffith, J. A., & Buckley, M. R. (2016). What works for you may not work for (gen)me: Limitations of present leadership theories for the new generation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28, 246–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.08.001>
- Archambault, L., & Larson, J. (2015). Pioneering the digital age of instruction: Learning from and about K-12 online teachers. *Journal of Online Learning Research*, 1(1). 49–83. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/149852/>
- Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 127–142. <https://doi.org/>

[10.1080/14697010902879079](https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010902879079)

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601>
- Atchison, C., Harper, R., Mirriahi, N., & Guerin, C. (2019). Tensions for educational developers in the digital university: Developing the person, developing the product. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(2), 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1663155>
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2007). Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes? *NebGuide G02-1481-A*. University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.
- Bartley, S. J., & Golek, J. H. (2004). Evaluating the cost effectiveness of online and face-to-face instruction. *Educational Technology & Society*, 7(4), 167–175. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.7.4.167>
- Beatty, C. A. (2016). Communication during an organizational change. In *The easy, hard & tough work of managing change* (pp. 111–141). Queen’s University IRC.
- Beck, C. D. (2014). Antecedents of servant leadership: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(3), 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051814529993>
- Bolliger, D. U., & Inan, F. A. (2012). Development and validation of the online student connectedness survey (OSCS). *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 13(3), 41–65. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v13i3.1171>
- Boss, S. (2015). Powering up learning with PBL plus technology. In J.A. Bellanca (Ed.), *Deeper learning: Beyond 21st century skills* (pp. 111–135). Solution Tree Press.

- Bound, J., Braga, B., Khanna, G., & Turner, S. (2021). The globalization of postsecondary education: The role of international students in the US higher education system. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35(1), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.35.1.163>
- Bown, C., Bessette, H., & Chan, T. C. (2006). Including ethics in the study of educational leadership. *Journal of College and Character*, 7(8), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1220>
- Brancato, V. C. (2003). Professional development in higher education. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 2003(98), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.100>
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Burnes, B. (2020). The origins of Lewin’s three-step model of change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(1), 32–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886319892685>
- Burns, M. (2019, February 15). *Yes, you should pilot your online course: A few things to consider as you do*. eLearning Industry. <https://elearningindustry.com/pilot-your-online-course-things-consider>
- Bushe, G. R. (2013). Generative process, generative outcome: The transformational potential of appreciative inquiry. In D. L. Cooperrider, D. P. Zandee, L. N. Godwin, M. Avital & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of transformation (advances in appreciative inquiry, volume 4)*, (pp. 89-113). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Canadian Bureau for International Education. (2020). *International students infographic*. <https://cbie.ca/infographic/>

- Capper, C. A. (2018). Individual and organizational identity formation toward social justice. In *Organizational theory for equity and diversity: Leading integrated, socially just education* (pp. 215–233). Routledge.
- Chen, K. Z., Lowenthal, P. R., Bauer, C., Heaps, A., & Nielsen, C. (2017). Moving beyond smile sheets: A case study on the evaluation and iterative improvement of an online faculty development program. *Online Learning*, 21(1), 85–111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i1.810>
- Cialdini, R. B. (2021). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion*. Harper Business.
- Claar, V. V., Jackson, L. L., & TenHaken, V. R. (2014). Are servant leaders born or made? *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 1(1), 46–52. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2749273>
- Clark, M. (2021). *The problem of Jesus*. Zondervan.
- Cockell, J., & McArthur-Blair, J. (2020). Being an appreciative inquiry practitioner in higher education. In *Appreciative inquiry in higher education: A transformative force* (2nd edition, pp. 133-152). FriesenPress.
- Cockerell, L. (2008). *Creating magic: 10 common sense leadership strategies from a life at Disney*. Vermillion.
- Coghlan, A. T., Preskill, H., & Catsambas, T. T. (2003). An overview of appreciative inquiry in evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2003(100), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.96>
- Coleman, P. D. (2012). Ethics, online learning and stakeholder responsibility for a code of conduct in higher education. *Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning*, (9)3, 29–34. <https://encompass.eku.edu/kjectl/vol9/iss1/3>

- Collins, S. (2018a). Culturally responsive and socially just change processes: Implementing and evaluating micro, meso, and macrolevel interventions. In *Embracing cultural responsiveness and social justice* (pp. 689–770). Counselling Concepts.
- Collins, S. (2018b). Embracing cultural responsiveness and social justice: A foundation for professional identity. In *Embracing cultural responsiveness and social justice* (pp. 343–403). Counselling Concepts.
- Connolly, M., James, C. & Beales, B. (2011). Contrasting perspectives on organizational culture change in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12(4), 421–439.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9166-x>
- Conradie, P. (2013). *Applying system theory to develop a mobile learning pedagogical framework*. Academic Conferences International Limited.
- Conradson, J. R. (2014). Outsourcing: The higher education of tomorrow? *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 29(1), 48–58.
- Cooper, A., Rodway, J., & Read, R. (2018). Knowledge mobilization practices of educational researchers across Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 48(1), 1–21.
<https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v48i1.187983>
- Cooperrider, D. L. (2012). *What is appreciative inquiry?* David Cooperrider and Associates.
<https://www.davidcooperrider.com/ai-process/>
- Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1, 129–169.
- Cooperrider, D. L., Whitney, D. D., Stavros, J., & Fry, R. (2008). *The appreciative inquiry handbook: For leaders of change*. Berrett-Koehler.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). The selection of a research approach. In *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (4th ed., pp.3–23). SAGE Publications.
- Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., & Brown, K. G. (2015). Unfreezing change as three steps: Rethinking Kurt Lewin’s legacy for change management. *Human Relations*, 69(1), 33–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715577707>
- Cutri, R. M., & Mena, J. (2020). A critical reconceptualization of faculty readiness for online teaching. *Distance Education*, 41(3), 361–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1763167>
- Darby, F., & Lang, J. M. (2019). *Small teaching online: Applying learning science in online classes*. Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, L. (2018, April 20). *Heutagogy explained: Self-determined learning in education*. Schoology Exchange. <https://www.schoology.com/blog/heutagogy-explained-self-determined-learning-education>
- Decarvalho, R. J. (1990). A history of the “third force” in psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 30(4), 22–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002216789003000403>
- Delahaye Paine, K. (2011). *Measure what matters: Online tools for understanding customers, social media engagement, and key relationships*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Demirtas, O. (2015). Ethical leadership influence at organizations: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126, 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1950-5>
- Dentzel, Z. (2014). How the internet has changed everyday life. In M. Castells (Ed.), *Change: 19 key essays on how the internet is changing our lives* (pp. 235–253). BBVA Open Mind.

