THE ROAD TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION: INCORPORATING INNOVATIVE IDEAS

INTO THE FABRIC OF AN INSTITUTION

by

JUANITA WILLIS HICKS

(Under the Direction of Charles B. Knapp)

ABSTRACT

Institutionalization is the effort of incorporating a new concept, structure, or value into an existing organization or system. This dissertation looks at the institutionalization concept within a higher education institution during an active implementation at the University of West Georgia (UWG). UWG's transformational effort that seeks to change and improve the culture, leadership, and performance structure of an institution. The perceptions of senior leaders, campus stakeholders, and external consultants are analyzed in concert with the written, audio, and visual materials that have been collected over the course of the transformation process. The structural theory of Curry (1982) and behavioral lens of Goodman and Dean (1982) provide the theoretical framework to determine the level of institutionalization achieved far and next steps to attain and sustain change. The findings of the study recognize that the attainment and sustainability of institution are dependent upon maintaining mission focus, remaining adaptive as the needs of the institution changes, disciplined leadership, and consistently applying intentional enculturation efforts towards establishing values and behaviors. This study provides a unique view into a

transformational change effort in which other leaders seeking to embark on large-scale culture can utilize learning to plan their approach and set attainable goals.

INDEX WORDS: Institutionalization; Transformational leadership; Change initiatives;

                       Perceptions of change; Higher education

THE ROAD TO INSTITUTIONALIZTION: INCORPORATING INNOVATIVE IDEAS INTO

THE FABRIC OF AN INSTITUTION

by

JUANITA WILLIS HICKS

BBA, University of West Georgia, 2003

M.Ed., Clemson University, 2013

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2018

THE ROAD TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION: INCORPORATING INNOVATIVE IDEAS

INTO THE FABRIC OF AN INSTITUTION

by

JUANITA WILLIS HICKS

Major Professor: Charles B. Knapp
Committee: James C. Hearn
                     Erik C. Ness

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2018

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my tribe, Craig, Will, and Bella Hicks. For all the days and nights, you all patiently watched me go through the process and supported me, I thank you and dedicate this accomplishment to you. I now give myself back to you and look forward to next chapters of our lives. Mommy is officially a Georgia Bulldog, Go DAWGS!!!

that you did. To my Mommy Crew, I look forward to the birthday parties to come and continuing our journeys through this beautiful world. The University of West Georgia Office of Human Resources will be forever in my heart as they held down the fort through every cohort session, two trips around the world, and at times when I needed to release a little pressure with a good laugh.

As I close, I acknowledge and give thanks to each and every member of the Best Cohort Ever. To Cohort 4, we started this journey together and have created friendships that will transcend time. I appreciate each and every moment, text message, and meal shared around the world, especially those at the JW Marriott and their wonderful staff. No cohort member left behind. Peace and blessings to all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Change in American higher education institutions is inevitable, and campus leaders and campus stakeholders must be prepared to manage the change efforts required to meet the societal needs of higher education. Higher education is continually challenged by society, the political environment, and public opinion to provide relevant and useful knowledge. This expectation co-exists with the historic mission of colleges and universities to meet the needs of an ever-changing society by educating students. As the world becomes more dynamic and diverse, the education environment must also broaden and change. Administrators today are expected to maintain the core mission, but also encourage faculty and staff to do the same in a way that drives innovation in an effective and efficient manner. In many institutions meeting this core mission requires periodic change.

Institutional leadership must be aware of the prevailing campus culture and campus readiness when instituting holistic change in a higher education institution. The literature on change strategies indicates that the lack of a distinctive approach for the institution often leads to introducing values inconsistent with the academy and failure to engage the right people to bring about change (Kezar, 2001, p. 7-8). Leaders of an institution must continually assess their purpose, practices, and goals. "Visionaries are key to changing the organization, but they are not only presidents, chancellors, or deans. Faculty and staff are also visionaries and leaders of the process of change" (Curry, 1992, p. 32). Leaders can choose among a vast variety of methods and strategies to institute change. These change processes are often costly, cumbersome, and

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Change in American higher education institutions is inevitable, and campus leaders and campus stakeholders must be prepared to manage the change efforts required to meet the societal needs of higher education. Higher education is continually challenged by society, the political environment, and public opinion to provide relevant and useful knowledge. This expectation co-exists with the historic mission of colleges and universities to meet the needs of an ever-changing society by educating students. As the world becomes more dynamic and diverse, the education environment must also broaden and change. Administrators today are expected to maintain the core mission, but also encourage faculty and staff to do the same in a way that drives innovation in an effective and efficient manner. In many institutions meeting this core mission requires periodic change.

Institutional leadership must be aware of the prevailing campus culture and campus readiness when instituting holistic change in a higher education institution. The literature on change strategies indicates that the lack of a distinctive approach for the institution often leads to introducing values inconsistent with the academy and failure to engage the right people to bring about change (Kezar, 2001, p. 7-8). Leaders of an institution must continually assess their purpose, practices, and goals. "Visionaries are key to changing the organization, but they are not only presidents, chancellors, or deans. Faculty and staff are also visionaries and leaders of the process of change" (Curry, 1992, p. 32). Leaders can choose among a vast variety of methods and strategies to institute change. These change processes are often costly, cumbersome, and

take a significant toll on the campus culture. After great investment, change initiatives can still fail. Formative assessment of change plays a key role in informing leaders during the implementation of change as to what works and what does not in order to establish successful change.

Purpose of the Study

This dissertation will be a qualitative case study of a transformational change initiative at the University of West Georgia, a large, public, comprehensive university situated within a multi-campus system in the southeastern United States. The study will look at a current change initiative to seek an understanding of perceptions held by campus constituents of the implementation at onset of the initiative, at present, and how sustainable change might be achieved. The change initiative that is the focus of this study is in its fourth year and was implemented shortly after the current president was appointed. The goal of the initiative is to shift the culture and approach of the institution to a position of continuous improvement and an environment where everyone values achievement and is committed to their role of contributing to the success of the institution. The evidence-based leadership model followed by the institution has been adopted from a successful strategy used within healthcare organizations and K-12 systems created by a leading culture and performance consulting firm (Studer Education, n.d.). Led by the president and guided by an external consulting firm along with internal change agents, transformation activities include a series of leadership development efforts, campus–wide goal setting, workforce engagement building, and accountability exercises to realize cultural change. The effort seeks to create a committed environment that is in continual reflection of the transformation efforts so that the institution remains a sustainable and relevant contributor to society and the students that it serves.

Using a four-year approach to change, the transformation process at the institution under study defines four stages as the learning year, the living year, the leading year, and the legacy year. Each year builds upon the previous year as goals are developed and skills are attained with the ultimate objective to create a "built," or structured, environment, striving for achievement and continuous improvement. Initiatives such as this requires the voice and participation of all campus constituents (Kezar, 2001) and the multi-campus system stakeholders, with the goal that each person sees their connection and ability to contribute to the institution.

Case Study Selection

The University of West Georgia (UWG) is a comprehensive university situated in a large multi-campus system within the southeastern United States. UWG is in the fourth year of a transformational culture movement called EngageWest. The EngageWest initiative was initiated by President Kyle Marrero, a first-time president, in 2013 during his first full year of presidency. President Marrero sought to build upon the strengths of the university and awaken opportunities that had not been attempted in history of the institution. Following a previous administration that consisted of a 19-year presidency, President Marrero wanted to create a structured approach to developing goals and raising campus engagement. Modeled after an existing framework from Studer Education that was originally implemented in the healthcare industry to improve performance and patient satisfaction, the EngageWest effort has a strong basis set upon employee engagement as well as performance results. The annual employee engagement survey provides critical insight to employee satisfaction, perceptions, and expectations. This data, in addition to the guidance provided by institutional senior leaders, external consultants, and the environmental needs of the campus has provided the roadmap for the EngageWest effort.

Overall the EngageWest initiative seeks to create a campus community culture that embraces individuality, leadership development, and accountability. The published vision statement for EngageWest is provided in Appendix A. This broad initiative also seeks to embrace a unified vision to make the University of West Georgia a destination institution for faculty, staff, and students. To create an environment that can be considered a destination, the EngageWest effort sets out to shift the performance standards of the institution from meeting standard expectations to one that focuses on setting growth goals and exceeding those expectations.

Several initiatives and innovative practices comprise the effort of EngageWest to include, but are not limited to, leadership development, continuous improvement of performance, and campus engagement activities. The establishment and implementation of EngageWest is set to take place within a four-year timeline. This study will focus on assessing the perceptions associated with implementation of EngageWest from the perspectives of campus stakeholders: senior administrators, external participants, faculty and staff, in addition to seeking ideas to sustain the changes made.

Significance of the Study

At the current point in time, there is limited study of institutionalization during the active implementation stage. Thus, this study provides an important contribution to the literature. Leaders within the higher education community may benefit from the reflections and expectations of UWG stakeholders as the study will allow them an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the institutionalization framework and potentially guide their large- and small-scale culture and transformation initiatives.

The researcher expects to present case study findings representative of campus stakeholders to understand their perceptions of the EW initiative implementation. Findings are expected to demonstrate that varying cultures are in existence within the campus community leading to different expectations and strategies for change attainment. The findings generated through the data collection will provide feedback to policy makers that could serve as formative concepts to inform the remaining steps of the process and the continuous improvement environment being built.

The intention of the study to provide timely and relative feedback to UWG leaders and stakeholders also has opportunity to contribute strategic leadership guidance to the higher education community. The opportunity to view the perceptions of campus stakeholders during implementation will add a unique voice to the literature, providing an opportunity to understand perceptions and impact during the course of activity. A generalized approach will be taken with the findings in the data analysis. This will allow for the findings to inform future change initiative strategies and studies that will look toward institutionalizing a change effort.

Theoretical Framework

The goal of EngageWest is to build an institutional environment where participants are continually engaged and consistently seeking to improve; therefore, the change theory must have applicability with short- and long-term strategies. In looking to define the theoretical framework, approaches for consideration required multi-faceted components that looked at change in a behavioral and a structural manner. The selected theories for the study combine these components, behavior and structure, to allow both constructs to be accounted for. This selection will be important in the finding as there will be behavioral and structural aspects to address.

Curry's (1992) theory of institutionalization provides the structural theoretical underpinning to determine the current state of change at the institution of study. The objective is to identify the strategies necessary to establish long-standing success of the change initiative from the perspective of campus stakeholders. Curry's theory identifies three levels of institutionalization: (a) structural; (b) procedural; and (c) incorporation (Curry, 1992, p. 15). Curry's levels begin with concrete and tactical efforts in the structural phases, and then move to policy and behaviors in the procedural phase. Incorporation is the level in which the new values and norms are established and accepted by the institution.

Goodman and Dean (1982) also describe institutionalization as being distinct in time and evolving through the following five behavioral phases:

- knowledge of behavior;

- performance of the behavior;

- preferences for the behavior;

- normative consensus; and

- values (Goodman & Dean, Jr., 1982).

Goodman and Dean's static and evolution theory will inform the findings associated with the behavioral perceptions of implementation. The recognition of differences and similarities of perceptions within the institution as the initiative continues are key factors in achieving institutionalization.

The theories of institutionalization selected for the study both emphasize the values of the institution undergoing change in order for institutionalization to be attained. The EngageWest initiative does not focus on a particular point of achievement, but rather focuses on shifting the behavior, structure, and core values of the institution. The theories of Curry and Goodman and

Dean allow for the behavior, structural aspects, and values of a change initiative to be validated; used together the theories fairly represent the change effort for this study.

Research Design

Institutionalization theory (Curry, 1992; Goodman and Dean, 1982) will serve as the model of change that will frame the underpinnings of the study. Leadership and cultural influences will be considered in assessing the findings of the study. One potential application of the findings could be to inform campus stakeholders of the level of institutionalization attained thus far and to suggest what actions might be applied to realize full achievement.

The research questions will focus on the perceptions of the campus stakeholders to assess the original expectations of the transformation plan versus their current expectations. The research questions are as follows:

- What is the perception of institutional leaders regarding the first four years of EngageWest? Does this assessment demonstrate achievement of initialization as described by the theoretical frameworks of Curry and Goodman and Dean?

- What do the perspectives of institutional leaders relating to the EW implementation to date suggest about the potential for the sustainability of the initiative and full institutionalization, if not fully achieved to date?

A constructivist perspective of change will be applied to the study and findings, understanding that the existing culture, past and present, will have great effect on the leadership and management styles used within the change initiative. Interviews of campus stakeholders, consisting of individual senior leaders, external consultants, and focus groups, will be conducted to collect perceptions of the environment. Printed, audio, and visual materials documented throughout the process will be incorporated to demonstrate the implementation strategy of the

organization at various points in time. Triangulation of data from the aforementioned sources, along with established theories of leadership and culture typology characteristics, will inform findings of the study.

The findings will be coded using an inductive to deductive approach beginning with the interviews and then the focus groups. Additional support for the established themes gathered in interviews provided through printed, audio, and visual materials will be deductively coded to illuminate existing themes. A final review of themes will be completed in order to achieve a generalized list of themes for use in the findings discussion.

I acknowledge my direct involvement and participation in the leadership and management of some aspects within the EW change initiative. Biases will be mitigated by the use of historical documented printed, audio, and visual materials, to validate that the recollection of activity and campus perceptions are accurate for the various points in time. Interviewees will be provided a synopsis of the interview content in advance, as well as given opportunity to review quotes taken during the interview, to ensure that perceptions and statements are captured accurately. An appreciative inquiry approach will be used to construct interview questions in a manner that capitalizes on seeking suggestions and identifying what worked well in the past to distinguish actions that will add value in the future for solution finding (Hammond, 2013). The appreciative inquiry concept is expected to open up communication with interview participants, providing a more comfortable methodology of providing feedback with reduced negativity of tone.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This study focuses on the perspectives of campus leaders and stakeholders regarding the success of EngageWest, while they are in the midst of this active change environment. Models of change, specifically institutionalization, will serve as a primary framework of the literature. Leadership and culture literature will provide a strong basis for analyzing institutionalization from the vantage point of the stakeholders involved in the case study. Understanding the roles and perspectives of the initiative from the key stakeholders identified will be insightful as the study looks to determine attainment and sustainability.

Foundational works used for this study are those of authors Curry (1992), Goodman and Dean (2002), Bergquist and Pawlak (2008), Kezar and Eckel (2002), as well as Kezar (2001, 2005, 2013, 2014) that focus on the archetypes of change theories, culture, and leadership models. Curry, as well as Goodman and Dean, present models of institutionalization that will frame the research findings, allowing the opportunity to assess the level of change attained. Both works identify the vital roles of leadership and culture. In addition, influential pieces from Bergquist and Pawlak along with Kezar provide beneficial literature to the study.

Bergquist and Pawlak analyze the type of cultures that exist within the academy, concentrating on traditional and emergent styles. Understanding the cultural archetype of an institution is essential in understanding the type of change needed and when to enact that change. Given the dynamic environment of a campus, institutions of higher education have been described as *total institutions* since "all aspects of life occur in the same place" (Tierney, 1985,

p. 100). All aspects include the ability for student, faculty, and staff to live, work, and grow within the same environment. Change initiatives must recognize that this multitude of activity is occurring within the same environment and balance the needs of the varying constituents.

The recent work of Kezar (2014) operationalizes characteristics of culture derived from theory along with change model types used within the academy to assist leaders in identifying what will be the optimal strategy for change within their institution. "Organizational learning demonstrates why change is often uncommon, as it requires individuals to question existing knowledge, form wholly new perspectives, and to function in an environment that is supportive of such risk taking and experimentation in thought" (Kezar, 2014, p. 31). Understanding that institutions are unique environments steeped in tradition that often consist of blended cultures, the goal of this study is to learn more from the formative process of enacting change and how to institutionalize a cultural change from the perspective of varying stakeholders in a leadership capacity. This study will add to the literature by assessing a current transformational process.

Models of Change

Change initiatives can range from a specific action to a shift in the values for an entire organization. This study focuses on the latter of the change spectrum in order to assess the perceptions of an organizational change initiative that identifies as a culture transformative movement. This type of movement from an innovative idea to being a part of the fabric of an organization is called institutionalization (Curry, 1992). Curry's theory specifically represents the structural capacity of an organization to change. However, institutionalization as an institution–wide transformational movement also requires the commitment of institutional leadership to the behavioral management of change.

