

College Student Personnel Program

**CSP 611: ORGANIZATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION**

**Organizational Change**

Tuesday, 1:45 PM- 4:20 PM, Coulter Building, Room 202

**Spring 2011**

Syllabus

**Instructor:** Dr. Cheryl Joy Daly  
**Office Location:** Killian Building, Room 250  
**Telephone:** (828) 227-2115  
**E-mail:** [cdaly@wcu.edu](mailto:cdaly@wcu.edu)

**Office Hours:**

Tuesday 10:30 PM - 12:00 PM & Thursday, 11:30 AM – 12:30 Noon UNCA

Feel free to make an appointment, to meet in person or by phone.

**Required Textbooks**

Bess, J., and Dee, J., (2007). Understanding College and University Organization: Theories for Effective Policy and Practice. Sterling, VA: Stylus. Volume 2

Other Required Readings and case studies as assigned by instructor

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

- 1) To understand the importance of organizational theory/analysis for the key aspects of administration --leadership, change, and decision-making;
- 2) To be able to apply organizational theory to institutional problems and situations;
- 3) To think as an organizational change agent rather than as a student affairs department/project manager, registrar, or financial officer—That is, to think at a variety of levels simultaneously, which intersect across different administrative offices, and from university-wide perspectives. This develops a internal and external systems approach and allows for engagement in big picture thinking.

**Course Organization**

The course is organized around five organizational concepts:

1. **Conflict in Organizations** — Typical modes of addressing conflict include competition, avoidance, compromise, collaboration, and accommodation.
2. **Power and Politics** — Organizations like colleges and universities can be conceived not only as bureaucratic organizations, but at least in part as polities
3. **Organizational Decision Making**— A typical sequence in the process of decision-making involves decision recognition, diagnosis, development of solutions, selection, screening, evaluation and choice, and authorization.

4. **Organizational Strategy**, a subject of considerable interest in the organizational theory literature as well as in higher education. Strategy is largely concerned with the alignment of the internal resources and goals of organizations so that they are congruent with the nature of the environment in which the organization is immersed.
5. **Organizational Effectiveness**—This process is central to demonstrating institutional accountability, but the complexities of conceptualization and measurement make effectiveness a controversial topic in higher education circles.

Each concept will be explored through the case study method, with cases drawn from the previously written cases in higher education.

#### **College of Education and Allied Professions Conceptual Framework:**

The fundamental role of Western Carolina University is to develop a community of scholarship in which students, faculty, administrators, and staff learn and apply the products of learning. The College of Education and Allied Professions (CEAP) at Western Carolina University fulfills its mission by creating and nourishing a community of learners guided by knowledge, values, and experiences. The guiding principles of this community include the belief that the best educational decisions are made after adequate reflection and with careful consideration of the interests, experiences, and welfare of the persons affected by the decisions, appreciation of and respect for diversity, and the fostering of the responsible use of technology.

The College Student Personnel program at Western Carolina University is based on many of the guiding principles that dovetail with the C.E.A.P.'s overarching Conceptual Framework. The program is based on the premise that highly effective student affairs educators and leaders must be committed to the growth and development of all students and must possess the skills to create environments in either two-year or four-year institutional settings where such growth and development can occur.

#### **RELATIONSHIP OF COURSE TO GOALS OF THE MASTER'S PROGRAM**

The M.Ed. in College Student Personnel (CSP) is designed to meet the guidelines established by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) programs. CPS focuses on preparing leaders and professionals to work in student service organizations that promote and facilitate intellectual, social, and personal development of college students. Student Service professionals work with colleagues, faculty, administrators, staff, community organizations to provide college students with an array of services that enhance their educational experience. Learning to understand and use multiple organizational perspectives to analyzing organizations allows the student affairs professional to view the organization from a broader context that includes both internal and external systems, rather than simply as divisions, departments or functions.

#### **Course Objectives**

- 4) To understand the importance of organizational change/analysis for the key aspects of administration --leadership, and decision-making;
- 5) To be able to apply organizational change theory to institutional problems and situations;

- 6) To think as an organizational change leader rather than as a student affairs program coordinator, registrar, or financial officer—That is, to think at a variety of levels simultaneously, which intersect across different administrative offices, and from university-wide perspectives. This develops a internal and external systems approach and allows for engagement in big picture thinking.

## **II. EXPECTATIONS**

### **Accommodations**

*Students with disabilities will be fully included in this course.*

Western Carolina University is committed to providing equal educational opportunities for students with documented disabilities. Students who require disability services or reasonable accommodations must identify themselves as having a disability and provide current diagnostic documentation to Disability Services. All information is confidential. Please contact Disability Services for more information at (828) 227-2716 or 144 Killian Annex.