- Deszca, G., Ingols, C., & Cawsey, T. F. (2020). *Organizational change: An action-oriented toolkit (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(5), 880–896. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.880>
- Dinwoodie, D., Pasmore, W., Quinn, L., & Rabin, R. (2015). *Navigating change: A leader's role*. Center for Creative Leadership. <https://www.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/navigating-change-white-paper.pdf>
- Dixson, M. D. (2015). Measuring student engagement in the online course: The online student engagement scale (OSE). *Online Learning*, *19*(4), 1–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v19i4.561>
- Donnelly, P., & Kirk, P. (2015). How to use the PDSA model for effective change management. *Education for Primary Care*, *26*(4), 279-281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14739879.2015.11494356>
- Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership*, *75*(6), 40–44.
- Dudar, L., Scott, S., & Scott, D. E. (2017). The rapid change model. In A. H. Normore (Ed.), *Accelerating change in schools: Leading rapid, successful, and complex change initiatives* (Volume 27, pp. 109–136). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-366020160000027009>
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional communities at work*. Solution Tree Press.

- Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2018). Online learning in higher education: Exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30, 452–465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-018-9179-z>
- Dweck, C. S. (2007). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Ballantine Books.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Evans, L., Thornton, B., & Usinger, J. (2012). Theoretical frameworks to guide school improvement. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 96(2), 154–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636512444714>
- Fitzgerald, S. P., Murrell, K. L., & Newman, H. L. (2001). Appreciative inquiry: The new frontier. In J. Waclawaki & A. H. Church (Eds.), *Organizational development: Data driven methods for change* (pp. 203–221). Jossey-Bass.
- France, P. E. (2020). *Reclaiming personalized learning: A pedagogy for restoring equity and humanity in our classrooms*. Corwin.
- France, P. E. (2021). *Humanizing distance learning: Centering equity and humanity in times of crisis*. Corwin.
- Frass, L. R., Rucker, R. D., & Washington, G. (2017). An overview of how four institutions prepare faculty to teach online. *Journal of Online Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–7. <http://ojs.iucdt.com/index.php/johe/article/view/7>
- Fullan, M. (2012). *Stratosphere: Integrating technology, pedagogy, and change knowledge*. Pearson.

- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992). Teacher development and educational change. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change* (pp. 1–9). Falmer Press.
- Fusarelli, L. D. (2020, August 6). *If only I knew: Reflections for new faculty members*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/08/06/seasoned-faculty-member-reflects-what-he-wishes-hed-known-new-professor-opinion>
- Future Design School. (2022). *The future of education report*. <https://learn.futuredesignschool.com/pages/futureofeducation>
- Gaines, J. (2021). *The philosophy of ikigai: 3 examples about finding purpose*. Positive Psychology. <https://positivepsychology.com/ikigai/>
- Gearhart, D. (2014). Ethics for elearning: Two sides of the ethical coin. In R. Luppicini (Ed.), *Evolving issues surrounding technoethics and society in the digital age* (pp. 232–244). IGI Global.
- Georgina, D. A., & Olson, M. R. (2008). Integration of technology in higher education: A review of faculty self-perceptions. *Internet and Higher Education*, 11, 1–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.11.002>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Grenon, V., Lafleur, F., & Samson, G. (2019). Developing the techno-pedagogical skills of online university instructors. *International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education*, 32(2). <http://www.ijede.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/1111>
- Grigsby, R. K. (2008). Committee, task force, team: What's the difference? Why does it matter? *Academic Physician & Scientist*, 42(2), 4–5.

- Gudmundsdottir, G. B., & Brock-Utne, B. (2010). An exploration of the importance of piloting and access as action research. *Educational Action Research, 18*(3), 359–372.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2010.499815>
- Hargreaves, A., & Harris, A. (2015). High performance leadership in unusually challenging educational circumstances. *Estonian Journal of Education, 3*(1), 28–49.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/eha.2015.3.1.02b>
- Harris, A. (2014, September 29). *Distributed leadership*. Teacher Magazine.
https://www.teachermagazine.com/au_en/articles/distributed-leadership
- Harting, K., & Erthal, M. J. (2005). History of distance learning. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 23*(1), 35–44.
- Hase, S., & Kenyon, C. (2000). *From andragogy to heutagogy*. ultiBASE.
<https://webarchive.nla.gov.au/awa/20010220130000/http://ultibase.rmit.edu.au/Articles/dec00/hase2.htm>
- Hellener, J. (2008). The professional learning community: A fulcrum of change. *Kairaranga, 9*(1), 50–54.
- Hill, P. (2021, September 1). *OPM market landscape and dynamics: Summer 2021 updates*. Phil on Ed Tech. <https://philonedtech.com/opm-market-landscape-and-dynamics-summer-2021-updates/>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020, March 27). *The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning*. EDUCAUSE Review.
<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>

- Holdsworth, S., & Maynes, N. (2017). "But what if I fail?" A meta-synthetic study of the conditions supporting teacher innovation. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(4), 665–703. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/3118>
- HolonIQ. (2019, February 14). *The anatomy of an OPM and a \$7.7B market in 2025*. <https://www.holoniq.com/news/anatomy-of-an-opm/>
- Hord, S. M. (2009). Professional learning communities: Educators work toward a shared purpose—Improved student learning. *National Staff Development Council*, 30(1), 40–44.
- Horowitz, D. (2020 June 9). *Leaders: Put your own oxygen mask on first*. Forbes Coaches Council. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2020/06/09/leaders-put-your-own-oxygen-mask-on-first>
- Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Jansen Perry, S., Witt, L. A., Penny, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 316–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.12.001>
- Hussain, S. T., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M. J., Hussain, S. H., & Ali, M. (2016). Kurt Lewin's change model: A critical review of the role of leadership and employee involvement in organizational change. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 3, 123–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.07.002>
- Inglis, G. (2022, February 24). *Flexibility, accessibility and engagement: How the Centre for Open Learning developed positive teaching practice from the pandemic*. Teaching Matters. <https://www.teaching-matters-blog.ed.ac.uk/flexibility-accessibility-and-engagement-how-the-centre-for-open-learning-developed-positive-teaching-practice-from-the-pandemic/>