Institutionalization as a behavior is the theoretical approach described by Goodman and Dean (2002). The authors look at the stages of change from the human behavior perspective, asserting that success is measured by the synthesis of values. "The defining characteristics of an institutionalized act are performance by multiple actors, persistence, and its existence as a social fact" (Goodman and Dean, 2002, p. 229). The initial characteristic is knowledge of behavior, followed by performance where understood expectations are acted upon. Preference of behavior is the third characteristic where actors are making the determination to like or dislike the change. Normative consensus, the fourth concept, establishes accepted behavior of the environment leaving the pinnacle characteristic, values. In institutionalization, values represent social consensus of behavior where full alignment of the change effort and behavior is attained.

Goodman and Dean's behavior-based theory is leveraged well with the structural approach to theory established by Curry (1992). Curry's theory begins with the structural level with concrete initiatives occurring that represent the change initiative. The second level is procedural where policy and behavior find alignment and can be documented through achievements and written materials. Incorporation is the third level where values and norms, similar to the fourth and fifth characteristics of Goodman and Dean, are accepted into the culture of the institution. While both theories could take on a linear approach, it is likely that these levels may blend or ebb and flow within a highly active environment such as the institution of study.

Institutionalization, as a structure or process, is akin to Beckhard and Pritchard's (1992) description of a fundamental change where pieces of the organization are moving and shifting at the same time, not requiring a lock-step approach to change. A shared vision becomes the

11

definition of what people are expected to do and a motivating tool. Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) offer the theory of vision-driven change along with four key factors:

- creating and setting the vision

- communicating the vision

- building commitment to the vision

- organizing people and what they do so that they are aligned (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992, p. 25)

The vision-driven model focuses on leaders creating the vision therefore making the leader an essential factor. Once the vision is created, space must be made for teaching the new vision and allowing for a learning environment to be developed. "Change is a learning process and learning is a change process" (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992, p. 14). Clarity of the level of vision development, the learning environment created, and the pending evolution of change will be valuable to the study. In loosely coupled organizations such as universities, the smaller units and areas within the institution are where the change truly happens and the ability to be agile is done at its best (Eckel & Kezar, 2011).

These smaller units comprised of individual institutional departmental units, will be referred to as a critical mass. When the critical mass does not understand the vision and expectations of the leader, instituting change can be challenging. Evaluating the readiness of the critical mass for change can prevent decisions that may seem radical in nature. Kezar (2005) warns against radical change efforts for the fear of doing more harm than good. The timing of change can be as critical as selecting the approach to change. Kezar (2014) distills and defines type of radical change by clarifying "when campuses respond to external forces, this is adaptation; when campuses unintentionally switch from one practice to another, mimicking

others in the enterprise, this is called isomorphism; and, when campuses implement a new program or practice, this is called innovation" (Kezar, 2014, Preface).   Institutionalization challenges what Kezar presents as radical change, as adaption and isomorphism are behavioral and structural steps on the continuum of sustained change.

The institution of study defines the change initiative as transformative, promoting the ability of constituents to be innovative and adaptive with intent. This potential realization challenges Kezar's theory that these activities are mutually exclusive or radical efforts to attainment of change. Kezar also asserts when a poorly timed change initiative is coupled with an effort that is not well suited for the institution, an opportunity exists for institutional harm.

Kezar (2014) focuses on six types of change: (1) scientific management; (2) evolutionary; (3) cultural; (4) political; (5) social cognition; and (6) institutional. The strategies of change theories are often described within Kezar's work in relation to the leadership style associated with the institution. Characteristics of four of Kezar's theories are expected to be predominant in this case study: (a) evolutionary; (b) cultural; (c) social cognition; and (d) institutional. This assumption is derived from the way EngageWest is defined by the institution and the hyper focus on the individual and how they identify with the institution and align with the commitment to success. As each realm is looked at more closely, the specific type of attributes should become more apparent.

Leaders in the evolutionary realm are more adaptive in nature, focusing less upon the planning aspects as a proactive measure, and more upon being ready to respond to the organization in times of need. "Change happens because the environment demands that systems change in order to survive" (Kezar, 2014, p. 27). In a similar vein, the cultural theory suggests that change is inspired naturally in response to the environment through slow and meticulous

efforts that pay close attention to the symbolic attributes of the organization such as the history

or rituals. Social constructivism is strongly represented in this theory, since the same culture is

perceived and experienced differently dependent upon the individual (Kezar, 2014). Elements of

the general society that demand productivity and profit are not always absorbed by organizations

within this realm until time has allowed for meaningful change to occur. Innovative change is

associated with social cognitive change in the work of Kezar. The social cognition change

theory focuses on the ability of individuals within the organization to be able to fully understand

the change they are a part of and how they will personally respond. The common thread of the

first three theories–evolutionary, cultural, and social cognition–is the awareness of the individual

as an important factor in the change process. In order to achieve success, the individual must be

attended to and heard as leaders make decisions and navigate the waters of change. This focus

on the individual has direct connectivity to the EngageWest definition and it will be interesting

to learn if this also resonates with stakeholders.

The institutional theory may, however, have the strongest resonance since it focuses upon

the ability for long-standing institutions to change while connecting individuals to external

factors.

> Institutional theory describes why change occurs as a complex interplay of institutional
>
> forces of inertia with varying external logics that push for new ways of doing things.
>
> Neo-institutional theories emphasize the role of human agency to a greater degree
>
> because earlier institutional theories were critiqued for being too deterministic and having
>
> no role for individuals to shape reality (Kezar, 2014, p. 36).

The lack of individuality and opportunity for individuals to insert feedback gives way for

isomorphism in Kezar's work. In the sense of attempting to change traditions, isomorphism

could take on a negative connotation. DiMaggio and Powell state that "isomorphism is a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 149). Discounting the human capacity associated with change as a myopic view, DiMaggio and Powell support gradual change and adaptation leaning toward a more sensible approach allowing for isomorphism to potentially fall on the continuum line of change.

As an institution begins to work in new ways and individual actors are given voice to change, the traditions and identifying archetypes are subject to change. The goal of institutionalization is to develop values and norms that are in alignment with purpose of the transformation. Seeking to understand how individuals have been able to shape the change initiative will be valuable in ascertaining the attainment of institutionalization. Recalling the work of Goodman and Dean (2002), individuals make the decision to like or dislike change affecting the ability to impact the perception and potentially the direction change. Data obtained through the interview process of this study will inform this concept.

Institutional Leadership During Times of Change

Operating a postsecondary institution can be rich with complexity as the organization is tasked with teaching, research, and service to a community of students and society as a whole. The American Association of University Professors speaks to power and separation in the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, noting that governing boards, presidents, and faculty should seek collegial agreement at times on matters of the university while respecting the fact that some decisions should remain with the realm of a specific group or entity (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 1966). When and how this agreement should occur can be different or ambiguous in nature in many colleges and universities. At the top of the

organizational structure is often the president, who is responsible for providing leadership and oversight to the institution, charged to look at complex situations from a variety of vantage points and make decisions that are best suited for the institution. While a president may be near the top of the organizational chart, superseded only by the board of trustees, no one entity in higher education can ever have total control in the intentionally autonomous environment of a college campus (Bolman & Gallos, 2011).

Control in the sense of change can be easily seen as the responsibility of the president who is often expected to meet dynamic and diverse needs from a leadership perspective. Bennis (1989) identifies the leadership competencies required for change as:

> (a) the management of attention through a set of intentions or a vision, not in a mystical or religious sense but in the sense of outcome; (b) the management of meaning; (c) the management of trust; (d) the management of self (Bennis, 1989, p. 20-21).

The skills noted by Bennis may seem simple in concept, but are truly monumental in effort. The ability to manage outcomes, organizational meaning, trust, and oneself during times of ambiguity and potential unrest can be a significant challenge for any leader. I believe that the strain a leader experiences can manifest as counterproductive behavior and impact the larger campus community. Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) advise leaders that an assessment of readiness for change and identification of best fit strategies for the critical mass is vital. This assessment process can, I believe, balance the expectations of the leader. It is of interest to understand the impact of deficiencies within these competencies as well as the level of organizational readiness.

"Determination of what constitutes a critical mass requires an analysis of the formal organization, surrounding key constituents, and their relevance to and position toward the change" (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992, p. 77). The critical mass for this research study is defined

as the faculty and staff in institutional departmental units as well as those in leadership positions in the institution of study. This assumption is based on the fact that EngageWest is targeted to this population. Selected members of the critical mass for the selected institution will in essence serve as the primary scope of interviewees for the case study. The change initiative strategy adopted by the institution is highly dependent upon the buy-in and effort of senior leaders and then subsequent layers of the institution. These subsequent layers represent the broader campus population who are depended upon to carry out the tactical aspects of the change initiative and university objectives. Understanding their perceptions of the change initiative and impact on culture will be key findings, since they are noted as a key to success according to Beckhard and Pritchett.

Understanding perceptions held by interviewees of the critical mass is a part of the assessment process and can also be referred to as sensemaking. The sense making process of a university president is critical to success of a change initiative, in particular to that of a new president. Sensemaking, called *reframing* by Bolman and Gallos (2011), "is the deliberate process of looking at a situation carefully and from multiple perspectives, choosing to be more mindful about the sense making process by examining alternative views and explanations" (Bolman & Gallos, 2011, p. 23).

Smerek (2013) found that presidents often engage in ethnographic study habits, even without intent, to assess their institutions. Smerek's assessment is formulated around three direct questions. Smerek's first question asks, "What's the story here*?"* and immediately brings light to the cultural aspect of the assessment. Smerek found that the shared meaning of the institution and the purpose was essential to the ability of the presidents within the study to make solid decisions as the second question begins to consider change models as the determination of "What

to do next." The intrinsic third question of "Why am I here?" is poignant from the reality of a president and new leader to an institution and may be useful in an additional study. The current study has the research goal of understanding the expectations of further efforts and level of attainment for change; leadership and cultural impacts of the change initiative will be potential themes in the findings.

Governance and Autonomy

Looking back to Smerek's first question, understanding the established governance structure of an institution as well as other aspects, can be an essential aspect for the president as well as the campus constituents. Understanding the opportunity for change and who is empowered to take action is significant. Generally speaking, governance structures consist of the functional capability and authority of individuals or groups within an institution or the larger entity of which they are a part. The functions of these groups include communication practices, the delegation of decision-making, and the scope of environmental impact (Balderston, 1995). Birnbaum (1988) devotes a chapter to the problems of governance, management, and leadership within the academy highlighting the perceptions of being highly effective and dysfunctional all at the same time. He discusses the lack of clarity when it comes to defining who is included in leadership, their ultimate responsibility, and the power that they hold creating an environment that lends itself to confusion and disarray at times.

Birnbaum (1988) identifies various types of institutions–bureaucracy, collegial, political, and anarchical–and assesses the effectiveness as well as the opportunities for the varying models. He concludes with integrating the models into what he calls the *cybernetic institution*. For the purpose of this study, the final section of the work that focuses upon administration and leadership within the hybrid institutional model was particularly insightful. Birnbaum addresses

the leadership needs of a large and complex system, focusing upon points that bring great expectation upon the president of the institution. He challenges presidents to listen, cultivate leaders at varying levels, look at the institution from multiple frames when making decisions, and be a balanced administrator remembering that "governance is just a process that permits people to work together" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 229). The understanding of who you are permitted to work with is not only important for the president, but should be understood by all that are within the institution. This concept speaks to autonomy, the abilities for people to work with whomever is necessary and in the stylistic approach that best fits their needs. The ability of a president to create this environment in a healthy manner can have direct impact on the attainability of a change initiative.

The analysis of what is needed to sustain the initiative under study will use the concepts defined by Birnbaum. The cultivation of leaders at various levels, the understanding of expectations throughout the organization, and autonomy allowed may inform the viability of the change effort. Support from the governing entity above the university level may also play a role in leadership, culture, and sustainability.

Higher education institutions often operate under the guidance or direction of a governing board. Institutions can be a part of multi-campus systems that share governing boards or administrative oversight with varying degrees of authority. Governing boards who are not in continual practice can delegate authority to a full-time president for daily operations and decision making (Balderston, 1995). In 1985 a typology of multi-campus systems was developed (Creswell, Roskens, & Henry, 1985), defined by the type of control, public or private, the jurisdiction of governing board for public systems, and types of campuses within the system. The typology identified four major types of campuses: private, statewide, heterogeneous public,

and homogenous public. Statewide multi-campus systems are publicly funded institutions who share a board with constitutional or statutory governing authority over all or specifically identified postsecondary educational institutions within the state.

The University of West Georgia operates within a multi-campus public system. At the time of study, the University System of Georgia (USG) is comprised of 29 public colleges and universities, Georgia Archives, and the Georgia Public Library Service (University System of Georgia, 2017). The colleges and institutions are categorized into four tiers based upon institutional mission: (1) research, (2) comprehensive, (3) state university; and (4) state college. The USG is governed by the Board of Regents (BOR) who are appointed by the governor and represent the state-at-large and the 14 congressional districts. "The Georgia Constitution grants to the Board of Regents the exclusive rights to govern, control, and manage the University of Georgia, an educational system comprised of twenty-nine institutions of higher learning, a marine research institute, and a central University System Office" (University System of Georgia, 2017, Policy Manual). The published governance structures recognized within the BOR include the campus level president with formal delegation and the ability for Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council representatives to voice opinion regarding concerns of direct impact when requested by the chancellor. The chancellor is appointed by the BOR and performs the role of Chief Executive and Administrative officer. The BOR and chancellor ultimately provide the vision for the system, governing policies, and directional expectation for institutions. While this formal definition of the BOR indicates that the campus president has formal responsibility for campus leadership, it will be interesting to see if the BOR emerges as an influencer when it comes to campus culture and governance.

As mentioned earlier, Birnbaum's (1988) work states that governance provides a landscape for whom you can work with, and the president must be able to look at the various governance structures that will impact the institution. This can become critical in a transformational process with the development of goals and expectations that are understood by the members of the campus community. Leadership and the challenges that occur within the layers of the multi-campus system could be a potential influence to change that may be of particular use for this study. Johnstone (1999) focuses on the distinctive purposes and responsibilities of the multi-campus system governance, but assures that "universities will continue to be both repositories of culture and traditions as well as servants of change and bearers of social and political criticism" (Johnstone, 1999, p. 20). Here we see notes of isomorphism and the recognition that adaption is necessary for continued existence and governance systems must be responsive to the needs of the institution.

Balderston (1995) notes that the fundamental task of university governance is to confidently provide effective autonomy for the institution independent of self-interest or external unrest. Maintaining autonomy in an institution that is a part of multi-campus system can be a challenge as the institution inherently has a responsibility to follow the direction of the system. In a 2006 qualitative study of community colleges, Eddy asserts that "when colleges are part of a multi-college district, it is not only the campus president who has authority over institutional changes and sense making, but also the system chancellor" (Eddy, 2006, p. 46). The study focused upon a single change initiative applicable to the entire district where the dean structure was under revision. This change effort involved consultants working on behalf of the chancellor to help enact the change that was expected, taking into account the varying cultures of the

campuses involved. The president of each campus did have influence in how the organizational change was communicated and carried out.

The five campuses that participated in the study were not named, but rather given pseudonyms that were fitting of the culture and reaction to change. The campuses were named as follows: Don't make waves, Rogue, New cutting edge, Tradition bound, and Me-toos. The *Don't make waves* campus embodied leaders who chose to simply work within the bureaucracy of the system instead of questioning or working against it. Indicative of the name given, the *Rogue* campus often sought to challenge the status quo and push the envelope on rules and procedures. Prior to the change initiative, a new president was selected by the chancellor to encourage the campus to operate more in line with the system. The *New cutting edge* campus was learning centered and focused upon innovation and welcomed new ideas and methodologies. The *Tradition bound* campus was the oldest of all and steeped in tradition along with reluctance towards change. Any issues associated with the change were due to the chancellor's framing and not the college president. Finally, the *Me-toos* consisted of a faculty base who felt that they should have more say in change initiatives that would impact their campus, but the president was ultimately accepting of a clearer chain of command due to his military background.

Eddy's study ultimately found that leaders need to consider the institutional culture of the campus when determining change strategy and level of sense making that should occur to enact change. This study was particularly interesting when thinking of the *Tradition bound* and *Don't make waves* campuses, but from a blended perspective of where the institution of study, UWG, began. The president does have control over organizational change and is seeking to become a *New cutting edge* campus in many ways. It will be interesting to gather the perspective of influence as it relates to the system level governance structure during the transition.