### **Diversity Statement:**

The professional education unit at Western Carolina University defines diversity broadly to include *exceptionalities, race, ethnicity, culture, religious background, gender, linguistic differences, socioeconomic level, and any of the other ways our society defines human and group differences, including age, geography, sexual orientation and national origin.*

### **Academic Honesty Policy**

Western Carolina University, as a community of scholarship, is also a community of honor. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students work together to achieve the highest standards of honesty and integrity. Academic dishonesty is a serious offense at Western Carolina University because it threatens the quality of scholarship and defrauds those who depend on knowledge and integrity.

Academic dishonesty includes:

- 1) Cheating—Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.
- 2) Fabrication—Intentional falsification of information or citation in an academic exercise.
- 3) Plagiarism—Intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of someone else as one's own in an academic exercise.
- 4) Facilitation of Academic Dishonesty—Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help someone else to commit an act of academic dishonesty, such as knowingly allowing another to copy information during an examination or other academic exercise.

The procedures for cases involving allegations of academic dishonesty are:

1. Instructors have the right to determine the appropriate sanction or sanctions for academic dishonesty within their courses up to and including a final grade of "F" in the course. Within 5 calendar days of the event the instructor will inform his/her department head, and the Associate Dean of the Graduate School when the student is a graduate student, in writing of the academic dishonesty charge and sanction.

2. The department head or graduate program director will meet with the student to inform him/her orally and in writing of the charge and the sanction imposed by the instructor within 10 calendar days of written notice from the instructor. Prior to this meeting, the department head will contact the Office of Student Judicial Affairs to establish if the student has any record of a prior academic dishonesty offense. If there is a record of a prior academic dishonesty offense, the matter must be referred directly to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs

### **Attendance**

This course relies on class participation and it is very important that you come to class. You are allowed two excused absences. More than two excused absences will lead to a lowering your total grade for every class missed by 3 points. Attendance means physical presence at the start of the class and continuing throughout the duration of the class time. Students are responsible for sending an e-mail message prior to missing the class. *You will be notified within 24 hours, via blackboard email, if I elect to use another classroom for presentations or project workspace.*

### **Beepers and Cellular Phones**

Beepers and cellular phones must be completely turned off for the duration of the class. In the event that you must be contacted for an emergency situation please inform the instructor at the beginning of class. In this incident, set your cell phone in vibrate mode.

### **Grades Assessment**

All participants are expected to engage actively in course activities and assignments, including some discussion of content and logistics that will take place on email in between class meetings. Final course grades will be based on five assignments. Students are also expected to complete other (non-graded) assignments in order to participate in class activities and to be able to complete the graded course projects successfully.

The grade of I (incomplete) is given when the course requirements have not been met by the end of the semester for excusable reasons. The maximum limit for completing an incomplete grade is one semester year. **The maximum makeup grade for an incomplete is B.** A student may withdraw from the course for any reason at any time prior to the completion of the course and shall receive the grade of W.

### **Assignment & Activities:**

1. Contributions to Class Discussion	20%
2. Mid-term Examination	20%
3. Group Project: Change Project	25 %
4. Group Assessment	5 %
5. Final: Case Analysis	30 %

### **Class Participation (20%)**

To help you organize your participation and preparation, and to allow you to help set the agenda for class discussion, you are required to read the case study and the beginning of each assigned chapter in the Bess and Dee text. The instructor will randomly select a student from

the class to present the case by answering the question below. [Please note, there is the possibility that you may present once and at the next name drawing be selected again on the same day].

1. From the perspective of this chapter, what are the salient issues in the case?
2. Which concepts from the chapter are particularly relevant to this case?
3. Which theories can best be used in understanding the issues?
4. What are the goals and objectives of the institution from the perspectives of the key protagonists in the case? Consider both short-run and long-term goals, both manifest and latent.
5. Given the history and culture of the institution, what strategies and tactics might the main protagonist engage in to achieve his or her objectives?
6. What reactions inside the organization (individuals, formal and informal groups) do you anticipate in response to the use of the strategies and tactics you recommended in answer to question five (5)?
7. Do you expect that the strategies and tactics will be successful? If yes, can the success be explained by the predictive value of the theories that were (or might have been) used? If not successful, it is because of the failure of the theory? In what ways?
8. Would you attribute the success or failure of the protagonist to the use or lack of use of either the social constructionist or postmodern paradigms? Explain why or why not.

### **Change Agent Project (30%): Due April 19th**

The team project should be a study of a real change agent. I will provide a list of administrators to select from.

The change effort can be successful or unsuccessful. Your paper should cover both their challenges as individuals, attempting to visualize some form of new direction for the organization, as well as their efforts at effecting that change. What I hope you will gain from this experience is three-fold. First, I want you to have a chance to assess how someone has gone through an individual and organizational transition so that you may uncover useful lessons for your own lives moving forward. Second, in seeing how someone has gone through this experience, and in particular what motivated them to move forward and the resistance they encountered in doing so, you may have greater insights into stimulating change in your organization by encouraging people in positions of power to act. Third, a key objective of this assignment is to give you an opportunity to apply the concepts you have been reading about and discussing in class.