- Irvine, V. (2020, October 26). *The landscape of merging modalities*. EDUCAUSE Review.
https://er.educause.edu/-/media/files/articles/2020/10/er20_4103.pdf
- Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(4), 49–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406>
- Jacobs, A., Barnett, C., & Ponsford, R. (2010). Three approaches to monitoring: Feedback systems, participatory monitoring and evaluation and logical frameworks. *IDS Bulletin*, 41(6), 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2010.00180.x>
- Johnson, N., Seaman, J., & Veletsianos, G. (2020). *Digital learning in Canadian higher education in 2020: National report*. Canadian Digital Learning Research Association.
http://www.cdla-acrfl.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2020_national_en.pdf
- Judge, W., & Douglas, T. (2009). Organizational change capacity: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(6), 635–649.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810910997041>
- Kang, S. P., Chen, Y., Svihla, V., Gallup, A., Ferris, K., & Datye, A. K. (2020). Guiding change in higher education: An emergent, iterative application of Kotter’s change model. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1741540>
- Keeley, B. (2007). A bigger picture. In *Human capital: How what you know shapes your life* (pp. 94–111). OECD.
- Kepios. (2021). *Digital around the world*. DataReportal. <https://datareportal.com/global-digital-overview>
- King, F., & Stevenson, H. (2017). Generating change from below: What role for leadership from above? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(6), 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1108/>

[JEA-07-2016-0074](#)

- Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and applying research paradigms in educational contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(5), 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26>
- Klein, S. M. (1996). A management communication strategy for change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9(2), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534819610113720>
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). Successful change and the force that drives it. In *Leading change* (pp. 19–34). Harvard Business Review Press.
- Lannes, W. J., & Logan, J. W. (2004). A technique for assessing an organization's ability to change. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 51(4), 483–488. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2004.836360>
- Lavis, J. N., Robertson, D., Woodside, J. M., McLeod, C. B., & Abelson, J. (2003). How can research organizations more effectively transfer knowledge to decision makers? *The Milbank Quarterly*, 81(2), 221–248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.t01-1-00052>
- Lawton, A., & Páez, I. (2015). Developing a framework for ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(3), 639–649. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2244-2>
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; Social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103>
- Lewis, L. K. (2011). *Organizational change: Creating change through strategic communication*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- Lock, D. (2019, September 10). *Change management models: Actionable ways to lead organisational change*. Daniel Lock Consulting. <https://daniellock.com/change-management-models>
- Luenendonk, M. (2020, July 25). *Servant leadership guide: Definition, qualities, pros & cons, examples*. Cleverism. <https://www.cleverism.com/servant-leadership-guide/>
- MacCoy, D. J. (2014). Appreciative inquiry and evaluation - getting to what works. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 29(2), 104–127.
- Mahendrati, H. A., & Mangundjaya, W. (2020). Individual readiness for change and affective commitment to change: The mediation effect of technology readiness on public sector. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 431, 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200407.010>
- Malik, S. (2020). Knowledge mobilization for impact: A multi-case study of education organizations. *International Journal of Educational Policy & Leadership*, 16(6), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.22230/ijep1.2020v16n6a945>
- Malmqvist, J., Hellberg, K., Möllas, G., Rose, R., & Shevlin, M. (2019). Conducting the pilot study: A neglected part of the research process? Methodological findings supporting the importance of piloting in qualitative research studies. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919878341>
- Markiewicz, A., & Patrick, I. (2016). *Developing monitoring and evaluation frameworks*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Martin, F., Budhrani, K., Kumar, S., & Ritzhaupt, A. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Roles and competencies. *Online Learning Journal*, 23(1), 184–205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i1.1329>

- Matias, C., Popovic, A., & Lebel, A. (2021). *Projected financial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Canadian universities for the 2020/21 academic year*. Statistics Canada. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/81-595-m/81-595-m2021002-eng.pdf>
- McCauley, C. D., & Palus, C. J. (2021). Developing the theory and practice of leadership development: A relational view. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101456>
- McKenzie, L. (2021, April 27). *Students want online learning options post-pandemic*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/04/27/survey-reveals-positive-outlook-online-instruction-post-pandemic>
- Merrill, M. D. (2009). Finding e3 (effective, efficient and engaging) instruction. *Educational Technology*, 49(3), 15–26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44429676>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Moore, R. L. (2020). Developing lifelong learning with heutagogy: Contexts, critiques, and challenges. *Distance Education*, 41(3), 381–401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1766949>
- Mrig, A., & Sanaghan, P. (2014). *8 keys to improving task forces and committees in higher education*. Academic Impressions. <https://www.academicimpressions.com/PDF/TaskForcesDiagnostic.pdf>
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1980). A model for diagnosing organizational behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(2), 35–51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(80\)90039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(80)90039-X)

- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *The Academy of Management Executive (1987-1989)*, 3(3), 194–204.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4164899>
- Naylor, D., & Nyanjom, J. (2020). Educators' emotions involved in the transition to online teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 40(6), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1811645>
- Newton, D. (2016, June 7). *How companies profit off education at nonprofit schools*. The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/06/for-profit-companies-nonprofit-colleges/485930/>
- Nicholson, J., & Kurucz, E. (2017). Relational leadership for sustainability: Building an ethical framework from the moral theory of 'ethics of care.' *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(1), 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3593-4>
- Niyivuga, B., Otara, A., & Tuyishime, D. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation practices and academic staff motivation: Implications in higher education within Rwandan context. *SAGE Open*, 9(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019829564>
- Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Leadership theory and practice, sixth edition*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- O'Donoghue, T. (2017). *Understanding contemporary education: Key themes and issues*. Routledge.
- Osborne, L. (2018). Servant leadership. In *Lead like a shepherd* (pp. 123–130). Thomas Nelson.
- Openo, J. (2020). Education's response to the COVID-19 pandemic reveals online education's three enduring challenges. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 46(2), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt27981>