Kezar (2005) warns against radical change in governance structures, cautioning that dramatic shifts can lead to negative consequences. She recommends gradual movement towards a new model of governance that is befitting of the institution. She notes there is no perfect model or structure when it comes to governance. Her grounded theory approach studied four frameworks through case studies. The first framework is teleological/business process re-engineering which has an external focus. The next framework is the political model, also used by Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) to examine the collegial culture, which addresses oppositional viewpoints and power differentials that could be internal or external. The political model of a power struggle does not allow for additional voices to join the conversation and with decrease of regular and tenured faculty, change is needed. The institutional model seeks to repair alignment with the mission of the environment. Finally, the cultural model pursues defining the values of the organization and then aligning structures and processes. Approaching governance with respect to the needs and mission of the institution through the cultural model would be more ideal.

Bergquist and Pawlak's general assumption that leadership is created through give and take may be more appropriate from a consensus or collaborative approach rather than a democratic approach, which is the fundamental position of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) [AAUP], 1966). However, the University of West Georgia participates in the University System of Georgia (USG) governance structure where faculty are expected to provide advisement and recommendation for the general welfare of the system (University System of Georgia, 2017). They describe the faculty role in a more formal fashion with direct power and participation in university governance. With USG setting the expectation

of faculty to have a less formal role in governance, campus leadership can elect an autocratic approach without formal repercussion.

EngageWest aims to bridge the concepts of democracy defined by the AAUP and the USG expectation for all campus constituents to have voice in the decisions that impact general welfare for the institution. This expectation presents a potential shift in role and expectation of faculty at UWG. With the predominant role of faculty supporting the core institutional mission, understanding the perspective of leadership and the expectations of faculty may have great impact on the initiative. As a first attempt to ascertain this type of change, it is helpful to understand the literature on why the faculty roles have changed over time.

Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) assert that the changing role of the faculty is attributed to four megatrends: (a) the rapid and unpredictable pace of change, (b) the structural change of the economy, (c) societal shifts in ideology and philosophy, and (d) the growing focus on funding and privatization (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). While their study focused on faculty, these trends can be generally applied to other constituents within the collegium. Two of the megatrends directly address the responsibility of higher education for knowledge management and dissemination. The authors state "the core of this dimension of change are precisely those economic arrangements related to the collection, dissemination, and management of information and knowledge: historically higher education's social functions" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 6). The ideological and philosophical shift follows the economic shift, stated as "how society views higher education, namely, increasingly as a private rather than public good and as an 'industry' that must be ever more open to competition within and from without rather than as a protected social institution" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 6).

Schmidtlein and Berdahl (2011) also address the competing responsibilities in academia, attributing the complexity to the many external agencies that now regulate the academy. The examples of external agencies noted in their work include accreditation bodies and governmental regulatory agencies that may or may not recognize the distributive nature of leadership and governance that takes place within the collegial environment. The lack of recognition of the distributed governance can create undue hardship on those expected to do the work. A faculty member who participates in shared governance roles as a formal leader, such as a department chair, is faced with a multitude of competing priorities to include the respect and protection of their own intellectual property. The potential perception that EngageWest is an additional work expectation could negatively impact or slow the process of achievement.

There are many institutions across the country similarly situated in a governance structure much like the university of focus for this study. They are continually faced with competing demands for students, higher expectations from their governing board, economic strains, and societal challenges that impact the temperament of a campus daily, rendering the decision making environment rife with complexity. Schmidtlein and Berdahl (2011) ask the question in the title of their work, *Autonomy and Accountability: Who Controls Academe?* The authors speak about overreach from a system perspective and the impact on a campus as they connect the ability of a campus to be autonomous in the midst of a multi-campus system. "Unstructured competition reduces diversity and increases costs through program duplication, while excessive regulation restricts the ability of competent institutional leaders to take expeditious advantage of new opportunities and adjust to new circumstances" (Schmidtlein & Berdahl, 2011, p. 78). As the perceptions are gathered in this study and assessed on the time continuum from the start, along with expectations of the future, the agility of the president within a multi-campus

environment will be a key finding.   Finding balance between meeting the needs of the campus, system leaders, and external constituents is expected as a point of discussion during the interview segments.

The risk that institution-wide change brings for campus leaders and collegium is not to be ignored. Hamilton (2000) states that "the major threat to the [academic] profession's role has been–and will be–from groups who wish to prevent the anguish and pain that results when their beliefs are subjected to checking and public criticism" (Hamilton, 2000, para. 20). As EngageWest looks at the institution from all vantage points, the historical or established beliefs and values of campus constituents are subject to be challenged and criticized. Hamilton, while six years earlier than the megatrends of Schuster and Finkelstein, speaks of the challenge with new theory and development of societal norms, questioning the ideology that is expected of the learned community. Hamilton goes on to clarify that there must be a correlation and responsibility of faculty to the peer collegium to ensure that ethical and professional standards are continually met, reducing challenge and large-scale criticism due to the loss of vigor. Hamilton expresses how these values have been lost by the faculty at-large. As EngageWest aims to educate campus leaders, faculty, and staff as to the needs of the institution and create an environment where individual contributors have the autonomy to create and sustain change, the peer collegium will need to maintain focus and potentially remind others of the need to remain true to the academic mission. The achievement of institutionalization within the UWG environment has the opportunity to strengthen values and create a trajectory of continued success.

Cultural Impact of Change

Campus culture, however, is intrinsically dependent upon the many constituents that create the institutional body. Culture theory and organizational change models have in common that culture and behavioral experiences of people are always evolving, never reaching status quo; therefore, we must be careful in the changes we choose to make (Kezar, 2005). Geertz (1973) defines the study of culture as "not an experimental science in search of law, but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (Geertz, 1973, p. 5). Birnbaum (1988) surmises that the president cannot singlehandedly create culture and sustain change through the development of new ideas and goals. "However, they can strengthen and protect the existing culture by constantly articulating it, screening out personnel who challenge it, and in other ways continually rebuilding it" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 81).

The second research question of the study deals with the sustainability of change. The influence of culture will be used in the analysis of this question, from the initial start until present day. Identification of the cultural shifts taking place within the institution during the change initiative may be valuable in understanding the perceptions of sustainability. The second edition of *Engaging the Six Cultures of the Academy* by William H. Bergquist and Kenneth Pawlak (2008) delivers a succinct depiction of six university cultures within American and Canadian higher education. The original work of Bergquist in 1992 identified four cultures: the collegial, managerial, developmental, and advocacy cultures; virtual and tangible were added in the 2008 revised and expanded version with Pawlak (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Bergquist and Pawlak do not attempt to define which is the optimal culture, but offer that an institution may embody more than one culture in its environment. These concepts speak to the expectations of the

varying cultures and the needs that each culture desires to provide the best service to the institution.

The Collegial culture holds to the values found in many historic institutions where faculty members determine the curriculum of their disciplines, maintain responsibility of peer accountability, and share governance responsibility with administration. The Managerial culture is long standing and defines institutions that value sustainable growth, shared goals and objectives, and accountability structures through healthy discourse. Managerial cultures are depicted in the works of Birnbaum (1988) as well as Smart and Hamm, being the only other fully shared culture concept alongside the collegial culture (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 378). The Managerial and Collegial culture share traditionalist aspects of higher education culture.

The Developmental and Advocacy cultures, however, share in the modernization of higher education with a common focus of developing the whole person. The Developmental culture resides in institutions described as having high focus on outreach and programs that support personal and professional evolution for students, faculty, and staff. Key to values in a Developmental culture is the institutional responsibility of continued growth and maturity. The Developmental culture is generally strong in student-centered areas within the institution such as student affairs. In contrast to the intrinsic nature of the Developmental culture, the Advocacy culture deals with values of access and opportunity. Advocacy cultures strive to ensure that access to higher education is granted to students, faculty, and staff of varying demographical factors such as socioeconomic or national origin. A high focus is also placed on equality in Advocacy cultures and can be seen with institutions that have collective bargaining agreements.

The final two cultures developed in concert with Pawlak in 2008 are the Virtual and Tangible cultures. The Virtual culture was born through the advancement of technology and the

impact on culture. The ability to gain, develop, and disseminate information on a global basis has tested institutional constituents, changing the relational bounds and ways of being in the academy. In contrast, the Tangible culture holds to the geographical bounds of an institution finding value in physical aspects of campus, community, and the people within. All six cultures vary in origin and can exist within one institution impacting the governance model and leadership style.

Bergquist and Pawlak claim the Collegial culture holds dominion in many North American institutions as they hold true to the traditional British, German, and Scottish systems that they were modeled after. Bergquist and Pawlak define the collegial culture as:

> A culture that finds meaning primarily in the disciplines represented by the faculty in the institution; that values faculty research and scholarship and the quasi-political governance processes of the faculty; that holds assumptions about the dominance of rationality in the institution; and that conceives of the institution's enterprise as the generation, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge and as the development of specific values and qualities of character among young men and women who are future leaders of our society (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008, p. 15).

Bess (1992) separates the concepts of culture and collegiality, then places them back together as one concept referred to as *c-collegiality*. "Culture in the current professional lexicon generally refers to the folkways, mores, ethos, or values found in a circumscribed social system" (Bess, 1992, p. 6). For colleges and universities, Bess asserts that it is unreasonable to see culture as a homogenous concept, but more so an ambiguous heterogeneous paradigm in a loosely coupled environment. When looking at collegiality as a culture, Bess uses the work of Meryl Reis Louis stating that collegiality is a "feeder" culture that is brought forth from the

faculty experiences of administrators. "C-collegiality in the common usage seems to refer to the institutionalization of the rights of stakeholders in decisions to participate in the decisions affecting them" (Bess, 1992, p. 11).

Classic collegiality and the autonomy it brings to institutions has been the epitome of what academe means to society and higher education. However, the managerial culture, along with virtual and tangible culture, may be the reality for most institutions today (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). In assessing the institution of study, many of the missions and goals of the institution have direct alignment with these cultural archetypes. While Bergquist and Pawlak do not observe how these cultures interact and impact one another within the bounds of one institution, this study may indirectly speak to the conflict of missions, leadership, and achievement with varying cultures at play.

Kezar and Eckel (2002) acknowledge the original work of Bergquist in being helpful in understanding the cultural archetypes of an institution. They maintain that typology cannot be solely responsible for instituting change or managing the many facets of organizational governance. Kezar and Eckel approach institutional change as a mix of institutional culture and strategy. Their findings suggest that change agents or leaders should maintain an overarching view of the organization while noting the varying cultures and networks that exists, to ascertain if the change strategy is a critical violation of culture that is necessary. This theory could prove applicable to governance policy development and leadership practices of the institution since the creation of seemingly smaller activity may in fact lead to detriment. Kezar and Eckel closed their study urging the research community to do more assessment on the formative process of change strategy and cultural impact in the higher education community. Continual assessment of

the mission and responsibility of the institution could prove to be a critical factor in the formative assessment process, providing an appropriate reminder as to the purpose of this study.

Summary of Theoretical Frameworks

The literature is clear that the forces of institutionalization along with structural and behavioral strategies must be considered in concert with one another to ultimately define the vision, articulate expectations, align behaviors, and consistently demonstrate the established values of the organization. Institutional culture, both past and present, will have a place in this study as well as the stated mission. It is also known that each person or actor will have their own decision-making power which determines their input and continuance. I believe that this is a key component to remaining relevant and agile in attaining institutionalization and future continuous improvement.

Without individual contribution and the institution taking a strategic stance on reflective continuous improvement, the institution is subject to isomorphic response and reversion to undesirable culture and behaviors of the past. Treating the institution solely as an independent "living organ" will lead the organization towards a very limited approach to change as it will only be influenced by existing traditions. In order to mitigate pitfalls, Kezar (2005) warned and documented the risks associated with attempting culture change without understanding the existing culture and actors. The literature states that the assessment and understanding of the cultural landscape is the responsibility of campus leaders.

As this study looks to identify the perceptions of stakeholder, themes identified will be correlated with the institutionalization frameworks. Table 1 provides a snapshot of the components and levels of institutionalization that will be used during the study to identify

attainment and expectations for the future as it relates to the EngageWest initiative. Literature

that supports the institutionalization theories have been provided in the table as well.

Table 1

Overview of Selected Institutionalization Theoretical Frameworks

Core Theoretical Framework	Levels of Attainment	Selected Supporting Theories
Structural Institutionalization – Curry (1992)	*Structural* – development of a concrete initiative	Vision-Driven Change (Beckhard and Pritchett, 1992)
	Procedural – alignment of policy and expected behaviors	Approach to radical change (Kezar, 2005); Strategies for change (Kezar, 2014)
	Incorporation – values and norms are accepted into the culture	Approach to radical change (Kezar, 2005);
Behavioral Institutionalization – Goodman and Dean (2002)	*Knowledge of behavior* – articulation of expectations by leaders	Vision-Driven Change (Beckhard and Pritchett, 1992)
	Performance – acting upon expected behaviors	Operationalization of culture (Kezar, 2014); Competencies of change (Bennis,1989); Governance (Balderston, 1995)
	Preference of behavior – actors demonstrate their or dislike of the change	Control and Responsibilities (Schmidtlein and Berdahl, 2011)

Normative Consensus – established behavior of the environment that demonstrates values	Bergquist and Pawlak (1992)

This diagram will continue to inform the study through the analysis and findings process with a goal of identifying sustainability factors for continued success and attainment of institutionalization. It will be important to know if any levels of institutionalization are present, and whether the activity sources from the structural or behavioral lens. It is my belief that the institution must achieve both frameworks in concert in order to fulfill the goals of the initiative, but this is not to say that a linear approach will be required. It will be interesting to see how the literature informs the analysis and whether or not the path to achievement has impact on sustainability.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

A case study approach allows for the researcher to depict the perceptions and expectations of an initiative from the associated stakeholders and specific campus of study. The application of theories and processes can vary depending upon the many institutional factors and themes that arise during the study. Tierney (1985) suggests that as researchers:

> We approach the institution to be studied as if it were an interconnected web that cannot be understood unless one looks not only at the structure and natural laws of that web, but also at the actors' interpretation of the web itself (Tierney, 1985, p. 94).

The perceptions of the initiative from the viewpoint of varying stakeholders within the institution from outset to present day are the foci of the study. The impact of culture and influence of leadership are reoccurring themes in the analysis as well as the findings. The concept of culture adds ethnographic aspects to the study and provide a way to understand the purposes and intent of the initiative. "An institution that can profit from ethnography is one in need of asking: what are we doing, what will come of it, and is it all worthwhile" (Tierney, 1985, p. 102)? Given the parameters of the study time period, the case study approach was the primary method. Ethnographic concepts and strategies may be applied in some areas to garner optimal understanding of perceptions and drivers for change as well as attainment of institutionalization.

Research Design

  The research study focused on determining the perceptions of campus stakeholders in the realm of a transformational change initiative that is actively in development and defined expectations to attain sustainable change. The selected institution of study, University of West Georgia, was in the process of completing the third year of a four-year transformational change implementation plan during the study period. The primary objective was to obtain the perceptions of the campus stakeholders at the onset of the initiative and at the current point in time to identify expectations of sustainability. Evidence from the study of institutionalization will add to the literature through the determination of perceptions and expectations of constituents for policy makers.

  A case study approach has been selected to allow for the unique perspectives of the institution to be explored, and allow for probing questions to be organically developed in response to the answer from an interviewee. Since the EngageWest initiative is actively in progress and is not intended to reach a definitive end during the course of the study, the continual achievements, shifts, and opportunities for improvement were able to be assessed during the course of the study. Understanding what has worked and should be continued as well as what has not worked was critical to the findings and continued to support the selection of a case study in using a formative approach to assessment, as opposed to a summative approach.

  Assessment literature differentiates formative assessment from summative assessment as to what is actively happening during the course of initiative. Alternatively, summative assessment demonstrates what has occurred (Boston, 2002). Understanding that the change initiative was in progress and did not conclude prior to the close of the study, a formative analysis lens was used to assess the findings. The formative lens was more appropriate for this

study since the information was in a continual developmental process with no definitive end

during the study period. Qualitative data provided the basis for a formative assessment.

Interviews and written materials such as presentation notes, assessment documents, open campus

letters, and tools associated with the initiative will be collected, coded, and analyzed to

determine findings.

Case Selection

The University of West (UWG) is a public comprehensive university within the multi-

campus system of the University System of Georgia. Total student enrollment for Fall of 2016

was approximately 13,300 students with a faculty and staff base of over 1,400 employees

(University of West Georgia [UWG], 2016). Dr. Kyle Marrero is UWG's current president and

was in his fourth year of tenure with the institution during the time of study. Since Dr. Marrero's

arrival, the institution has established a shared organizational vision. The vision reads as

follows: "The University of West Georgia aspires to be the best comprehensive university in

America–sought after as the best place to work, learn, and succeed" (University of West Georgia

[UWG], 2016). Upon establishing the vision, Dr. Marrero initiated a transformational change

effort called EngageWest in his second year of presidency. The goal statement of EngageWest

seeks to achieve an environment where constituents are aware how their role and purpose

connects to the institution and the value of their contributions to the overall attainment of the

institutional vision. The full goal statement is provided in Appendix A.