In organizing the project write-up, think of the project as a formal analysis with an:

- (a) Introduction/executive summary, (b) Background, (c) Analysis and discussion, (d) Recommendations or alternative suggestions, and (e) Conclusions and lessons learned. Exhibits should support your analysis. External sources should be referenced with endnotes.

The project should be no longer than 10 double-spaced pages (not including exhibits and references) in 12 point times roman font. The paper is due at the beginning of the final **session 13**. You will also fill out the attached Team Evaluation Form individually and submit it separately.

**Individual Analysis of Team Effectiveness (5%):** You will submit an individual analysis of how your team functioned in the project. It should include analysis, not only of what went right and what went wrong, but also a discussion of what you would need to do to improve team effectiveness. This is not just an opportunity to rate your dissatisfaction with your team members. You should draw on course concepts in group conflict and change in this analysis. The analyses should be double spaced, 12 point, times roman font. It may be in outline or bullet form if you prefer.

**Midterm Examination: Take Home Examination (30%)**

**Due: Feb 22**

**Prepare a 7-8 page case analysis using the three questions below to guide your analysis; and use the appropriate theories in Chapter 9: Organizational Change in Higher Education to support your arguments.**

**Paper Outline:**

- 1. Purpose of the paper (What will you address in the paper).**
  - A. Force Field Analysis**
  - B. Planned Change Model**
  - C. Emergent Change Framework**
  - D. Contingency Framework for change**
- 2. Conclusion**

**Three Guiding questions**

- 1. Conduct a **force field analysis** of the curriculum change grant. What were the forces for and forces against change? Display the relative strength of these forces. Did academic administrators take any actions to either increase the strength of the forces for change or reduce the strength of the forces against change?**
- 2. In what ways did the administration's grant proposal development process reflect aspects of the **planned change model**? How did the provost's response to faculty resistance employ the **emergent change model**?**
- 3. Consider the structure, leadership, culture, resources, and external environment regarding the curriculum change grant. Given these **contingencies**, does a planned change model or an emergent model seem more likely to yield successful outcomes?**

## **CASE CONTEXT**

### **Curriculum Change at Greenbough Tech**

Greenbough Technical University, a historically Black public institution, has strong programs in the natural sciences and engineering fields, as well as a good reputation for having faculty who care deeply about teaching. Administrators in the Provost's Office at Greenbough Tech received a request for proposals from the federal government for a grant to improve college teaching in science and engineering. A group of administrators met to develop a proposal. Given the deadline, however, there was little time to get faculty involved in writing the proposal.

Four months later, the administrators were pleased to announce that Greenbough Tech's proposal had been funded through the national competition. The funds and prestige associated with the grant would give faculty in science and engineering programs significant capacity to change their practices.

However, at department meetings across the university, faculty members raised concerns. Faculty members in the chemistry department, for example, were skeptical that the funds would be sufficient to provide enough course release time for faculty to participate in curriculum development. "This stuff takes time," noted the chemistry department chair. "We simply cannot add another task for faculty who already have big teaching loads and major research responsibilities. They have budgeted only one semester of course releases for participating faculty. That's not enough. We would really need to reassign faculty members for at least an entire year in order to do this effectively."

The biology faculty, moreover, were doubtful regarding whether curriculum development would actually count as legitimate faculty work in tenure and promotion reviews. "I sure as hell don't want my junior faculty working on this," the biology chair declared. "And I am not crazy about the senior faculty working on this either. All of us need to be in our labs, doing research. We all care about teaching, but damn it, we have junior faculty who need to get tenure. And all of our faculty need to publish."

Initially, administrators were angered by the faculty responses and viewed their comments as a sign of resistance to change. "Here we are coming in with bags of money, and they still don't want to do anything different," complained the provost. But after a few days, the provost met with the department chairs to discuss their ideas for curriculum change. And she started the meeting in an interesting way.

"OK, let's forget about this grant for a minute," she explained. "And just tell me what your faculty are already doing in their classrooms." The department chairs welcomed this discussion and spent the next hour sharing with the provost all that their faculty members were doing to update syllabi, experiment with new pedagogical practices, and engage both graduate and undergraduate students in their research projects.

"All of this is quite exciting," noted the provost. "Actually, the parameters of the grant give us quite a bit of flexibility regarding the activities themselves. So let's revise the activities. Let's use the course release funds for updating syllabi. Let's shift the focus of our summer workshops to concentrate instead on new pedagogical practices, especially the innovative stuff that you are doing to promote collaborative learning in large lecture classes. And let's use those travel funds

to promote undergraduate research with faculty.” “I like this idea,” replied the chemistry chair, “because it keeps the same goals, outcomes, and indicators as the original grant proposal, but the activities will actually be designed to provide more support for the things that we are doing already.”