- Pacific Coastal University. (n.d.a.). *Board of governors*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Pacific Coastal University (n.d.b.). *Pacific Coastal University core values*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Pacific Coastal University. (n.d.c.). *Mission, vision, and statement of faith*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Pacific Coastal University. (n.d.d.). *The history of Pacific Coastal University*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Pacific Coastal University (2016). *Strategic plan*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Pacific Coastal University. (2020). *Pacific Coastal University institutional prioritization process*. [Citation information withheld for anonymization purposes.]
- Page, D. (2009). *Servant empowered leadership: A hands on guide to transforming you and your organization*. Power to Change Ministries Inc.
- Palmer, P. J. (2000). *Let your life speak*. Jossey-Bass.
- Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *113*, 377–393.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>
- Pietrzak, M. & Paliszkievicz, J. (2015). Framework of strategic learning: The PDCA cycle. *Management*, *10*(2), 149–161.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1–6.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>

- Province of British Columbia. (2021). *Different types of post-secondary institutions in B.C.* Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training. <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/post-secondary-education/find-a-program-or-institution/find-an-institution>
- Purdue Online. (2021). *What do instructional designers do?* Purdue University. <https://online.purdue.edu/blog/education/what-do-instructional-designers-do>
- Reddy, A. V., & Kamesh, A. V. S. (2016). Integrating servant leadership and ethical leadership. In M. Chatterji & L. Zsolnai (Eds.), *Ethical leadership* (pp. 107–124). Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Reed, L. L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011). A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: Development, analysis, and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*, 415–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0729-1>
- Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 63*(4), 345–359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3242-1>
- Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2019). *Liberating learning: Educational change as a social movement.* Routledge.
- Roeck, K. M. (2017). *Fostering cultural change: A journey towards digital literacy and technology integration.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Pacific Coastal University.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). Innovativeness and adopter categories. In *Diffusion of innovations, 5th edition* (pp. 436–483). Simon & Schuster, Inc.

- Sabir, A. (2018). The congruence management - A diagnostic tool to identify problem areas in a company. *Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 1(2), 34–38.
<https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jpsir.20180102.11>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Sampson, H. (2004). Navigating the waves: The usefulness of a pilot in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 383–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410404047236>
- Scazzero, P. (2015). *The emotionally healthy leader*. Zondervan.
- Schaffhauser, D. (2021, October 7). *Report: Most learners have found they like online learning*. Campus Technology. <https://campustechnology.com/articles/2021/10/07/report-most-learners-have-found-they-like-online-learning.aspx>
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2017). The humanistic approach. In *Theories of personality* (11th edition, pp. 245–290). Cengage Press.
- Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 118–137). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Schwantes, M. (2015). Servant leadership: The case for the best leadership philosophy. *Leadership Excellence*, 32(5), 30–31.
- Seaman, J., & Johnson, N. (2021). *Pandemic-era report card: Students, faculty, and administrators reflect upon the academic year*. Bayview Analytics.
<https://cengage.widen.net/view/pdf/sq4wmggt6e/pandemic-era-report-card.pdf>
- Selwyn, N. (2014). The internet and education. In M. Castells (Ed.), *Change: 19 key essays on how the internet is changing our lives* (pp. 190–215). BBVA Open Mind.

- Serdyukov, P. (2015). Does online education need a special pedagogy? *Journal of Computing and Information Technology*, 23(1), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.2498/cit.1002511>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1869-x>
- Shin, M., & Hickey, K. (2020). Needs a little TLC: Examining college students' emergency remote teaching and learning experiences during COVID-19. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(7), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1847261>
- Silberman, E. (2021). Views of university administrators on the outsourcing of online education. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 21(3), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v21i3>
- Smith, A. & Graetz, F.M. (2011). Philosophies of organizational change: 'Change context.' In *Philosophies of organizational change* (pp. 1–24). Edward Elgar.
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190401000406>
- Smith, D. A., Sevensma, K., Terpstra, M., & McMullen, S. (2020). *Digital life together: The challenge of technology for Christian schools*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Snowman, J., & Biehler, R. (2012). Constructivist learning theory, problem solving, and transfer. In *Psychology applied to teaching* (13th edition, pp. 326–364). Cengage Learning.
- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2019). *What is knowledge mobilization?* https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/knowledge_mobilisation-mobilisation_des_connaissances-eng.aspx#a1

- Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1), 25–30.
- Springer, S. (2018). One university's experience partnering with an online program management (OPM) provider: A case study. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 21(1).
- Starlink. (2021). <https://www.starlink.com/>
- Starratt, R. J. (2011). *Refocusing school leadership*. Routledge.
- Starratt, R. J. (2014). Ethics and social justice: Strangers passing in the night? In I. Bogotch & C. M. Shields (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and social (in)justice* (pp. 67–80). Springer Science+Business Media.
- Statistics Canada. (2020). *International students accounted for all the growth in postsecondary enrolments in 2018/2019*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/201125/dq201125e-eng.htm>
- Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Thomas, S., Wallace, M., Greenwood, A., & Hawkey, K. (2006). *Monitoring and evaluation: Reflecting the progress of your professional learning community*. Digital Education Resource Archive. <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/16502>
- Stubblefield, A. (2004). *The Baptist health care journey to excellence: Creating a culture that WOWs!* Wiley.
- The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*. (2001). Crossway.
- Ubell, R. (2021). *Staying online: How to navigate digital higher education*. Routledge.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 654–676.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007>

UNESCO. (2021). *Number and rates of international mobile students (inbound)*.