To fully realize the mission of the EngageWest movement, the consulting services of

Studer Education were retained to provide a framework for the four-year effort. Studer

Education follows an evidence-based leadership and culture of high performance approach to

change initiatives. Evidence-based leadership is defined as a model that "provides an objective,

measurable framework for leadership and planning. It allows individual leaders, departments, and the university as a whole to accurately gauge progress towards our goals" (University of West Georgia [UWG], n.d.). Evidence-based leadership lends itself to the behavioral and structural based concepts of institutionalization as it provides clear direction, or tools, that expect behavioral improvements and results.

The EngageWest four-year model encompasses the following themes:

- the learning year - building the toolkit

- the living year - using the tools

- the leading year - sharpening the tools

- the legacy year (EngageWest Orlando Presentation, 2016).

This study analyzed the EngageWest initiative to understand the perceptions of campus constituents, as well as their expectations to achieve sustainable change. The literature on the influence of leadership and the cultural impact of change informed the analysis and findings. UWG was selected for the study due to the robust nature of the initiative. My ready access to the campus stakeholders and the data associated with the project also supported the selection as it can be a challenge to garner the trust of an unknown organization. The results have clear and specific benefits for UWG, but it also provides generalizable information to others who aspire to engage in initiatives that seek to impact the leaders, culture, values and structural capacity of an institution.

Data Sources

Interviews

With EngageWest proceeding through the fourth year of the four-year implementation, it was important to select interviewees that had the ability to reflect on the process from onset to

current time. A series of elite interviews and focus groups were conducted to collect the

perception data needed for the study. I conducted a series of elite interviews that consisted of the

president, vice presidents, and the external change consultants associated with Studer Education

and the Leaders Lyceum who provide programmatic guidance and professional development for

leaders within the institution. These interviews are considered elite given the limited nature of

the positions and individuals within the roles.

Vice presidents present the first population where the parameters of interviewees must be

reviewed, as the full group of vice presidents had not been in position for the entire initiative.

While only two of the five vice presidents were in position for the entire initiative, two additional

vice presidents have been present for more than half of the time. The fifth vice president

participated in order to offer a voice that was reflective as to how the program is perceived from

the lens of a new leader.

A purposeful sampling approach was taken with the development of the focus groups that

were interviewed to gather perceptions of campus constituents. Participant selection looked at

the current chairperson, past chairperson, and the chairperson elect for voluntary Faculty Senate

and Staff Advisory Council groups respectively. The chairperson role was selected for the focus

groups since they are expected to represent the voice of both faculty and staff and have the

opportunity to advise leadership on behalf of their colleagues.

Finally, snowball sampling suggestions were collected at the conclusion of all interviews

and focus groups to identify other participants who may provide useful insight to the

EngageWest initiative. Snowball sampling was expected to be limited or restricted if the data

reached the point of saturation at the close of the original interview population. Saturation did

occur; therefore, I made the decision not to proceed with the snowball interview exercise. It is

important to note that suggestions for snowball interviews have been considered for additional study.

The same semi-structured approach and interview protocol (Appendix B) was taken with all interviewees and focus groups. Each interview session, individual or focus group, lasted approximately one hour; additional time will be given if mutually agreed upon by the interviewee and researcher. Following a semi-structured process allowed for a more open and personal response. Using the same protocol provided me with the ability to compare and align responses. Participants were encouraged to freely answer and share. At times participants were redirected to ensure that questions were understood and answered when the conversation when too far adrift. Merriam (2016) states that "this format allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 11).

All interviews and focus groups were recorded to allow me to focus my attention to the conversation and referred back to during analysis. Member checking exercises will be completed to ensure that recorded responses are accurate from the participant perspective. Member checking was primarily conducted for the purpose of using direct quotes in the findings. President Marrero was the only interviewee mentioned by name in the findings, all others are referred to by their positional group. As an example, the vice presidents are all referred to a *senior leader* in the findings.   President Marrero did not object or make corrections to any of the quotes selected for study.

Printed, Audio, and Visual Materials

The EngageWest initiative is a well-documented effort with publicly available documentation found on the University of West Georgia's website as well as additional

documentation available upon request. Printed, audio, and visual materials associated with

EngageWest are listed with independent websites that offer detailed information about campus

participation, areas of focus, and information regarding current events and activities. The

EngageWest data sources by topical area are noted below in Table 2 (UWG, 2016). The printed,

audio, and visual materials associated with the initiatives will be selected from the following

initiatives noted in Table 2 and reviewed prior to the completion of interviews and focus groups.

Table 2

Listing of EngageWest Initiatives and Data Sources

EngageWest data sources by topical area in alpha order	*Description of source*
Annual Employee Engagement Survey (Engage West Survey)	Employee engagement measurement tool (Appendix D)
Barrier Team	Committee appointed by president to review and resolve barriers to university productivity
Best of the West	Institutional reward and recognition program
KPI (Key Performance Indicator) Team	Cross-divisional team that develops and monitors institutional KPIs
EngageWest: Faculty Edition	Series of professional development activities for faculty

EngageWest: Staff Edition	Series of professional development activities for staff
Leadership Development Institutes	Quarterly leadership development sessions for leaders with five direct reports or more
Points of Pride	Monthly communication shares campus community achievements
Presidential Committee on Campus Inclusion	Campus representative committee charged with providing recommendations to improve diversity and inclusion
Senior Leadership Scorecards	Annual evaluation of established goals for president and vice presidents
UWG Strategic Plan	Strategic objectives and initiatives for the institution encompassing years 2014-2020

Data Analysis

The purpose of the study is to identify the perceptions of campus constituents in relation to the EngageWest initiative and the expectations associated with the sustainability of the initiative. Codes were derived from the data collected from interviews, focus groups, and the review of historical print, visual, and written data elements to identify the common perceptions and expectations. A deductive approach beginning with the elite interviewees was used to identify the common perceptions and expectations themes that closely aligned with the

theoretical frameworks. The inductive theming will be continued with remaining interviewees and groups. The whole body of planned interviews was used to create themes.

Information collected through the printed materials such as the presentation materials, survey structures, and campus communications were deductively coded after the interview materials. At the conclusion of coding all of the data points, a review of the themes was completed to see if any themes should be consolidated with a comprehensive listing of themes being provided as the final structure. A reflective review of the theories of institutionalization by Curry and Goodman and Dean will have informed the comprehensive theming. The data analysis process utilized professional transcription services as well as the coding software NVIVO to track and maintain data points.

Limitations

It is a commonly stated notion that change can be uncomfortable and not welcomed by all. This might prove true for the EngageWest initiative given that this study was conducted during an active implementation. Gathering honest feedback and reporting of the information could have created reluctance with some of the participants. Anonymity was not guaranteed to participants considering the limited number of individuals who were in leadership positions within the institution and serving on Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council. An appreciative inquiry (AI) strategy (Hammond, 2013) developed by David Cooperrider was used to ask questions that capitalize on the success of the program first. The identification of opportunities for improvement came through secondary questions posed in a positive manner. "The major assumption of AI is that in every organization something works and change can be managed through the identification of what works, and the analysis of how to do more of what works" (Hammond, 2013, p. 3). In addition to using a question structure that guided the

conversation in a positive manner, it was communicated at the start of each interview that participants will be reflected in the study as a participant group pseudonym rather than by name. The participant group naming reference will be applicable to all participants with exception to the president given the specificity of the role. The Interview Protocol, Appendix B, provides the interview introduction structure.

Researcher Bias

As a former five-year employee of the University of West Georgia serving as the Associate Vice President (AVP) of Human Resources and member of the President's Cabinet, it is necessary that I provide justification of researcher trustworthiness for the study. In an effort to be fully transparent, a disclosure of my participation in the EngageWest initiative is critical. Since the inception of the EngageWest initiative I was a participant at all levels of the program. Examples of my participation included providing idea generation, formal critique of the program through focus groups, and completing work assignments closely aligned with the transformational program at the direction of the President Kyle Marrero. Within my role as AVP of Human Resources, there was component of accountability associated with the engagement of the departmental staff whom I led. This accountability was assessed through the Annual Employee Engagement Survey, as well as my annual performance evaluation.

Trustworthiness

In addition to acknowledging my personal involvement, I utilized strategic processes to ensure a quality approach. Yin (2009) notes that a researcher should possess the following five skills to achieve a quality case study. The skills include (a) asking good questions, (b) being a good "listener," (c) being adaptive and flexible, (d) having a firm grip on the issues being studied, and (e) being unbiased by preconceived notions. The skills identified by Yin were an

area of focus for me in order to produce an unbiased analysis of materials and interview data. In addition to the skills stated by Yin, Merriam (2016) lists triangulation, respondent validation, and peer review among the strategies for "enhancing the rigor" of a study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 258).

Triangulation of the data points was the primary method for the case study in order to maintain validity and reliability. Triangulation aided in the interpretation of participant data due to the difficulty that recollection of historical events in many cases can bring. As noted in the interview methodology, President Marrero was offered the opportunity to validate all direct quotes yielding no additions or corrections. As a final step to ensure that I did not have improper use of personal perceptions a member of the UWG staff leadership community was asked to provide a peer review of the study. This exercise did not yield any factual corrections to the data analysis or finding. The peer review did provide insightful validation of opportunities for future study that are presented in the conclusion.

CHAPTER 4

Research Findings

This chapter focuses on the findings from the qualitative case study on institutionalization and future sustainability of the EngageWest initiative at the University of West Georgia. Structured interviews of campus stakeholders were conducted in addition to a review of pertinent historical data to determine the level of change from a behavioral and structural capacity as described by Curry, as well as by Goodman and Dean, respectively in the theoretical underpinnings. The following research study questions were used to guide the study overall:

(1) What is the assessment of institutional leaders regarding the first four years of
    EngageWest? Does this assessment demonstrate achievement of initialization as
    described by the theoretical frameworks of Curry and Goodman and Dean?

(2) What do the perspectives of institutional leaders relating to the EW implementation to
    date suggest about the potential for the sustainability of the initiative and full
    institutionalization, if not fully achieved to date?

Data for the findings is sourced from 10 interviews with senior leaders and external consultants and two focus groups representing Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council. Snowball sampling was not conducted due to the repetition of perceptions and suggestions for sustainability with predetermined interviewees. The table below represents the individuals who participated in the interviews by position or group affiliation.

Table 3

Interviewees by position or group affiliation

Position title or group	Group	Selection Method
President	President	Preselected
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	Senior Leader	Preselected
Senior Vice President for Business and Finance	Senior Leader	Preselected
Vice President for Advancement Services	Senior Leader	Preselected
Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer	Senior Leader	Preselected
Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management	Senior Leader	Preselected
Faculty Senate (Chairs – Past, Present, and Chair-Elect)	Faculty Senate	Preselected
Staff Advisory Council (Chairs – Past and Chair-Elect)	Staff Advisory Council	Preselected
Studer Group Consultant	External Consultant	Preselected
Leaders Lyceum Principal	External Consultant	Preselected

A semi-structured interview protocol (Appendix B) was used in all interviews and focus groups. With the exception of the president, all interviewees and groups will be referred to by

their collective group title rather than by specific title; for example, comments by a vice president will be noted as senior leader(s) and not be related to the specific position or title. This will protect the anonymity of some and allow for more genuine response. This process was communicated through the interview protocol (Appendix B).

During the course of the interviews, responses to the questions that posed strong concepts or constructs directly related to institutionalization were noted in the margin of the interview notes. The concepts noted in the margins served as the original themes that were used in the coding software, NVivo. As the interview transcripts were coded, additional themes were added. A total of 38 concepts were collected (Appendix C), and at the point of reaching exhaustion with creating new themes, related concepts were correlated together into subsets. The overarching themes were dependent on the number of times referenced by interviewees as well as direct correlation to the theoretical frameworks. The final theme titles defined for the research questions were representative of the truest sense of the findings as indicated by the interviewees and other supporting data points utilized in the study.

The findings are identified and organized by research question. The first research question seeks to understand the assessment of the first four years of the EngageWest initiative by institutional leaders and the level of institutionalization attained thus far. Five major themes were identified for question one related to the assessment of EngageWest: leadership driven, accountability, cultural awareness, allowance for individuality, and approach to change. The themes range from low level demonstrations of institutionalization to that of successful implementation. The second question looked towards the future seeking to understand what actions were necessary to attain and sustain institutionalization; the themes related to the findings here are categorized as sustainability factors. The four sustainability factors identified are as

follows: maintain mission focus, remain adaptive, disciplined leadership, and intentional enculturation. The demonstrated ability to implement these factors would secure a position of structural *incorporation* and behavioral *normative consensus* for UWG, beginning with a focus on the intent of the institutional initiative.

The State of Institutionalization: An analysis of attainment

The findings from this study quickly determined that institutionalization does not necessarily occur in a linear process from a behavioral or structural lens. However, it was also apparent that institutionalization could be attained at varying levels within the institution. The findings and discussion are in accordance to the themes identified in the perception analysis. Overall UWG is largely in a phase of *procedural* attainment as described by Curry and *preference of behavior* as defined by Goodman and Dean. Given that the initiative has only been in progress for four years, this is notable. There is overall recognition that the initiative is highly connected to the president, but individual actors are seen as important contributors to the transformation.

Leadership Driven

From the perspective of the theoretical framework developed by Curry (1992), structure of the organization is the primary focal point and states that the idea of change requires the institutional leadership to be connected to the management of change at an intensely high level. All stakeholders shared who they believed to be important to the EngageWest movement, and when asked about the perception of the initiative from origination to current, collectively stakeholders identified the president as the primary visionary and driver of change. The work of Beckhard and Pritchett's (1992) vision-driven theory of change most closely supports the findings as it relates to the work of the president. The university's vision of "being the best place

to work, learn, and succeed" has proved to be a major success in communicating the vision expected for the university. The president commonly used the vision statement in writings, public speaking opportunities, and, as a means to encourage faculty and staff to share the vision; according to interviewees, it is often repeated in unison as a mantra. While the full vision statement was not consistently quoted in full during the data collection, pieces of the statement were commonly identified during the analysis. This example supports Birnbaum's (1988) notion that consistent repetition and articulation of the vision helps to realize the expected culture.

Keeping in concert with the president driving the concept and expectation of change through the vision statement, delivery on resources crystalized the leadership commitment. The ability to obtain necessary resources and taking responsibility of sensemaking for constituents of the institution creates a space where the president serves as the pied piper of sorts. Dr. Marrero's charisma in particular was noted in an external consultant interview as a critical factor for success stating, "a different leadership type could still lead this [level of] impact, but he's an amazing *connector* or *vision painter getting enthusiasts on board kind* of leader." While perceptions of enthusiasm and charisma were shared by others, it was more apparent that the president needed to be the driver of change when speaking with the president. Dr. Marrero noted, "whoever wants to venture into this . . . better have a president who won't waiver and will keep driving it and be a catalyst for the program, for the ideology and the direction." This concept aligns with Beckhard and Pritchett's (1992) strategy placing high value on the presidential role.

The perception and recollection of the initiative being leadership driven was applied to the senior leaders almost as frequently as it was to the president. From a structural sense an external consultant remarked as a part of final thoughts during the interview, "if you want to do

this system [wide], you've got to have an engaged president and executive team, who's going to model good behavior or the right behaviors. If not, a president [who is] willing to say that's not the right executive team for me." One senior leader summed up the role of a senior leader well, stating that "the vice president's . . . deans [other leaders] have been influential in trying to talk about it, translate, make sense of it, make it a part of [the] working world, show how it will benefit us in the long run."

Bennis (1989) highlighted the importance of the intrinsic leadership competencies of a leader: vision, meaning, trust, and self-authenticity. The challenges these concepts bring to leadership were noted either directly or indirectly by all interviewee groups. The president and an external consultant both recalled a moment where the intrinsic expectation brought challenge and eventual appreciation of the value-added benefits these competencies bring to leadership. Early on the president pressed the external consultant to provide more direct guidance as to how he should lead through the initiative. The external consultant resisted providing this type of guidance sharing that it is critical for a leader to self-determine a strategy through studying the needs of their environment and taking the approach most authentic for them. While admittingly frustrated during this period of time, President Marrero shared that he believed this to be one of the most monumental points of the initiative for him. He came to understand the value of leadership authenticity, giving him the ability to model the expectation for other leaders.