“But what about the issue regarding tenure and promotion criteria?” asked the biology chair.

“Well, we already have a policy on the books that allows a faculty member to specialize in applied research. We can add curriculum development to the list of examples of applied scholarship,” explained the provost, who continued to note that this policy change would be consistent with Ernest Boyer’s (1990) conceptualization of faculty research, which includes the scholarship of discovery (empirical research), the scholarship of integration (interdisciplinary synthesis), the scholarship of service (applied research to serve the public), and the scholarship of teaching and learning (inquiry into pedagogy, curriculum, and learning modes).

“Let’s make that change in policy,” replied the provost. “The College of Education is already using curriculum development as a criterion for promotion and tenure, and I think that a few liberal arts departments do, too. At any rate, this policy change has my strong support.”

“All right, as soon as the policy changes, I will encourage my faculty to participate,” the biology chair responded.

“I see. Trust, but verify,” joked the provost.

“Well, no, I trust that you will follow through. But I would just have more confidence going to my faculty after the change is already on the books,” explained the biology chair.

“No, I completely understand,” the provost noted. “And the good news is that this grant is about to produce its first policy change, which could actually have some long-term implications for teaching and learning on this campus.”

- 1 Conduct a force field analysis of the curriculum change grant. What were the forces for and forces against change? Display the relative strength of these forces. Did academic administrators take any actions to either increase the strength of the forces for change or reduce the strength of the forces against change?
- 2 In what ways did the administration’s grant proposal development process reflect aspects of the planned change model? How did the provost’s response to faculty resistance employ the emergent change model?
- 3 Consider the structure, leadership, culture, resources, and external environment regarding the curriculum change grant. Given these contingencies, does a planned change model or an emergent model seem more likely to yield successful outcomes?



#### 4. **FINAL: CASE STUDY ANALYSIS**

For this final assignment, you will need to use all of the course materials we have studied to explain, interpret, and analyze a particular case study in higher education. You will need to link all of your observations to the larger conceptual and theoretical ideas discussed in course readings and draw on evidence from the case study to substantiate your key points. Please limit your analysis to no more than **ten pages**. The case study will be distributed in class on **April 22th** and will be due on **May 3**. Please submit a hard copy (with the case study attached) to me in class as well as an electronic submission to Blackboard drop

#### **Case Study Preparation:**

When preparing the case studies, do not read them as simply a story. Consider three sets of concerns as you analyze the case.

1. **Issues:** Identify the essential issues described in the case. Issues represent current or emerging problems faced by individuals and groups in the organization. Keep in mind there are many issues in any given case, but not all of them are equally important. Focusing on no more than two or three issues will probably serve you well.
2. **Analysis:** What are the causes/factors producing the situation described in the case? What seems to be causing the key problems? Do the problems share a cause, or are they related in some other way? The linkages you make among causes/factors in the case are important. You may want to list, draw, or somehow represent the factors you see as important. You might find a visual representation helpful in capturing the core dynamics. The goal is to discern how and why the situation arose in the first place.
3. **Action:** What course of action would you adopt if you were involved in this situation? Your solution should address the underlying causes of the issues. How would you implement your suggested actions? What potential failure points do you need to anticipate? What is the downside of your solution? How would you monitor progress towards full implementation? You want to be as concrete and realistic as possible.

Schedule Reading due dates for the Bess and Dee book.

Week 1. Jan 11:	Snow day- Class is cancel
Week 2. Jan 18:	Overview of Course Content
Week 3. Jan 25:	Chapter 2: Conflict in Organizations
Week 4. Feb 1:	Chapter 3: Power and Politics in Higher Education
Week 5. Feb 8:	Chapter 4: Organizational Decision
Week 6. Feb 15:	Chapter 9: Organizational Change in Higher Education
	<b>Week 7. Feb 22: Advisement Day –No Class Mid-term Examination Due—Make up Day for Jan 11</b>
Week 8. March 1:	Spring Break
Week 9. March 8:	NASPA Placement Exchange in Philadelphia, PA Event & Reflection Paper
Week 10. March 15	Change Agent (please <b>make your appointment well in advance</b> )
Week 11. March 22:	Chapter 5: Organizational Decision Making-individual —
Week 12. March 29:	Chapter 7: Organizational Strategy – Reading TBA
Week 13. April 5:	Chapter 8: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency- Readings TBA
Week 14. April 12:	Chapter 10: Chapter Leadership – Readings TBA
Week 15. April 19:	Presentations-Change Agent Project Change Agent Project Paper Due
Week 16. April 26	Presentations-Change Agent Project
Final Exam Week:	Final Due—May 3