<http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx>

Valkovicova, M. (2021). Robots need not apply. *TREK Magazine*, 77(2), 4–7.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>

van Dierendonck, D., & Sousa, M. (2016). Finding meaning in highly uncertain situations: Servant leadership during change. In C. Peus, S. Braun, & B. Schyns (Eds.), *Leadership lessons from compelling contexts: Monographs in leadership and management* (Volume 8, pp. 403–424). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-357120160000008015>

VanLeeuwen, C. A., Veletsianos, G., Belikov, O., & Johnson, N. (2020). Institutional perspectives on faculty development for digital education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 46(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt27944>

Veletsianos, G. (2021, May 27). *Opening plenary panel: Pandemic reflections on the OTESSA conference themes*. [Conference session]. Congress 2021, Alberta, British Columbia, Canada. <https://congress2021.ca/>

Veletsianos, G., VanLeeuwen, C. A., Belikov, O., & Johnson, N. (2021). An analysis of digital education in Canada in 2017-2019. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 22(2), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v22i2.5108>

Villasenor, J. (2022, February 10). *Online college classes can be better than in-person ones. The implications for higher ed are profound*. The Brookings Institution.

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2022/02/10/online-college-classes-can-be-better-than-in-person-ones-the-implications-for-higher-ed-are-profound/>

- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). The theory of open systems in physics and biology. *Science, New Series*, 111(2872), 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.111.2872.23>
- Voyle, R. J., & Voyle, K. M. (2022). *Appreciative inquiry interview guides*. The Appreciative Way. <http://www.appreciativeway.com/appreciative-inquiry-resources/AI-generic-questions.pdf>
- Wagner, T. (2015). The worst of times, the best of times. In J. A. Bellanca (Ed.), *Deeper learning: Beyond 21st century skills* (pp. 159–175). Solution Tree Press.
- Wan, S. (2021, October 7). *When returning to campus, I realized I missed virtual courses*. Hybrid Pedagogy. <https://hybridpedagogy.org/when-returning-to-campus/>
- Waylen, K. A., Blackstock, K. L., van Hulst, F. J., Damian, C., Horváth, F., Johnson, R. K., Kanka, R., Külvik, M., Macleod, C. J. A., Meisner, K., Oprina-Pavelescu, M. M., Pino, J., Primmer, E., Rîșnoveanu, G., Šatalová, B., Silander, J., Špulerová, J., Suškevičs, M., Van Uytvanck, J. (2019). Policy-driven monitoring and evaluation: Does it support adaptive management of socio-ecological systems? *Science of the Total Environment*, 662(20), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.462>
- Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, 4(67), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67>
- Wekullo, C. S. (2017). Outsourcing in higher education: The known and unknown about the practice. *Journal of Higher Education and Policy Management*, 39(4), 453–468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1330805>
- Western University. (2013). *E-learning task force: Report to the provost*. https://provost.uwo.ca/pdf/INSIDE_E-Learning_REPORT-may2013-v4.pdf

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697011003795651>
- White, B. (2017, May 26). *Are micro-campus a new model for international HE?* University World News. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20170522232833803>
- White, W. C. (2000). *Relational leadership: A biblical model for leadership service*. Paternoster.
- Whitney, D. D., & Cooperrider, D. L. (2011). *The appreciative inquiry summit: An emerging methodology for whole system change*. David Cooperrider and Associates. <https://www.davidcooperrider.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/The-AI-Summit-Methodology-x.pdf>
- Whitney, D. D., & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2010). *The power of appreciative inquiry: A practical guide to positive change (2nd edition)*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413–434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135>
- Winston, B. E., & Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 6–66. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol1iss2/winston_patterson.doc/winston_patterson.htm
- Wright, W. C. (2000). *Relational leadership: A Biblical model for influence and service*. Paternoster Publishing.
- Youth Unlimited. (2019). *Three decades of youth work, one incredible legacy*. <https://www.youthunlimited.com/connections-2019-09>

- Zhao, Y. (2015). Paradigm shift: Educating creative and entrepreneurial students. In J. A. Bellanca (Ed.), *Deeper learning: Beyond 21st century skills* (pp. 83–108). Solution Tree Press.
- Zhu, W., May, D. R., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). The impact of ethical leadership behavior on employee outcomes: The roles of psychological empowerment and authenticity. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *11*(1), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190401100104>

Appendix A: Organizational Change Readiness Questionnaire

Readiness Dimensions	Readiness Score
<i>Previous Change Experiences</i>	
1. Has the organization had generally positive experiences with change?	Score 0 to +2
2. Has the organization had recent failure experiences with change?	Score 0 to -2
3. What is the mood of the organization: upbeat and positive?	Score 0 to +2
4. What is the mood of the organization: negative and cynical?	Score 0 to -3
5. Does the organization appear to be resting on its laurels?	Score 0 to -3
<i>Executive Support</i>	
6. Are senior managers directly involved in sponsoring the change?	Score 0 to +2
7. Is there a clear picture of the future?	Score 0 to +3
8. Is executive success dependent on the change occurring?	Score 0 to +2
9. Are some senior managers likely to demonstrate a lack of support?	Score 0 to -3
<i>Credible Leadership and Change Champions</i>	
10. Are senior leaders in the organization trusted?	Score 0 to +3
11. Are senior leaders able to credibly show others how to achieve their collective goals?	Score 0 to +1
12. Is the organization able to attract and retain capable and respected change champions?	Score 0 to +2
13. Are middle managers able to effectively link senior managers with the rest of the organization?	Score 0 to +2
14. Are senior leaders likely to view the proposed change as generally appropriate for the organization?	Score 0 to +2
15. Will the proposed change be viewed as needed by senior leaders?	Score 0 to +2
<i>Openness to Change</i>	