The role of the leader as sensemaker and modeler of expected behavior is a key institutionalization element relevant to structure associated with Goodman and Dean. The creation of unified goals and expectations that were clear and demonstrable to the campus community has left a long-lasting impression on stakeholders. These concepts and processes also left an impression of vulnerability on senior leaders. It was mentioned in various groups that

senior leaders were required to set performance goals, work throughout their divisions and units towards accomplishment, and report on their performance to the larger campus community. This concept is more commonly referred to as the "senior leader scorecard" on the UWG campus and can be found on the UWG EngageWest website as Senior Leadership Scorecards. Leadership is demonstrated here from a practical program sense which aligns with Curry's first step of institutionalization, *developing a concrete initiative or objective*. The recollection of leadership impact by stakeholders also aligns with Goodman and Dean's behavioral levels *knowledge of behavior* and *performance*. Since the senior leaders were first to model this behavior, vulnerability is a key element within the leadership driven theme. The president stated, "I think one of our greatest strengths in all of this has been how it's really made the senior leadership real and vulnerable and people in the eyes of those that would still want to say we [represent] the dark-side, [administration]." Other senior leaders reflected positively on the strength and growth trajectory that vulnerability brings.

As an example, the 2017 Presidential Scorecard can be found in Appendix G. This particular scorecard shows areas of strength and opportunity. Each year the president presents his scorecard to the USG Chancellor as a part of his annual evaluation, modeling transparency and accountability to the campus community. The vulnerability, structure, and transparency of goal definition and assessment demonstrated through the senior leadership scorecard example directly relates to the next theme strongly identified in the perception analysis, accountability.

Accountability

The senior leadership demonstrations of goal setting and assessment increased accountability and the awareness of opportunities for improvement. The acknowledgement of areas within the institution that are lacking in accountability was a common discussion point

51

among stakeholders. As mentioned in the leadership driven theme, the senior leaders embraced the structural and behavioral components of institutionalization. While the senior leadership scorecards clearly demonstrated the structural concepts of EngageWest, perceptions associated with the Leadership Development Institutes (LDI) and the EngageWest Survey, a workforce engagement measurement tool and initiative, began to elicit more behavioral aspects of institutionalization from the interviewees.

Between years one and two, the learning and living years, it was evident that senior leaders were expected to develop goals and align behaviors to the mission and vision of the institution in order to attain stated goals. While interviewees generally recalled a specific moment or two of targeted concepts that were taught during LDI, a review of the agendas (Appendix E and F) reinforces the perception that a particular focus was intentionally set on teaching leaders at varying levels to understand the goals, identify how they fit in and could contribute, as well as how they and those that they lead were expected to behave, demonstrating an environment similar to that of Birnbaum's cybernetic institution. LDIs also encouraged faculty and staff leaders to engage in conversation, understand perspectives different from their own, and be a part of "solution-making" as stated in the EngageWest initiative definition.

The behavioral lens of accountability resonated with a variety of stakeholders, Staff Advisory Council in particular, through the annual workforce engagement survey, known commonly as the EngageWest Survey that began in the first year of the initiative. The engagement survey questions (Appendix D) are grouped by theme and measure a variety of perceptions from all faculty and staff who participate. The themes included are engagement, leadership, immediate supervisor, communication, environment/campus climate, pay and

benefits, work/life balance, mission and goals, division/college/school subscale, career progression subscales for faculty and staff as appropriate.

The success rate of the survey was mentioned by several interviewees as it has been able to collect data with an 80% or better participation rate per year. The survey questions range from an employee's perception of being heard, connectivity to the institution, and mission alignment. While the measurement of these concepts is important, the accountability factor was predominant during discussion about how this information is used in respect to leaders and their performance and behavior. According to a generally consistent description by stakeholders, once the engagement survey is completed, leaders are universally expected to analyze and discuss their departmental or unit results and then identify ways in which engagement could be improved for the individuals within the unit. Mixed perspectives exists as to whether or not this concept of an open discussion of results has been successful. Some institutional units participated fully in this process, while others took a more cursory approach. It is important to note that the EngageWest survey is not a part of the formal performance evaluation processes for UWG, but the action planning process and associated progress can be.

The president modeled the expectation of how to view and discuss the results by hosting an open town hall each year in which he shared his EngageWest survey results. In a published presentation regarding the 2018 EngageWest results, a trend table demonstrates the content areas within the university that have increased and decreased over the lifespan of the survey (Table 4). The ratings are based on a satisfaction scale from 1 to 5. Overtime the immediate supervisor and engagement areas have seen notable increases, making the case that supervisors in the broadest sense have been successful in improving their relationships, support levels, and engagement of faculty and staff.

Table 4

UWG 2018 Survey Mean Scores (University of West Georgia [UWG], 2018, Slide 14)

Item Category	2015 N=1,151	2016 N=1,185	2017 N=1,368	2018 N=1,280
Engagement	3.79	3.88	3.90	3.97
Leadership				
President	-	4.17	4.13	4.06
Senior Leadership	4.05	3.94	3.91	3.92
Institutional Leadership	3.68	3.92	3.88	3.90
Departmental Leadership	3.93	4.20	4.16	4.15
Immediate Supervisor	4.11	4.30	4.29	4.38
Mission and Goals				
University	4.19	4.20	4.20	4.18
Division	4.03	4.07	4.10	4.10
Department	4.08	4.23	4.19	4.21
Communication	3.45	3.54	3.56	3.54
Climate	3.49	3.63	3.62	3.63
Pay	2.83	2.92	3.00	3.04
Benefits	3.86	3.95	3.92	3.94
Work-Life Balance	3.55	3.59	3.60	3.68
Overall Mean	3.82	3.91	3.90	3.92

While senior leaders and the president have a clear expectation that the purpose of the engagement survey is to create and embrace engagement, Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory council participants collectively agree that pockets exists within the university that are resistant to the expectations that leaders conduct engagement conversations. Some of these pockets admittedly exist, according to the focus group participants, because there is a lack of trust or long-standing interpersonal differences. Regardless of the differences, it is understood and

expected that all leaders be held to the same standard. The perception that the institution has not reconciled the issue(s) or held the leader accountable for non-participation will continually prevent institutionalization from reaching *incorporation* or *normative consensus* levels. The pervasiveness of leaders lacking trust and not being held accountable is not known.

However, as long as the perceptions associated with trust exist, the impact to the institution and success of the initiative is at risk to diminish. Birnbaum's cybernetic institution is referenced here again as he states that it is equally important that senior leaders "screen out" actors that challenge vision attainment as it is to teach, train, and measure leaders at all levels of the institution.

Holistically the increased level of, or perception of, accountability is seen as a good thing, and the institution is benefitting from the efforts it has produced. One senior leader correlated accountability with the benefits of motivation and buy-in stating,

> the positive benefit, as it relates to productivity efficiency and morale around having a highly engaged [campus] invested to the point where people are accountable from a self-motivated standpoint. To [the point] where they buy into the vision and the mission of the organization.

With UWG's vision to be "the best place to work, learn, and succeed," buy-in to this vision through accountability and self-motivation would irrefutably define *incorporation* and *normative consensus* from the lens of institutionalization.

Cultural Awareness and Individuality

As a researcher, looking at culture and individuality often requires an ethnographic approach. While this case study is limited in the ability to fully assess and understand the culture(s) of the institution, it is important to recognize the human capacity for change.

EngageWest, as an initiative, is often spoken of in the sense of a *total institution* as described by Tierney (1985) and the traditional campus community lends itself to the perception that all aspects of the institution are occurring within the same environment. However, the work of Birnbaum (1988) and Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) tells us that the culture of higher education is varied, and multiple cultures can exist within one institution–UWG is no different.

It is clear that characteristics of the collegial, managerial, and developmental cultures are in existence. EngageWest by definition is a developmental initiative with goals to teach leaders how to lead and develop others so they may buy-in to the culture of high performance and accountability while the environment is aware and responsive to their individual needs. The high performance and accountability aspects are more directly correlated to the managerial culture as goals are developed and breakthroughs related to opportunities for effectiveness and efficiency are celebrated. As interviewees reflected on elements of the initiative, the gains in effectiveness and efficiency were cited as clear demonstrations of incorporation. The most common example referenced in interviews was of the Barrier Team.

The Barrier Team, an EngageWest initiative committee, is defined by UWG as a group of individuals created to

> identify, assess, and provide recommendations for improving operational processes, policies, and practices with the goal of eliminating barriers of inefficiency. With a culture and mantra of problem-solving, this team must align identified barriers with efficient solutions through the lens of mandated statues, governing policies, and system shared services (University of West Georgia [UWG], 2018).

In further review of the website and conversation with interviewees, it is interesting to note that sledgehammers are awarded and mounted in the foyer of the President's office as symbols of

barriers being broken or eliminated. To date, eight sledgehammers have been awarded according to the EngageWest website. An example of a sledgehammer award is related to the revision of the academic calendar. Efficiencies and effectiveness improvements identified in this effort are increases in instructional time, additional time allowances for administrative processing, and the creation of a fall break for students as well as creating more time to transition between classes daily. The recognition of awards reinforces the *performance* construct of behavioral institutionalization. Actors within the institution are indeed performing the expected behavior, and the celebration of those acts demonstrate encouragement.

The commitment and demonstrated success of the improvement initiatives garnered the attention of the governing body. In addition to the local presidential award, the Barrier Team, the Best of the West employee recognition program, and EngageWest's indirect impact to student retention was recognized by the University System of Georgia's Chancellor's Service Excellence Award, Institution of the Year and President in 2015. UWG's EngageWest effort has direct alignment to the USG Service Excellence Program (SEP) "established to provide the platform for a higher level of coordination of performance-based partnerships resulting in enhanced student experiences and success" (University System of Georgia, 2017, Recognition programs webpage). To qualify for the Outstanding Institution of the Year and President, both must demonstrate commitment and display high performance over the last year. "The Nominee's actions must reflect [at least five of] the following . . . attributes of service excellence: respectful, accessible, informed, supportive, culture of collaboration or teamwork, high morale of employees, organizational performance" (University System of Georgia, 2017, Recognition programs webpage). Birnbaum's (1988) and Balderstone's (1995) work asserts that the task of university governance is to create effective autonomy for the campus community. I

believe that EngageWest is a demonstration of autonomy without losing sight of alignment to the overall system needs and expectations, and for that recognition is received.

While the Barrier Team clearly defines a managerial culture with a strong team approach, and the USG service excellence award brings forth developmental and collegial concepts, some interviewees expressed a lack of the collegial culture as it relates to EngageWest. In particular, the Faculty Senate group recognized the many benefits that the EngageWest initiative has brought to the UWG campus community and staff members. Faculty Senate believed that EngageWest has helped to create a more equitable environment where faculty and staff interact more as peers in a shared community whereas in the past, feelings of superiority toward faculty were perceived and described by some. However, it was noted that beyond the feelings of improved morale, which should not be discounted, faculty in general are not perceived to be able to see and understand the impact of EngageWest in their day to day lives of teaching, research, and service. After further validation, if EngageWest indeed lacks a direct correlation to the specific role and needs of the individual faculty member, the collegium should be consulted to ascertain expectations. When discussing faculty engagement, one senior leader correlated this need back to the institutional core, stating

> . . . if an overall engaged campus is functioning, first and foremost, to further the educational mission, and then, the educational mission is flourishing, which then provides support for the overall campus effort. Then, that could be a virtuous cycle, I think.

If done in earnest, culture and the educational mission of the institution could work together in a continuous cycle that serves all individuals whether or not it is known to all individuals in the same way or language.

Here, individuality of the actors meets isomorphism, demonstrating the importance of both. Understanding that the mission of the institution to serve and educate students is the common thread, while the mode of action or the nomenclature used by individual actors can vary. While the Faculty Senate group did not see EngageWest as a common understanding among faculty, faculty are undoubtedly benefactors of the culture efforts. As stated by a senior leader, "a fully engaged university must have critical faculty . . . critical faculty who will push back, and that's got to be seen as okay; in fact, it's a sign of health. If you don't have a critical faculty, then you don't have a university."

However, it is important to note that the adoption rate of various programs and efforts vary by department or unit based on the level of readiness of the individual leader or unit, academic and non-academic alike. Despite the understanding that some may be more prepared than others, EngageWest creates a structured approach and strategy, leaving some individuals and units behind or in a position of difficulty. The Staff Advisory Council recounted stories of staff members working in units where misunderstandings occurred in the attempt to carry out initial initiatives, such as implementing goals associated with the engagement survey, now creating a perception of EngageWest leaving departments behind the curve and staff members feeling that they were missing out on or not a part of the collective success. While these areas seem to be in the minority, again pockets of low adoption defy the ability of the initiative to reach *Incorporation* or *Normative Consensus*.

Approach to Change: Time and Organizational Maturation

The EngageWest initiative is aligned with the academic year: the learning, living, leading, and legacy years. The focal points of each year are built upon the previous year with an expectation that at the conclusion of the physical year, the institution is prepared to move on to

the next stage of the "program." Here we find the point of true dissention with many of the stakeholders and the programmatic expectations of the initiative.

The questions relating to perceptions were framed in the context of the EngageWest nomenclature, for example the living year. While it took most individuals a moment to think back over time and the program evolution, the terms learning, living, leading, and legacy resonated only with the president, external consultants, and senior leaders in respect to their proficiency of use. For those in the Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council groups, the nomenclature did not resonate well, and they were better able to reflect on the years as one, two, three, and four. However, the general concept of time sparked conversation with several interviewees who had attended LDI and had not heard those terms. They found it interesting that each year had a title so to speak, and quickly articulated that they could see how it was beneficial to the LDI and other concepts that involved campus leadership, not intended for the campus as a whole.

The senior leadership, however, explored the nomenclature from the standpoint of time: how much time does change actually take? Perceptions varied as to whether or not the learning, living, and leading years actually reached the point of attainment. Generally, participants agreed that the institution was not at a clear point of legacy in the beginning of the fourth year. Most interesting was the reflection on the origination of these terms by the president. The time themes were actually developed after the first two LDIs. When asked to reflect, the president shared that

> what now looks like a nice wonderful package in the case study, on what we did, it was [actually] a little engineered and reversed in some cases; [we said] okay, that's what we did so let's call it that. And this is where we are and where we're headed. So, that's the truth of it.

It is interesting now that the terms have taken on more of a structured meaning even though they originated from a need to capture the moment in reflective exercise. A common language or nomenclature can contribute to and support sense making efforts. With such a large and comprehensive initiative, the use of common definitions and points of direction can positively impact the critical mass. Bolman and Gallos (2011) and Beckhard and Pritchett (1992) remind us of the importance that strategy, best fit approaches, and the ability of the broad population to understand what actions they are expected to carry out at specific points in time.

The current year, the legacy year, gave the greatest concern. One senior leader stated, "the idea of declaring year four as the legacy year is an artificial construct" going on to say, "it's going to take more time as legacies often do take more time to build up." When the same leader was asked how long EngageWest would take to reach a legacy year or period, the thought was around 10 years at least. Another senior leader was asked the same follow up question and responded:

> I let the circumstance speak for itself. So, when EngageWest is successful, the results will speak for themselves. To actually claim victory is unnecessary because victory will claim itself, because we already know what we're after is a greater success for our students and that is measured one student at a time. And we can see, we don't have to say it, we can see it. It just is there or it's not.

This same leader assessed the current state of EngageWest as in the learning period. These assessments and estimations of institutionalization all beg the question, where is the destination?

The perceptions related to time are hard to contextualize into a specific stage of institutionalization. Based on the lack of understanding, this concept is still in the early stages of *knowledge of behavior* even though many individual actors are indeed operating much further

ahead in other realms. As we move into the second research question related to achievement and sustainability, the clarity of what is expected begins to give meaning and guidance to the program and the organizational maturation process.

Sustainable Practices for the Future

The second question of the study focused on the future of EngageWest, seeking to understand what stakeholders expected in order to attain and sustain the cultural transformation associated with it. Expectations of clarity and focus encompassed what the campus perceived as to what was necessary for the future. In order to frame the context of the future, participants were asked to describe UWG in an ideal state. A communal view of the ideal state for UWG consisted of an institution that believes in the mission of generating knowledge, educating students, and servant leadership that holds people accountability in a values-centric way. The ideal state for UWG also allowed individuals to flourish and be able to thrive in a way that best suits the needs of their role and as an individual. Finally, the ideal state of UWG does not include a life without challenge, but an environment that can adapt to the needs of society through continuous reflection and improvement.