16. Does the organization have scanning mechanisms to monitor the internal and external environment?	Score 0 to +2
17. Is there a culture of scanning and paying attention to those scans?	Score 0 to +2
18. Does the organization have the ability to focus on root causes and recognize interdependencies both inside and outside the organization's boundaries?	Score 0 to +2
19. Does "turf" protection exist in the organization that could affect the change?	Score 0 to -3
20. Are middle and/or senior managers hidebound or locked into the use of past strategies, approaches, and solutions?	Score 0 to -4
21. Are employees able to constructively voice their concerns or support?	Score 0 to +2
22. Is conflict dealt with openly, with a focus on resolution?	Score 0 to +2
23. Is conflict suppressed and smoothed over?	Score 0 to -2
24. Does the organization have a culture that is innovative and encourages innovative activities?	Score 0 to +2
25. Does the organization have communications channels that work effectively in all directions?	Score 0 to +2
26. Will the proposed change be viewed as generally appropriate for the organization by those not in senior leadership roles?	Score 0 to +2
27. Will the proposed change be viewed as needed by those not in senior leadership roles?	Score 0 to +2
28. Do those who will be affected believe they have the energy needed to undertake the change?	Score 0 to +2
29. Do those who will be affected believe there will be access to sufficient resources to support the change?	Score 0 to +2
<i>Rewards for Change</i>	
30. Does the reward system value innovation and change?	Score 0 to +2
31. Does the reward system focus exclusively on short-term results?	Score 0 to -2
32. Are people censured for attempting change and failing?	Score 0 to -3


<i>Measures for Change and Accountability</i>	
33. Are there good measures available for assessing the need for change and tracking progress?	Score 0 to +1
34. Does the organization attend to the data it collects?	Score 0 to +1
35. Does the organization measure and evaluate customer satisfaction?	Score 0 to +1
36. Is the organization able to carefully steward resources and successfully meet predetermined deadlines?	Score 0 to +1

Note. The scores can range from -25 to +50. If the organization scores below 10, it is not likely ready for change and change will be very difficult. The higher the score, the more ready the organization is for change. To increase readiness, change agents can use the responses to the questions to help them identify areas that need strengthening and then undertake actions to strengthen the readiness for change. Change is never “simple,” but when organizational factors supportive of change are in place, the task of the change agent is manageable. The purpose of this tool is to raise awareness concerning readiness for change. Change agents can modify it to better reflect the realities of their organization and industry. Adapted from *Organizational Change: An Action-Oriented Toolkit* (pp. 113–114), by G. Deszca, T. F. Cawsey, & C. Ingols, 2020, SAGE Publications, Inc. Copyright 2020 by SAGE Publications, Inc. Adapted with permission.

Appendix B: Comparing Frameworks for Leading the Change Process

Figure B1


The Three-Stage Theory of Change



Note. From *Change Management Models: Actionable Ways to Lead Organizational Change*, by


D. Lock, 2019, Daniel Lock Consulting (<https://daniellock.com/change-management-models>).

2019 by D. Lock. Adapted with permission.

Figure B2*The Eight-Stage Process of Creating Major Change*

Note. From *Leading Change* (p. 23), by J. P. Kotter, 2012, Harvard Business Review Press.

Copyright 2012 by J. P. Kotter. Reprinted with permission.

Figure B3*Appreciative Inquiry 4-D Cycle*

Note. From *The Appreciative Inquiry Handbook: For Leaders of Change* (p. 34), by D. Cooperrider, D. D. Whitney, J. Stavros, & R. Fry, 2008, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated. Copyright 2008 by Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix C: Summary of the Eight Principles of Appreciative Inquiry

Principle	Definition
1. The Constructionist Principle.	<i>Words Create Worlds</i> Reality as we know it is a subjective rather than objective state. It is socially created through language and conversations.
2. The Simultaneity Principle.	<i>Inquiry Creates Change</i> Inquiry is intervention. The moment we ask a question, we begin to create a change.
3. The Poetic Principle.	<i>We Can Choose What We Study</i> Organizations, like open books, are endless sources of study and learning. What we choose to study makes a difference. It describes—even creates—the world as we know it.
4. The Anticipatory Principle.	<i>Images Inspire Action</i> Human systems move in the direction of their images of the future. The more positive and hopeful the images of the future are, the more positive the present-day action will be.
5. The Positive Principle.	<i>Positive Questions Lead to Positive Change</i> Momentum for large-scale change requires large amounts of positive affect and social bonding. This momentum is best generated through positive questions that amplify the positive core.
6. The Wholeness Principle.	<i>Wholeness Brings Out the Best</i> Wholeness brings out the best in people and organizations. Bringing all stakeholders together in large group forums stimulates creativity and builds collective capacity.
7. The Enactment Principle.	<i>Acting "As If" Is Self-Fulfilling</i> To really make a change, we must "be the change we want to see." Positive change occurs when the process used to create the change is a living model of the ideal future.
8. The Free-Choice Principle.	<i>Free Choice Liberates Power</i> People perform better and are more committed when they have freedom to choose how and what they contribute. Free choice stimulates organizational excellence and positive change.

Note. From *The Power of Appreciative Inquiry: A Practical Guide to Positive Change* (2nd edition) (p. 55), by D. D. Whitney and A. Trosten-Bloom, 2010, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated. Copyright 2010 by Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix D: Checklist for Quality Online Courses at Pacific Coastal University

**Asterisk denotes best practices in course design, but not mandatory.*

Course Component	Criteria
Course Overview and Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instructions are clear on how to navigate the course and how to get started. ● The course overview provides a course description, learning outcomes, and list of assessments. ● *There is a self-introduction by the instructor, welcoming students to the course and explaining key aspects of what to expect in the course. ● *Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.
Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The course learning outcomes are measurable and reflect the course description and level of the course. ● The module/unit learning outcomes are measurable and consistent with the course-level outcomes. ● The learning outcomes are stated clearly and written from the learner's perspective. ● There is a clear relationship between the course/unit learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessments.
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The assessments measure the achievement of the course learning outcomes and are consistent with course activities and resources. ● Specific and descriptive criteria (rubrics, marking schemes) are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation. ● The assessments are sequenced, varied, flexible, and appropriate to the content being assessed. ● Sufficient and varied opportunities for formative feedback are provided. ● The learner workload is appropriate and reasonable for the level and number of credits for the course.
Instructional Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The instructional materials (written/oral content, videos, graphics, readings, etc.), support learners in achieving the learning outcomes. ● Course materials and resources are up-to-date, relevant, and appropriate for the level of the course. ● The instructional materials are free of bias, culturally inclusive, and provide flexibility and choice. ● *A variety of instructional materials are used in the course.
Learning Activities and Learner Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learning activities support learners in achieving the learning outcomes and completing assessments. ● Learning activities provide scaffolding opportunities for building foundational knowledge and skills within the course. ● Learning activities foster student-instructor, student-content, and if appropriate to the course, student-student interaction. ● The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.

Course Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The technology used in the course support the learning outcomes, activities and assessments. ● Tools promote student engagement and active learning. ● Students are instructed on how to protect their data and privacy. ● All third-party materials are identified, cited and permission requested if necessary. ● *A variety of technology is used in the course.
Learner Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instructions for accessing support (instructor, IT, library, student services), are clearly stated in the course overview and when appropriate, throughout the course. ● Instructors provide support for students throughout the course (e.g. though emails, assessment feedback, welcome videos, weekly debriefing, and other updates). ● *Learners are able to participate in a peer support forum (e.g. Learning Café), for course-related questions or community-building activities.
Accessibility and Usability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The course navigation facilitates ease of use. ● The overall course is structured in a logical, consistent, sequenced, and efficient manner. ● Instructions are clear, include rationale for activities and assessments, and provide seamless connections between the various elements in the course. ● The course provides accessible text, videos and images for diverse learners.
PCU Values and Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learner interaction (student-instructor, student-student, student-content) promotes a sense of community aligned with Pacific Coastal University core values. ● Course design and instructional materials meet academic standards for Higher Education (online) learning.

Note. Adapted with permission (PCU internal document use authorization letter).


Appendix E: Comparison of the Proposed Solutions

Variable	Proposed Solutions		
	Proposed Solution 1	Proposed Solution 2	Proposed Solution 3
Summary of change	Outsource to an OPM	e-Pedagogy task force	e-Pedagogy trial project with one department
Time resources	Dependent on OPM partnership agreement (approximately 12 months)	Sept-Dec: Interviews, gathering data Jan-Feb: Data analysis Mar-Apr: Communication of findings, recommendations	July-Aug: AI Summit Sept-Dec: Professional learning communities focused on e ⁴ online educator skill development Jan-Apr: Roll out online courses, collect feedback from faculty and students May: Data analysis June: Communication of findings, recommendations
Human resources	OPM managers and staff; PCU leadership, faculty	Task force members; PCU leadership, faculty	DOLD e-pedagogy experts; PCU faculty members from selected department
Fiscal resources	OPM tuition sharing (average 50% of student tuition)	Possible stipend for internal task force members	Not applicable
Information resources	PCU mission, vision, values; PCU strategic plan	Interviews with PCU leadership, faculty; student enrolment data	Interviews with PCU faculty; survey feedback from online students
Technology resources	Upgraded infrastructure across the organization; faculty e-pedagogy development; student support	Not applicable	Faculty e-pedagogy development; student support
Strengths	Technological expertise from OPM managers and staff; faculty e-pedagogy development; recruitment and ongoing support for students	Deep dive into PCU current practices, challenges, and opportunities for e-pedagogy development resulting in clear recommendations for the future	Manageable on a smaller scale before rolling change out across the university; opportunity to assess and re-evaluate needed changes
Limitations	Success depends on external partnerships; potential for misalignment with PCU mission, vision, values, identity; loss of tuition	Finding time for task force members to meet; distrust from stakeholders if task force members are not diverse enough in perspective	Possible loss of stakeholder buy-in if pilot goes poorly
Key OIP considerations	Robust development of online learning infrastructure; e-pedagogy development might not align with e ⁴ educator framework; impacts POP guiding questions 1, 3	Alignment with OIP change framework and leadership approaches; deep dive into current practices could result in a robust plan; impacts POP guiding questions 1, 2, 3	Alignment with OIP change framework and leadership approaches; best opportunity to develop e ⁴ educators; impacts all four POP guiding questions

Appendix F: Conceptualizing Leadership Ethics Within the OIP

Figure F1


An Ethical Framework of Relational Leadership for Sustainability



Note. Adapted from “Relational Leadership for Sustainability: Building an Ethical Framework from the Moral Theory of ‘Ethics of Care,’” by J. Nicholson and E. Kurucz, 2017, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(1), p. 36. Copyright Springer Nature. Adapted with permission.

Figure F2

An Ethical Framework Combined with OIP Frameworks and Approaches



Note. The figure is labelled to illustrate connections to OIP frameworks and approaches. 1A = social constructivism; 1B = humanism; 2A = servant leadership; 2B = relational leadership; 2C = distributed leadership; 3A = e⁴ educator (identity); 3B = e⁴ educator (knowledge); 3C = e⁴ educator (action); 4 = AI 4-D cycle. Adapted from “Relational Leadership for Sustainability: Building an Ethical Framework from the Moral Theory of ‘Ethics of Care,’” by J. Nicholson and E. Kurucz, 2017, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(1), p. 36. Copyright Springer Nature. Adapted with permission.

Appendix G: Example of an Appreciative Inquiry Interview Guide

Instructions:

In pairs, take time to interview one another using the following questions. Be a generous listener. Do not dialogue; rather, take turns to actually conduct an interview. If you need more information or clarification, ask additional follow-up questions. Use this sheet to record notes during your interview. When your interview is complete, you will present the results to the larger group.

Before you conduct the interview, take a minute to read the questions. Decide how you would personally answer the question and make a mental note of your response. Now proceed with the interview, paying full attention to the interviewee rather than to your own story.

Question 1: Best Experience

Tell me about the best times you have had with online teaching and learning at PCU. Looking at your entire experience, recall a time when you felt most alive, most involved, or most excited about your involvement. What made it an exciting experience? Who was involved? Describe the event in detail.

Question 2: Values

Yourself

Without being humble, what do you value most about yourself? (e.g., as a human, as a friend, as a teacher)

Your Work

When you feel best about work at your organization, what do you value about it?

Your Organization <i>What is it about PCU that you value? What is the single most important thing PCU has contributed to your life?</i>

Question 3: Core Values <i>In your opinion, what are PCU's core values? What is it that, if it did not exist, would make PCU completely different than it is today?</i>

Question 4: Vision for the Future <i>If you could change three things about online teaching and learning at PCU, what would they be?</i>

Note. Adapted from *Appreciative Inquiry Interview Guides*, by R. J. Voyle & K. M. Voyle, Voyle and Voyle Consulting (<http://www.appreciativeway.com/appreciative-inquiry-resources/AI-generic-ques-org.pdf>). 2022 by R. J. Voyle & K. M. Voyle. Adapted with permission.