From the defined ideal state, the primary themes that emerged were the need to maintain a mission focus, remain adaptive, practice disciplined leadership, and practice intentional enculturation. While these concepts were not directly shared by all of those that participated, the inductive approach to data coding created themes that were representative of the collective.

Maintain Mission Focus

When asked the question as to how the EngageWest initiative could be sustained in a meaningful way to those that had faculty responsibility, it was consistently stated that the initiative was good, but a challenge for the average faculty to relate the efforts back to their work

of teaching, research, and service. Senior leaders and the Faculty Senate focus group participants believed that the EngageWest initiative has spurred an improvement in morale that is likely to be the reason that new faculty are attracted to the institution, as it creates a sense of community and collaboration that individuals look for when seeking faculty roles. However, it was stated that finding student involvement and activities that are directly linked to faculty responsibilities can be a challenge in the existing program. In my review of the strategic materials such as the strategic plan and key performance indicators, this did not hold true. The 2014–2020 strategic plan (University of West Georgia [UWG], n.d.) for UWG identifies academic and student success as key pillars. Each goal in the strategic plan has expectations to enrich the academic platform, the student experience, and increase the student success rate. Key performance indicators in the realm of student success and academic success saw upward trends in over 50% of the areas for fiscal year 2017 (University of West Georgia [UWG], n.d.).

The EngageWest website serves as the primary communication platform with each initiative having its own subpage. Record graduation rates, enrollments, attainment of resources, institutional and program awards, and recognition have been realized and attributed to EngageWest (University of West Georgia [UWG], n.d.). Unless broadly circulated internally, this information is not easily gathered from the EngageWest website as it was found in presentation materials and not as a direct link. A direct articulation for teaching, research, and service support is not readily found in formal EngageWest communications. I was able to confirm through review of the website subpages that this information was also presented in two campus town hall sessions. Opportunity exists for an enhanced communication strategy that works to communicate these successes to the broader campus community, thus being readily seen and understood by the critical mass.

It was suggested that senior leaders take a step back and look at putting a group of faculty together to identify what type of involvement and communication would keep them engaged and aware of EngageWest activities. The goal of this concept was referred to helping faculty find the "missionary zeal," essentially helping faculty key into what makes them want to engage with the full experience instead of teaching their discipline and going home. Bridging the gap between the faculty community and EngageWest may transition the initiative into a state of incorporation that is recognized by all constituents.

Remain Adaptive

This dissertation started by discussing the competing priorities of the higher education today. The way things have always been done will no longer suffice. The ideal state for UWG was consistently described as a productive environment that did not require success at every venture, but mediocrity was not a choice, and change would always be necessary in order to remain competitive. The president added a concept to his definition of an adaptive state describing an institution

> which is not subject to the winds, and the arrows and the flames that are thrown at us, that there's a spirit, a can do, a solving and evolving continuum and culture and attitude, with not only leadership but the entire institution; that we always see a way through; that we are quick to be agile and move and make [change] happen.

This comment speaks beyond being adaptive and reaches toward resilience and the full state of institutionalization where the values of the organization guide the behavior first and foremost. As one senior leader warned, UWG must be careful not to define a finite ideal state as that would indicate that we are no longer growing and changing, therefore defining the antithesis of what EngageWest was intended to create.

UWG has attempted to document their ability to adapt and attain success in relevant realms celebrating faculty, staff, student, and university success. Started in November 2014, during the Living Year, UWG began producing the Points of Pride publication.

At the University of West Georgia, we are in the business of transforming lives and we are focused on success. With so many advancements at UWG, our campus is constantly brimming with excitement. Through the Points of Pride, we celebrate these achievements and examine our success through the four major Strategic Imperatives of our Strategic Plan – Student Success, Academic Success, Partnership Success, and Operational Success. Congratulations to all those who strived for excellence and have achieved it. (POP, November 2014 edition)

Examples of achievement chronicled in Points of Pride include prestigious opportunities and awards granted to faculty and staff. Student accolades are also included, of both current and alumni to highlight achievements during and beyond their time at UWG. Partnership success identifies not only fiscal contributions, but also positive community trends such as the local community being on the *Ten Least Expensive College Towns* list and how UWG contributes to providing a robust community experience at a low cost (POP, August 2015 edition). Operational success looks to spotlight ways the university is improving its operational portfolio for the benefit of student. Examples of operational success include faculty contributions to the lowering costs of textbooks. The academic success highlights emphasize the development of new programs and educational ventures, achieving national and international attention.

In concert with the intent of the EngageWest movement, Points of Pride demonstrates the agility of the institution alongside the achievement expected by the initiative showcasing the campus community from the unique lenses of campus life. As noted by multiple senior leaders,

buy-in and campus participation are critically important to the process of vision attainment, remaining adaptive, and maintaining a resiliency that allows the university to be relevant to society and institutional mission.

Disciplined Leadership

A challenge represented at varying levels among interviewees was the expectation of leadership to maintain consistency in accountability within the institution. The Staff Advisory Council group voiced the concern that some leaders that do not desire to change or improve engagement for their staff have been allowed to remain at UWG. On the other hand, the Faculty Senate group recounted that two "negative-minded" people were hired and released during the probationary period with an assumption that leaders within their organization facilitated this action so that they maintain consistency among individual actors. These two examples demonstrate the varying levels of perceptions when it comes to leadership, accountability, and acceptable behaviors.

Disciplined leadership was selected as a theme for sustainability because it begins with the senior leaders and transcends throughout the organization and has impact on the overall achievement of the institution. Having different levels of accountability throughout the organization could present a threat to all of the efforts put forth as it relates to the positive attributes of EngageWest. The work of Bennis (1989) identified two leadership competencies that apply here, management of trust and management of self. Senior leaders are trusted to hold those under their command accountable, but this truly requires the management of self to do the work consistently under their authority.

Disciplined leadership also speaks to the development and attainment of goals which is a core value of institutionalization. An external consultant pressed that creating very specific goals

are key and when they are achieved, leaders must acknowledge and take time to celebrate the achievements with consistency. It is not a new finding to state that individuals will mimic those that they respect and are willing to work hard next to them. An air of sincere respect of the president was noted through the interviews, yet individual actors acknowledged that he must be careful not to continue to push new goals. The absence of disciplined goal setting that is appropriate for the institution was also noted as a concept to defy institutionalization giving way to goal fatigue and burnout. The president, senior leaders, and Staff Advisory Council acknowledged goal fatigue as being a threat, but the ability to recognize and reset as appropriate was an area that leaders, particularly the president must be attuned to.

Intentional Enculturation

Setting the intention for culture and morale has the ability to provide an anchor for the sustainability of EngageWest. One senior leader summarized that a well curated and sustained culture such as EngageWest must become the job of everyone, not just those who participate in the new hire orientation. At the point of full institutionalization from a behavioral sense, *normative consensus*, the communication of a consistent message should be pervasive within the institution. An example shared by a senior leader related to an individual going through the formal curriculum required by Human Resources for all new hires that communicates the tenets and expectations of EngageWest. If this individual then returns to their office and the culture and expectations are not reinforced by other staff and/or supervisors in that office, then this inconsistency alone is strong enough to prevent *incorporation* or *normative consensus*. Therefore, it is critical that all individual actors be able to find their unique connection to the shared vision and culture expectations. And this connection can and likely will have a direct correlation to productivity and results.

One Staff Advisory group participant stated that "the more pride we have for the university, then it's easier to sell to the students or incoming students." Another Faculty Senate member stated that they noticed recently the number of faculty and staff members who wear UWG apparel to work and away from work during personal time. In their time of over ten years with the university, they could not think of a time where employees wanted to wear UWG themed clothing. If this demonstration of pride is occurring in the present moment, it is a good sign institutionalization is moving towards attainment. The demonstration of pride through artifacts, such as a t-shirt, is an indication that the road to institutionalization may be closer and more attainable than one thinks.

This leads to the final thought as it relates to sustainability and creating legacy through intentional culture setting; the University of West Georgia must celebrate and tell its story. The counter to burnout is balance and reflection as it relates to a person or organization. *Harvest the wins* is a phrase used by one of the consultants, and it essentially means that any initiative or effort must honor achievements and use that as the fuel to continue pushing forward.

Through continuing to set attainable goals for the institution, measuring the levels of engagement, consistently articulating the vision and mission, and broadly communicating and celebrating success true culture shift can be achieved and sustained. A senior leader commented that leaders at all levels must be fully committed and speak the language in order to sustain change. The demonstrable ability for leaders and the critical mass to articulate the shared culture may not require that the articulation sound the same; and for UWG this is okay as long as the behavior of individual actors support the established mission, vision, and goals. The allowance of individuality here continues to support other stated expectations for sustainability.

Summary of Findings

An overview of the perception themes and sustainability factors found in this study has been provided in Table 4. Each theme and factor has been correlated to the institutionalization framework concepts previously identified in Table 1. For research question one, the framework alignment is based upon the collective assessment of the current state during the data collection phase of the case study. Sub-themes listed for the general themes provide more descriptive concepts realized through the findings that relate to the core themes.

The framework for research question two demonstrates the type of behavioral or structural effort that is required to sustain institutionalization once attained. The sub-themes for question two represent more descriptive and concrete expectations for sustainability.

While the findings do not support that full achievement of institutionalization has occurred, UWG has realized substantial progress. Through the lens of institutional leaders, the findings indicate that the legacy year is an inexact status, but clarity exists as to what actions are require for forward movement. Bess (1992) asserted that culture was not homogenous, but rather heterogeneous in a loosely coupled environment. This case study contends that EngageWest and the existing culture at UWG is indeed a fair representation of Bess's definition of culture and supports that an environment with a varied culture can lead to a path of shared vision, mission, and goal attainment. As summarized in the purpose statement of EngageWest, the creation of an inclusive community where through individuality the institution is able to be the best place to work, learn, and succeed demonstrates institutionalization. Success of this initiative is not built on a concept of perfection, but rather one of individuality and accountability that allows the shared vision to be realized in a multitude of ways.

Table 5

Overview of Research Findings and Correlation to Institutionalization Framework

Research Question	Themes	Framework Alignment: Curry (C) or Goodman and Dean (G&D)	Sub-Themes
What perceptions exist with campus stakeholders as it relates to first four years of EngageWest? Do these perceptions demonstrate achievement of initialization as described by the theoretical frameworks of Curry and Goodman and Dean?	Leadership Driven	Structural (C)	Presidential ownership; Clarity of expectations; Leader vulnerability
	Accountability	Performance (G&D) and Normative Consensus (G&D)	Senior leader demonstration of accountability; Perception versus reality
	Cultural Awareness	Structural (C) and Preference of Behavior (G&D)	Culture and alignment to goals
	Allowance for Individuality	Preference of Behavior (G&D)	Recognition that campus constituents will need to meet mission of institution in different ways

	Approach to Change: Timing and Organizational Maturation	Knowledge of Behavior (G&D)	Allowance for natural timelines and institutional shift
	Maintain Mission Focus	Incorporation (C) and Normative Consensus (G&D)	Minimize distraction to teaching, research, and search; Involve students
What do stakeholder perceptions of the EW implementation to date suggest about the potential for the sustainability of the initiative and full institutionalization, if not fully achieved to date?	Remain Adaptive	Normative Consensus (G&D)	Impact of external factors can influence environment
	Disciplined Leadership	Procedural (C) and Normative Consensus (G&D)	Consistent accountability; Management of goal setting; Awareness of fatigue
	Intentional Enculturation	Incorporation (C)	Shared culture responsibility; Maintenance of morale; Celebration of success

71

CHAPTER 5

The purpose of this research study was twofold: (a) to assess the perceptions of an active culture transformation initiative and identify the level of institutionalization attained thus far; (b) identify factors that would support full attainment and sustainability. Chapter five reviews the questions addressed by this study and summarizes the findings. Future opportunities for further study have also been identified. Looking beyond the scope of the University of West Georgia, implications are addressed for other institutions seeking to embark on institutionalizing a change effort.

The literature suggests that the occurrence of institutionalization can follow a behavioral or structural theoretical construct. This study merged those two concepts and then incorporated cultural and leadership theories to guide and frame the level of institutionalization attained at the institution of study. Understanding that the cultural transformation initiative of study was in the fourth year of activity, campus stakeholders were interviewed to understand their perceptions of the initiative thus far. Participants were also asked to share their expectations for future attainment of institutionalization and sustainability of program gains thus far.

Elite interviews were conducted with the president, institutional vice presidents, and external consultants who were contracted to assist in EngageWest activities. Two focus groups, Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council, were held to capture the voice and perceptions of the larger university audience. Participants were grouped by stakeholder type and referred to as a collective group rather than by name. The president was the only exception to this rule. Snowball interview suggestions were collected; however, the point of saturation was reached for

the established questions and the addition of new questions for additional interviewees would have broadened the study beyond the acceptable scope.

Interviews and focus groups data points were inductively coded during the data collection phase. The coding structure was validated through the review of transcribed data points using electronic qualitative data software. Supporting materials and artifacts were deductively coded and used to support or validate information learned during the interviews, where appropriate. Themes were determined through a combination of frequency during data collection and strength of correlation to the framework.

Discussion

The findings of this study focus on the two research questions. Discussion of each question illuminates the themes identified as well as connections to the literature. The first question focuses on the perception of campus stakeholders and whether achievement of initialization has been realized at the institution of study. The second question looks to identify the expectations associated with sustaining institutionalization and the achievements of EngageWest.

Question One - What is the assessment of institutional leaders regarding the first four years of EngageWest? Does this assessment demonstrate achievement of initialization as described by the theoretical frameworks of Curry and Goodman and Dean?

Understanding the perceptions of an initiative in the midst of active implementation allows for the institution to determine areas of success and identify opportunities to course correct, if needed. The perception findings were categorized by theme and then level of institutionalization. Five major perception themes were identified during this process: leadership driven, accountability, cultural awareness, allowance for individuality, and approach to change.

The themes range from low level demonstrations of institutionalization to that of successful implementation.

Leadership Driven

The notion of the program being *leadership driven* is a demonstration of Curry's structural level of *institutionalization*. A core responsibility of leadership in an endeavor such as EngageWest is to create and articulate a vision for the institution that upholds the mission and lays the groundwork for the values to be acted upon. The president of UWG has clearly set the vision and expectations for campus constituents as well as demonstrated accountability and vulnerability for himself and senior leaders. With the creation of scorecards and the engagement survey, it is well documented that UWG has created the structural expectation for the campus which correlates with the theme of accountability.

As Bennis (1989) indicated in his work, it is important for senior leaders to maintain a threshold of control and management of oneself during the process of change. President Marrero's integration of outside consultative services that specialize in the management of people and operational excellence should be recognized as a foundational strategic structure. It can be argued that leaders, executive and those at the forefront of the academic and operational units, have great responsibility in the success of a change effort initiative. Maintaining time and structured opportunities for leaders to hone their management qualities and seek alignment with the university on a regular basis has been commendable.

As noted in the literature and findings, there is a staunch expectation and dependency upon the president to continuously drive the effort in order for the campus to remain engaged. By engaging an outside consultative service, the president secured for himself a panel of trusted advisors who were able to challenge, reassure, and assist with maintaining purpose,

intent, and authenticity. These advisors were key in assisting the president in defining and shaping the change initiative which was branded "EngageWest." As other senior leaders at other institutions contemplate engaging in this type of work, it will be important to establish a trusted network as a self-imposed accountability measure. However, the success of EngageWest is highly dependent on the management level closest to the larger faculty and staff base to remain engaged and drive the purpose of the initiative. A gap in the middle management levels within the institution could subject the initiative to irreconcilable inconsistencies leading to the importance of maintaining accountability.

Accountability

While *accountability* has been demonstrated by the president and senior leaders and appears to be evidenced through engagement measures and scorecards, there is a perception that pockets exist within the institution where unit leaders are not demonstrating the vision and values of the change initiative. This awareness and rejection of dissention is evidence of *performance* and *normative consensus* theoretical attainment as described by Goodman and Dean as well as Curry. *Normative consensus*, as a reminder, is awareness of expected behavior and acknowledgement or potential rejection of actors who choose an unaccepted path. The observation of two behavioral levels of institutionalization existing at one time within one institution also supports the position that multiple cultures can exist within the institution simultaneously (Birnbaum, 1998; Bergquist and Pawlak, 2008). The existence of multiple cultures is more likely to be related to the preexisting cultures and their readiness level for change, which speaks to the third theme *cultural awareness*.