Appendix H: Example of an e-Pedagogy Faculty Professional Development Program

1. Foundations of Online Pedagogy

- 1.1. Education as a humanistic and professional value
- 1.2. Goals and functions of education
- 1.3. Education as a social and pedagogic process
- 1.4. Pedagogy as a science
- 1.5. Educational systems
- 1.6. Educational psychology
- 1.7. Major educational theories
 - Behaviorist learning theory
 - Cognitivist learning theory
 - Constructivist learning theory
 - Collaborative learning theory
- 1.8. Specifics of online pedagogy and its place in general pedagogy
- 1.9. Links between pedagogy and other sciences
- 1.10. Current trends and future developments in education

2. Online higher education

- 2.1. Goals
- 2.2. Types
- 2.3. Structures
- 2.4. Formats

3. Human development as a pedagogic problem

- 3.1. Formation of an individual as a person, society member and a specialist as a pedagogic problem
- 3.2. Learning as a developmental process: cognitive, emotional, social, moral and professional development
- 3.3. Students' characteristics, abilities and learning styles (adult vs. traditional student; students in online vs. brick-and-mortar environments)
- 3.4. Student dispositions
- 3.5. Motivation
- 3.6. Socialization in education
- 3.7. Self-development in the process of learning. Learner autonomy and self-efficacy

4. Principles of teaching and learning

- 4.1. Contemporary pedagogic approaches
- 4.2. Content of education
- 4.3. Knowledge construction
- 4.4. Collaboration and cooperation in teaching and learning
- 4.5. Educational and professional standards and expectations
- 4.6. Application of new knowledge and skills in real life and job situations

5. Methods and tools

- 5.1. Instructional approaches
- 5.2. Methods of education
- 5.3. Content presentation

- 5.4. Inquiry and problem solving
- 5.5. Interaction and socialization in learning
- 5.6. Teaching and learning tools

6. Educational technologies

- 6.1. Technical and educational characteristics
- 6.2. Online learning technologies. Learning Management Systems (LMS)
- 6.3. Social networking tools
- 6.4. Mobile learning tools
- 6.5. Technology-based teaching and learning

7. Methodology of teaching and learning

- 7.1. Instructor and student in the educational process
- 7.2. The logics and structure of the process
- 7.3. Types of learning
- 7.4. Learning strategies and techniques
- 7.5. Communicative and networking tactics
- 7.6. Quality control in education: feedback, reflection, assessment and evaluation

8. Online instructor

- 8.1. Professional qualifications
- 8.2. Professional culture and dispositions
- 8.3. Preparation and continuous professional development
- 8.4. Pedagogic activities in an online environment
- 8.5. Instructor's roles and functions
- 8.6. Teaching style and interactions with students

9. Designing online education

- 9.1. Course design
- 9.2. Course structure
- 9.3. Instructor activities
- 9.4. Student activities
- 9.5. Course materials: modalities and formats
- 9.6. Course tools and navigation
- 9.7. Student assessment and support

10. Planning and time management in teaching and learning

- 10.1. Course and lesson planning
- 10.2. Time management

Note. Reprinted from “Does Online Education Need a Special Pedagogy?” by P. Serdyukov,

2015, *Journal of Computing and Information Technology*, 23(1) pp. 70–71. [Attribution-](#)

[NoDerivatives 4.0 International \(CC BY-ND 4.0\)](#)

Appendix I: Professional Learning Community Progress Chart

	Starting Out <i>Acquiring information and beginning to use ideas</i>	Developing <i>Experimenting with strategies and building on initial commitment</i>	Deepening <i>Well on the way, having achieved a degree of mastery and feeling the benefits</i>	Sustaining <i>Introducing new developments, and re-evaluating quality</i>
When, approximately, did this happen?				
What were the most valuable processes in helping you to reach this phase?				
Which things didn't work, and why?				

Note. Adapted from *Monitoring and Evaluation: Reflecting on the Progress of Your Professional Learning Community* (p. 3), by L. Stoll, R. Bolam, A. McMahon, S. Thomas, M. Wallace, A. Greenwood, & K. Hawkey, 2006, National College for School Leadership. Copyright 2006 by L. Stoll, R. Bolam, A. McMahon, S. Thomas, M. Wallace, A. Greenwood, & K. Hawkey.

[Attribution 2.0 Generic \(CC BY 2.0\)](#)

Appendix J: Online Student Connectedness Survey

Rate each of the following items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Comfort

1. I feel comfortable in the online learning environment provided by my program.
2. I feel my instructors have created a safe online environment in which I can freely express myself.
3. I feel comfortable asking other students in online courses for help.
4. I feel comfortable expressing my opinions and feelings in online courses.
5. I feel comfortable introducing myself in online courses.
6. If I need to, I will ask for help from my classmates.
7. I have no difficulties with expressing my thoughts in my online courses.
8. I can effectively communicate in online courses.

Community

1. I have gotten to know some of the faculty members and classmates well.
2. I feel emotionally attached to other students in my online courses.
3. I can easily make acquaintances in my online courses.
4. I spend a lot of time with my online course peers.
5. My peers have gotten to know me quite well in my online courses.
6. I feel that students in my online courses depend on me.

Facilitation

1. Instructors promote collaboration between students in my online courses.
2. Instructors integrate collaboration tools (e.g., chat rooms, wikis, and group areas) into online course activities.
3. My online instructors are responsive to my questions.
4. I receive frequent feedback from my online instructors.
5. My instructors participate in online discussions.
6. In my online courses, instructors promote interaction between learners.

Interaction and Collaboration

1. I work with others in my online courses.
2. I relate my work to others' work in my online courses.
3. I share information with other students in my online courses.
4. I discuss my ideas with other students in my online courses.
5. I collaborate with other students in my online courses.

Note. Adapted from “Development and Validation of the Online Student Connectedness Survey (OSCS)” by D. U. Bolliger & F. A. Inan, 2012, *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 13(3), pp. 41–65. [Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)