While rejection of actors who choose not to accept the new behavioral expectations is one method of attaining a preferred environment, it does not replace the need for

accountability. Accountability must exist in order to attain and sustain change among all campus

constituents. The findings note that the adoption rate of EngageWest varies among the various

units; however, the reason why was largely unknown during the course of study. A responsible

approach to accountability is advised to first validate those who choose an alternate path from

those that lack understanding of the expectation. While a large population of leaders attend the

training sessions offered, the content is often dense and delivered within short and constrained

periods. Future study and decisions would benefit from exploring a deeper understanding from

units with low adoption rate in order to design accountability measure that addresses the needs of

a unit first and foremost, without punitive repercussion. Leaders must be steadfast in managing

accountability and the purpose of EngageWest which is to a part of solution-making and not just

going the motions participation. With the EngageWest survey not being a part of the formal

evaluation process at onset, careful attention will be necessary as the program continues to

develop. Moving from a developmental program to one that may be seen with opportunity for

punitive action could be met with a harmful shift in perception. As Kezar noted (2014) in her

work, forced radical change without understanding is more apt for detrimental results rather than

positive impact.

Cultural Awareness and Individuality

Bergquist and Pawlak's (2008) multiple culture identities of being collegial,

developmental, and managerial appear to be strongly represented at UWG, resulting in a

different response pattern from the respective groups in some cases. A formal or anecdotal

experimentation with measuring cultural archetypes and readiness would have been informative

for the institution of study and potentially shifted the structure of the initiative. The findings

associated with low level adoption rates by various units and leaders may be correlated with varying levels of readiness and authentic culture preferences.

The developmental and managerial realms are responsive to the model of teaching behavioral expectations and monitoring the effectiveness. Those within the collegial realm, faculty and staff, have pockets of reluctance or inability to align their work to the initiative requiring an expectation of individuality greater than what is being provided at the institutional level. The creation of individual alignment and expectation of the institution to do so will take time and effort of those within the institution of study. The developmental and managerial realms are responsive to the model of teaching behavioral expectations and monitoring the effectiveness.

Wholesale structure for change to fit one cultural archetype does not appear to be warranted. However, a better awareness of needs based on the organization's cultural archetype(s) may have improved the *need for individuality* and *approach to change* with a focus on timing and organizational maturation. The findings support a less prescriptive approach to EngageWest and that may in fact be the solution that will solve perceptions of faculty misalignment or lack of connectivity. An example of a less prescriptive approach could be demonstrated through hosting more LDIs without formal agendas or delivered content and more working sessions for cross-functional teams in broadly defined groups that meet more immediate needs and challenges for leaders. Opportunity is without bounds here and engaging the collegium in what they need is likely to be the best approach to resolution.

Approach to Change: Time and Organizational Maturation

Culture change takes time and one senior leader surmised that UWG has another 10 years or so left to see the full level of change expected. A nomenclature and time construct was created

77

for EngageWest approximately one year into the initiative: the learning, living, leading, and legacy years. While this concept was understood by interviewees, I was hard pressed to find voices that felt this implementation strategy was known and accepted by the campus community or a fair depiction of the initiative implementation. For those that may be considering a path such as EngageWest, it was generally advised by the majority of interviewees that the concept of a "year" should be abandoned and the implementation concepts be rolled out in phases instead of annually. This approach will allow the appropriate time to be spent within a phase as needed. The potential fault in the phased approach versus the annual approach will be keeping the organization moving and not stalling in the living phase in hopes of generating a faultless legacy.

It will be important for future endeavors at other institutions and the sustainability of EngageWest to set clear, attainable, and measurable expectations whether a phase or definitive time period is set forth. The ability to understand the expectation and clearly define the point of achievement is critical to those within the community. It should also be noted that various approaches to change could be considered and implemented for the appropriate cultural archetypes and readiness in existence.

The importance of nomenclature was a keen and interesting finding. While the living, learning, leading, and legacy year language was new to some and critically reflected upon, there was a common appreciation for having a nomenclature that defined the institution in current and future states. The creation and communication of this language earlier in the program may have provided significance benefit as it relates to writ-large culture change. The ability for individuals to speak in common terms can be helpful without infringing on necessary individuality and autonomy. Other institutions choosing to embark on a culture change will find significant value

in visioning the journey and utilizing guiding language similar to the learning, living, leading, and legacy year or phases.

Question Two - What do the perspectives of institutional leaders relating to the EW implementation to date suggest about the potential for the sustainability of the initiative and full institutionalization, if not fully achieved to date?

The second research question seeks to understand the perception of campus leaders regarding the sustainability of EngageWest and continuing institutionalization. The following four focus points were identified as core initiative sustainability and institutionalization factors: maintain mission focus, remain adaptive, disciplined leadership, and intentional enculturation. The ability to implement these factors would secure a position of structural *incorporation* and behavioral *normative consensus* for UWG beginning with a focus on institutional mission.

Maintain Mission Focus

Institutional mission, size, and existing culture may call for the consideration of varying approaches to change. It was noted in the findings that a portion of campus constituents, in particular faculty, did not perceive that EngageWest had direct alignment to the core *mission* of teaching, research, and service. As stated by one senior leader, the institution must be careful not to allow programming or initiatives such as EngageWest to be perceived as a mission drift with faculty but rather a deeper dive into the existing societal mission. It will be crucial for the senior leaders to communicate the connectivity to those in the faculty role. However, true connectivity will be found in those that have immediate supervisory responsibility such as a department chair or a unit level manager. This immediate supervision realm of the institution should be held

accountable to the mission, vision, and values, but not as contributors to the definition of such concepts.

While staff may not have demonstrated concern with mission drift in the findings, maintaining mission focus is still critical in this realm. Institutional staff carry a large role in supporting the academic mission of an institution from those in academic advising to individuals with fiscal responsibility. To develop goals and invest time into matters that are adrift of the institutional mission can create inconsistency and inefficiencies within the institutional having direct impact on the ability to fulfill the institutional mission. Leaders must be attuned to the need to continually evaluate alignment of activities to the institutional mission and redirect as necessary.

Remain Adaptive and Disciplined Leadership

Eckel and Kezar (2011) have said that the adaptability or agility of an organization lies within the lower levels of leadership. UWG recognizes that agility within the lower levels will help them to have continued performance success as well as full institutionalization of a renewed culture. The efforts already in place such as the Leadership Development Institute, engagement survey, and newly established unit level practical training programs will continue the path of creating an agile institution that takes on a disciplined approach to leadership.

Adaptability and disciplined leadership are placed together with intent. In order for leaders to remain agile and adaptive, they must be in the mode of continual learning and the assessment of performance within the internal and external environment. The luxury of the world standing still is not afforded to any institution and the impact to culture is inevitable. Self-managed accountability to some degree is warranted and eventually expected in institutionalization. The structural sense of *incorporation* says that new values and norms are

accepted while the behavioral perspective says that the environment demonstrates the values once *normative consensus* occurs. Both concepts are in agreement that at the point of institutionalization, the values and norms drive the environment and performance, creating a self-regulating disciplined culture. The culture not only expects a disciplined approach from its leaders, it also expects discipline from the individual actors.

It has been noted in the findings and the discussion that leadership has maintained dedication to quarterly leadership meetings that engage in the efforts of alignment, growth, and development. This commitment is not always met with a positive response or understanding of necessity. However, to change at a pace such as EngageWest, maintaining a cadence of engaging, assessing, and responding to the needs of the institution allows the campus to realize the benefits of disciplined leadership and culture of adaptability. Overall, as the institution continues to progress it was important to all study participants that leaders remain grounded in the institutional values and attuned to capacity in which the campus is able to change.

Intentional Enculturation

To continue building and maintaining a disciplined environment, the institution must take on an intentional culture approach when educating and developing individuals within the environment. It was stated during an interview that human resources could not be the holder of responsibility when it comes to the education of culture; that responsibility must be broadly incorporated into all units. Setting the expectations of campus culture must be the job of everyone. Here, we may find the true critique of the EngageWest initiative and leadership-driven program structure.

The leadership-driven model has merit and is indeed warranted to create an institutional change of this magnitude. However, we must go back to where change truly happens at the

individual level. The EngageWest model must find a way to instill the responsibility of campus

culture in all employees. Each person must take ownership and have self-regulated

responsibility of being the holder and creator of campus culture. Celebrating success and

maintaining a sense of pride was important to both Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory Council

and possibly the best indicator of institutionalization. A sense of pride is closely related to the

connectedness of an individual to the institution and being recognized for your accomplishment

provides needed validation.   The achievement of wholesale responsibility for campus culture at

the day-to-day individual level will not only create institutionalization from a behavioral and

structural sense, it will also realize the purpose of EngageWest to create "an environment where

people will know what to do, why they are doing it, and what we intend to accomplish

(University of West Georgia [UWG website], 2016)."

Future Study and Discussion

 Importance of Faculty and Staff Voice

During the course of the study, the function of leadership and perceptions associated with

the role of being a leader became the core focus. To study the role of faculty and staff as

responsible stakeholders, rather than beneficiary constituents, would complement this study and

the concept of institutionalization. It was suggested that this concept be explored through

additional focus groups consisting of staff and faculty without previous or current leadership or

responsibility to administration. These focus group sessions could have been hosted; however,

the established semi-structured interview protocol would have had to be amended to fit this

demographic.

In the course of the sessions with both focus groups, Faculty Senate and Staff Advisory

Council, it was apparent that the EngageWest nomenclature and time periods did not resonate

with those who had limited or no previous experience with the Leadership Development Institutes (LDI). The lack of ability to align the questions with campus culture reflections did not produce data that could inform the research questions regarding institutionalization attainment and sustainability in a meaningful way. However, analysis and study of the campus wide engagement survey may lend itself to providing the representative voice of faculty and staff needed.

The survey (Appendix C) asks questions related to campus climate, perceptions of leadership, and the expectations of an individual to feel supported within the campus community. At the close of the 2018 year, five years of longitudinal engagement data will be available for study. At present date, the institution has not completed any formal research analysis of the annual survey data. Leaders have only been able to do this individually with their own data points, if they felt inclined to do so and they possess the ability to interpret the results. Given the diverse population of the university campus, it would be important to look at this from a *total campus* perspective.

This analysis could define positive and negative correlations that may exist with themes or sub-themes which could significantly inform the future direction and sustainability factors for the EngageWest initiative. Capturing the voice of the campus in totality would be required as campus leadership continues to look at ways individual contributors will be able to engage in ways that are beneficial to them and their role within the stated mission, vision, and values of the institution.

Impact of Leadership Changes

Previously I have stated that the voice and role of senior leadership is important to the success of a large-scale campus culture transformation initiative like EngageWest. The president

and senior leaders noted that the commitment of this group is an absolute necessity for cultural institutionalization, beginning with the creation of a stated vision. Beckhard and Pritchard's (1992) vision-driven change theory relies on unstated leadership consistency much like EngageWest. A deeper dive into sustainability could bring clarity to the threats and opportunities that a leadership change could bring to the effort.

A new leader could denounce the efforts thus far, but this is less likely to happen in an effort that has seen success over the course of the initiative. Full institutionalization would bring about the level of change required that would keep values and performance in place, even with leadership change. The true question is whether or not values and performance can exist without the structural components of leadership scorecards, leadership development institutes, and an engagement survey. While this study did not include a review of the financial investment in the EngageWest effort, it is known that resources are required to fulfill and support the promises of such an initiative. This is the most likely area of opportunity for a new leader to assess and make alternative decisions as to how they will personally invest in the campus community.

Given the tenure of the president, now in his fifth year of presidency, and senior leaders ranging from two to ten years in position, it would be healthy for senior leaders to look at ways to sustain the initiative that will transcend time. The request from faculty and staff to continue working on efforts at the individual level may be a part of the remedy. Eckel and Kezar (2011) remind us that change within the smaller units is where it is done best and has the ability to be agile. As UWG looks at the potential to implement the sustainability factor of an individual experience, a case study to document the approach would be a valuable addition to the literature.

Conclusion

At UWG, the overall perception of EngageWest by campus leaders assumed a position of a *procedural* stance from the structural lens of Curry and *performance* from the behavioral sense of Goodman and Dean. This merged perception takes into account that there are concepts and units that are at levels of *incorporation* and *normative consensus*. However, EngageWest is largely perceived to be an activity driven by leadership, and the activities of the program solidify this perception. As the program continues to be incorporated into the organization, and individual units and actors institute change on a continual basis as best fits them, the perception of the program will continue to evolve and mature.

The most commonly used phrase in the collective interviews and focus groups was *I think*. Whether the question related to sharing program expectations, a recollection of the past, or a person's expectation for the future, this study reminds us that culture is as much about perception as it is structure and behavior. The University of West Georgia has demonstrated the strong achievement towards institutionalization and ability to recognize areas for continued effort and opportunity. It is without question that the fulfillment of the initiative is still highly dependent on the president and senior leaders' ability to articulate the vision, create the structure for individual contributors to receive the resources and direction needed to perform, and the leadership capacity and fortitude to hold units and campus leaders accountable when the stated values are violated or not demonstrated.

I challenge the concept that any organization can fully attain institutionalization for more than a moment. To define and create an environment where institutionalization has been met would require static activity of some of the core drivers of culture, people and values. Without question, we know that people are ever changing, and the landscape of higher education is ever-

evolving impacting institutions like UWG on a daily basis. While UWG has not been able to

discern full institutionalization, I would argue that through continual evaluation of the most

productive environments for faculty and staff, a dedication to remain cognizant of the mission,

and empowering leaders to hold and be held accountable, that UWG could yield a desirable

culture – which was the initial objective.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities

Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and organization* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Balderston, F. E. (1995). Managing today's university: Strategies for viability, change, and excellence (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beckhard, R., & Pritchard, W. (1992). Changing the essence: The art of creating and leading fundamental change in organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. (1989). *The unconscious conspiracy continues* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). Engaging the six cultures of the academy: Revised and expanded edition of the four cultures of the academy (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bess, J. L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research viii*, pp. 1-36). New York, NY: Agathon Press.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice (Vols. I-II). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Gallos, J. (2011). *Reframing academic leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boston, C. (2002). *The concept of formative assessment* (ED470206). Retrieved from ERIC Digest: www.eric.ed.gov

Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/article/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000006287.69207.00

Creswell, J. W., Roskens, R. W., & Henry, T. C. (1985, January/February). A typology of multicampus systems. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *56*(1), 26-37. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981720

Curry, B. K. (1992). *Instituting enduring innovations. Achieving continuity of change in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983, April 1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147-160. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095101

Eckel, P. D., & Kezar, A. (2011). Presidents leading: The dynamics and complexities of campus leadership. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century* (3rd ed. (pp. 279-311). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eddy, P. L. (2006, September 01). Nested leadership: The interpretation of organizational change

 in a multicollege system. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *30*(1),

 41-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668920500248878

Ewell, P. T. (1998). Achieving high performance: The policy dimension. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.),

 The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance (pp. 120-161). Baltimore,

 MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays by Clifford Geertz. New York,

 NY: Basic Books.

Goodman, P. S., & Dean, Jr., J. W. (1982). Creating long-term organizational change. In (Ed.),

 Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice (pp. 226-

 279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hamilton, N. (2000, Summer). The academic profession's leadership role in shared governance.

 Liberal Education, *86*(3), 12-20. Retrieved from http://proxy-

 remote.galib.uga.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=

 ehh&AN=3610438&site=ehost-live

Hammond, S. A. (2013). *The thin book of appreciative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Bend, OR: The Thin

 Book.

Johnstone, D. B. (1999). Management and leadership challenges of multicampus systems. In G.

 Gaither, *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects* (pp. 3-20).

 Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Kezar, A. (2005, November). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions:

 An exploration into the developmental process. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(7),

 831-860. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-6227-5

Kezar, A. (2013, June). Understanding sensemaking/sensegiving in transformation change

    processes from bottom up. *Higher Education*, *65*(6), 761-780.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9575-7

Kezar, A. (2014). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change*. [Kindle

    Cloud Reader]. Retrieved from https://read.amazon.com/

Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century:*

    Recent research and conceptualizations [ASHE - ERIC Higher Education Report,

    Volume 28, Issue 4]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. D. (2002, July/August). The effect of institutional culture on change

    strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts. *The*

    Journal of Higher Education, *73*(4), 435-460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2002.0038

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002, June). Examining the institutional transformation process: The

    importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher*

    Education, *43*(3), 295-327. http://dx.doi.org/0361-0365/02/0600-0295/0

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

    implementation (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Proposed Engage West Survey [Measurement instrument]. (2015). Unpublished instrument.

    Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/community/engagewest/assets-

    engagewest/docs/Proposed_Engage_West_Survey.pdf

Schmidtlein, F. A., & Berdahl, R. O. (2011). Autonomy and accountability. In P. G. Altbach, P.

    J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first*

century: Social, economic, and economic challenges (3rd ed., pp. 69-87). Baltimore, MD:

    The John Hopkins University Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: Restructuring academic work*

    and careers. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shinn, L. D. (2014). Top down or bottom up? Leadership and shared governance on campus.

    Change, *46*(4), 52-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2014.925766

Smerek, R. E. (2013, Spring). Sensemaking and new college presidents: A conceptual study of

    the transition process. *The Review of Higher Education*, *36*(3), 371-403.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0028

Studer Education. (n.d.). http://www.studereducation.com/

Tierney, W. G. (1985). Ethnography: An alternative evaluation methodology. *The Review of*

    Higher Education, *8*(2), 93-105.

Tierney, W. G. (1988, January/February). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining

    the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(1), 2-21. Retrieved from

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981868

University of West Georgia. (2016). *EngageWest Orlando presentation* [PowerPoint

    presentation slides]. Carrollton, GA: Author.

University of West Georgia. (2016). The University of West Georgia 2015 - 2016 fact book.

    Retrieved from

    https://www.westga.edu/administration/president/iea/assets/docs/Fact_Book__2016_Web

    .pdf

University of West Georgia. (n.d.). *General FAQ* [EngageWest Fact sheet]. Retrieved from

      https://www.westga.edu/assets-

      opentext/assetsADV/engagewest/Engage_west_general_FAQ.pdf

University of West Georgia. (2018). *UWG EngageWest town hall* [Presentation slides].

      Retrieved from University of West Georgia, EngageWest survey committee website:

      https://www.westga.edu/community/engagewest/assets-engagewest/docs/engage-west-

      survey-rollout-presentation-2018.pdf

University of West Georgia. (n.d.). University of West Georgia institutional performance

      indicators - strategic plan 2020. Retrieved from

      https://www.westga.edu/administration/vpaa/iea/assets/docs/UWG-

      InstitutionalKPIsDashboardExecScorecard.pdf

University of West Georgia. (n.d.). UWG strategic plan 2014-2020. Retrieved from

      https://www.westga.edu/administration/president/assets-

      president/docs/StrategicPlan_Brochure_pages.pdf

University System of Georgia. (2017). www.usg.edu

Wilson, S. (1977, Spring). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. *Review of*

      Educational Research, *47*(2), 245-265. Retrieved from

      http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170130

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). United States of America:

      SAGE.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: EngageWest! Initiative Goal Statement

EngageWest! is a cultural-transformative movement that promotes an environment in which all individuals know and own their roles and responsibilities in achieving the aspirational vision of the University of West Georgia.

We are engaged in growing ourselves to grow others!

We are building an environment where people will know what to do, why they are doing it, and what we intend to accomplish. At the same time, people will be engaged and part of solution-making!

People - Purpose – Action (University of West Georgia [UWG website], 2016)

Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Introductory Protocol
For the purpose of accurate data collection, I would like to audio record our conversation today. This audio recording will only be heard by the researcher(s) associated with the project. Once transcribed, the audio recording will be deleted and destroyed. For your protection and to meet human subjects research requirements, I have provided you with your consent documents via email. This document informs you of your rights and discloses the intent for the study. Your participation is voluntary and may be stopped at any time that you request as I do not intend to cause harm or make you feel uncomfortable. All interviewees will be referred to in the study by their group pseudonym rather than by position or name, such as Senior Leader, Faculty Senate, Staff Advisory Council, or External Consultant. The only exception to this structure will be President Marrero, given the specificity of the role. Your signature is not required, and the continuation of this interview will serve as your consent. (IF consent is given, move on to interview introduction and begin recording.)

Introduction
You have been selected to participate in this study because you have been identified as someone who has insightful information to share about the EngageWest initiative. The goal of this study is to identify the perceptions of EngageWest at the beginning stages of the initiative and throughout the implementation. I am also trying to learn about what expectations you have in order to ensure that EngageWest will be sustainable in the future.

This interview is expected to last approximately one hour. I will be considerate of your time and will attempt to ensure we spend the appropriate amount of time on each question. Should we need additional time, we can discuss an amenable time to have a follow up conversation.

Interview Questions
*** Ask focus group participants to speak their name, title, and area of the university to ensure that voices are accurately transcribed prior to start of questions.
1. How would you describe EngageWest?
    a. Probe – What is the purpose of EngageWest?
    b. Who is involved in the EngageWest initiative?
2. What do you recall about the implementation of the initiative, the learning year?
    a. Probe – What specific thoughts are needed
3. Now that EngageWest has been in progress for three years, what are your thoughts about the implementation of the living, and leading years?
4. From your perspective, who has been influential to the EngageWest initiative?

5. What has been the impact to the campus since the EngageWest initiative began?
6. Can you share a personal experience associated with EngageWest?
7. If you could describe UWG in an ideal state what would that look like as the effort moves into the fourth year, the legacy year?
8. Can you describe what activities or actions need to take place to achieve the ideal state just described?
    a. Probe – How will EngageWest help UWG achieve the ideal state?
9. Thank you for your time today. Is there any additional information that you would like to share that would be helpful to this study? Is there anyone else that you think I should talk to?

Appendix C: Chart of initial finding constructs

Category Name	Number of times referenced
Structure	36
Accountability	35
Leadership - General	35
Culture	34
Personal Growth	30
Purpose	30
Organization Maturity	29
President	27
Individuality	26
Measurement of Success	25
Awareness	24
Time	24
Engagement	21
Imperfection	19
Sustainability - Intentional Enculturation	18
External Influence	16
Optimistic Morale	16
Engagement Survey	14
Leadership - Vice President	14
Organic	14
Organization Layers - Faculty	10
Sustainability - Communication	10
Vulnerability	10
Organization Layers - Shared governance	9
Resources	9
Sustainability - Recognition of success	9
Acceptance	8
Employee Influencers	8
Sustainability - Adaptive	7
Sustainability - Cohesiveness	7
Organization Layers - Overall	6
Sustainability - Disciplined Leadership	5
Fear	3
Leadership - USG System	2
Organization Layers - Staff	2
Students	2
Sustainability - Flexible	2

Appendix D: Annual Employee Engagement Survey

Annual Modules (always included) – 29 questions – Scaled 1 to 5 Strongly Disagree to Strongly

Agree

Engagement (17 questions)

1. The work I do is meaningful.

2. My work positively impacts the success of our students.

3. Within my workplace, there is a feeling of community.

4. I feel personally driven to help this university succeed.

5. I go beyond what's expected of me to ensure the success of the university.

6. My ideas and opinions count at work.

7. My job meets my expectations.

8. The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable.

9. I feel a sense of pride when I tell people where I work.

10. I feel my efforts count.

11. I believe I have a career with this institution.

12. The University invests in my individual development.

13. I have a clear understanding of what is expected of me in my work.

14. I receive the support needed to accomplish my work objectives.

15. I am given credit for my contributions and achievements.

16. I am provided with adequate funding for my professional development.

17. I recommend this University as a good place to work.

Demographics (10 questions)

1. My highest level of education is:

       a. Did not finish high school

       b. High school graduate (or GED)

       c. Some college

       d. Associate's degree

       e. Bachelor's degree

       f. Master's degree

       g. Doctoral degree

2. Which of the following best describes your gender identity? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

       a. Male

       b. Female

       c. Transgender

       d. Other (Please specify)

3. My age (in years) is:

       a. 16-29

       b. 30-39

       c. 40-49

       d. 50-59

       e. 60 or older

4. I have been with UWG for:

       a. Less than one year

       b. 1-2 years

c. 3-5 years

d. 6-10 years

e. 11-15 years

f. 16-20 years

g. More than 20 years

5. Which of the following best describes you?

a. Asian

b. American Indian or Alaska Native

c. Black or African American

d. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

e. White

f. Multiracial (Two or more)

g. Other (Please specify)

6. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

a. Yes

b. No

7. Which of the following best describes you?

a. Married

b. Living together as if married/Cohabitating

c. Widowed

d. Divorced

e. Separated

f. Never married

g. Other (Please specify)

8. I am:

a. Tenured Faculty

b. Tenure-track Faculty

c. Full-time Non-Tenure-track Faculty

d. Part-time Faculty

e. Staff – Full Benefits Eligible (30 or more hours per week)

f. Staff – Partial Benefits Eligible (20 to 29 hours per week)

g. Staff – Non-Benefits Eligible (19 or less hours per week)

h. Staff – Temporary (employment is short in duration)

9. Are you a -

a. Disabled Veteran

b. Armed Forces Service Medal Veteran

c. Other Protected Veteran

d. Recently Separated Veteran

e. Not a Veteran

10. Are you the caregiver for someone who cannot carefully for themselves, like a child or an

aging adult?

a. Yes

b. No

Additional Questions (2 questions)

1. I believe we will use the information from this survey to improve our performance.

2. Do you have any additional comments? (Open-ended)

Optional Modules – 9 Modules

Leadership (18 questions)

- Senior Leadership Subscale (fill in names of senior leadership to clarify question)

  a. I think highly of Senior Leadership.

  b. Senior Leadership is sincere in wanting to know how I feel.

  c. With the current Senior Leadership, I am confident UWG will be successful.

  d. Senior Leadership communicates openly on University issues.

  e. Senior Leadership is transparent when making decisions.

  f. Senior Leadership is helping to move UWG in a positive direction.

- Institutional Leadership Subscale (fill in names of institutional leadership to clarify)

  a. I think highly of Institutional Leadership.

  b. Institutional Leadership is sincere in wanting to know how I feel.

  c. With the current Institutional Leadership, I am confident UWG will be successful.

  d. Institutional Leadership communicates openly on University issues.

  e. Institutional Leadership is transparent when making decisions.

  f. Institutional Leadership is helping to move UWG in a positive direction.

- Department Leadership Subscale (fill in names of department leadership to clarify; only ask if applicable)

  a. I think highly of Department Leadership.

  b. Department Leadership is sincere in wanting to know how I feel.

  c. With the current Department Leadership, I am confident UWG will be successful.

113

d. Department Leadership communicates openly on University issues.

e. Department Leadership is transparent when making decisions.

f. Department Leadership is helping to move UWG in a positive direction.

Immediate Supervision (9 questions) (Fill in name of immediate supervisor to clarify)

a. I have confidence in the abilities of my immediate supervisor.

b. My immediate supervisor cares about me as a person.

c. My immediate supervisor treats me fairly.

d. My immediate supervisor gives me feedback about my performance.

e. My immediate supervisor recognizes outstanding work.

f. My immediate supervisor gives me the opportunity to do my best work.

g. I work with my immediate supervisor to set clear objectives and goals.

h. My immediate supervisor supports my attempt to balance my work and home responsibilities.

i. My immediate supervisor has worked with me this year on my development.

Communication (4 questions plus 6 overlap)

a. I find the University website helpful in keeping up with the latest developments.

b. I am kept informed on matters that affect UWG.

c. The right information gets to the right people at the right time.

d. Open and honest communication is encouraged at UWG.

e. (Add questions d & e from each subscale in the Leadership module if it is not being asked)

Environment/Campus Climate (10 questions)

   a. Faculty are treated fairly at UWG.

   b. Staff are treated fairly at UWG.

   c. Employees here are treated better than employees at other academic institutions.

   d. This is a comfortable environment in which to work.

   e. The University is consistent in handling issues for all employees.

   f. Policies are applied fairly to all faculty and staff.

   g. In my workplace, I believe people are generally treated fairly, without favoritism.

   h. Discrimination is NOT tolerated at UWG.

   i. UWG is effective at retaining valuable people.

   j. In general, employees in this university take initiative to help others when the need

   arises.

Pay and Benefits (10 questions)

- Pay Subscale

a. My pay is fair when compared with similar colleagues in similar organizations.

b. My pay is fair when compared to my colleagues here at UWG with similar

responsibilities.

c. My pay keeps pace with the cost of living.

d. I am paid adequately for the level of work I do.

e. Leadership around campus is working to improve my pay.

- Benefits Subscale

a. Benefits at UWG are comparable to those provided by other academic institutions.

b. I understand my benefits plan.

c. Benefits can be selected to meet individual needs.

d. I know where to go if I have questions about my benefits plan.

e. Leadership around campus is working to improve my benefits plan.

Work/Life Balance (3 questions plus 1 overlap)

a. I feel supported in my attempt to balance work and personal life.

b. Staffing levels in my department are appropriate for the workload.

c. I find I am able to balance my home and work life effectively.

d. (Add question h from the Immediate Supervisor module if it is not being asked)

Mission and Goals (15 questions)

- University Subscale

a. I have a good understanding of the mission and goals of UWG.

b. I am committed to the mission and goals of UWG.

c. I have a clear understanding of the future direction of UWG.

d. I am encouraged by the progress I see at UWG.

e. My work is important to the success of UWG.

- Division/College/School Subscale (tailor this question to fill in division, college, or school for clarification)

a. I have a good understanding of the mission and goals of my Division/College/School.

b. I am committed to the mission and goals of my Division/College/School.

c. I have a clear understanding of the future direction of my Division/College/School.

d. I am encouraged by the progress I see in my Division/College/School.

e. My work is important to the success of my Division/College/School.

- Department Subscale (only ask if applicable)

a. I have a good understanding of the mission and goals of my Department

b. I am committed to the mission and goals of my Department.

c. I have a clear understanding of the future direction of my Department.

d. I am encouraged by the progress I see in my Department.

e. My work is important to the success of my Department.

Faculty Only (9 questions)

a. The tenure process is clear and transparent.

b. The promotion process is clear and transparent.

c. The standards for tenure at UWG are difficult to achieve.

d. The standards for promotion at UWG are difficult to achieve.

e. Faculty who receive tenure at UWG, deserve it.

f. Faculty who receive promotion at UWG, deserve it.

g. Faculty who deserve tenure at UWG, receive it.

h. Faculty who deserve promotion at UWG, receive it.

i. Promotion and Tenure guidelines align with institutional goals and priorities.

Staff Only (3 questions)

a. I feel secure in my position.

b. Promotions go to the best qualified people.

c. I am provided with adequate opportunities for advancement.

Appendix E: May 2014 Leadership Development Institute Agenda

Day 1 - Leadership Development
Michael Hester - MC

8:00 – 8:45   Full Breakfast

8:45 – 8:55   Connect to Purpose – Zach Bearden (student)

8:55 – 9:45   State of University – President Marrero

9:45 – 11:00   Guest Speaker – Dr. Keith Eigel

11:00 – 11:15 Break

11:15 – 12:15 Overview of Engaged West (Janet to talk about what the outcomes - What can you expect in three years – accomplished – cultural and transformational. What will we look like in three years. Also, show the scorecard to set the stage for strategic planning session)

12:15 – 1:00   Lunch

1:00 – 1:45   Activity – Social Team – Core Values

1:45 – 3:00   Roll Out Examples – Janet (PAC Team members) – Developing Action Plans

3:00 – 3:15   Break

3:15 – 4:00   Activity – Social Team – Team Play Tubes

4:00 – 4:30   Employee Annual Evaluation Processes – Juanita Hicks

4:30 – 5:00   Take Aways for the Day – by Table (ask each person to debrief on a take away and then each table present one to the group)

5:00   Evaluations of the Day – Linkage Team

Day 2 – Leadership Meeting

7:30 – 8:00   Continental Breakfast

8:00 – 8:10   Re-Connect to Purpose – Linkage Team

8:10 – 9:30   Strategic Planning and Assessment 101 – Cathi Jenks, Pamala Dixon

9:30 – 9:45   Break

9:45 – 10:30   Annual Reporting template – Cathi Jenks, Kathy Kral

10:30 – 11:45 Reward and Recognition – Team Presentation and break-outs

11:45 – 12:00 Linkage – from now until August

engage west!
Leadership Development Institute
Connect. Transform. Succeed.

VALUE, RESPECT and ACCOUNTABILITY (counting on each other)

Engage West LDI - August 15, 2014, 8:00am – 5:00pm - Campus Center Ballroom
Jane McCandless - Emcee

7:15 a.m.	Breakfast (optional)
8:00 a.m. – 8:15 a.m.	Connect to Purpose: Social Team Activity
8:15 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	What Have We Accomplished: President Kyle Marrero
8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Senior Leadership Presentation of Scorecards: Kyle Marrero Micheal Crafton, Jim Sutherland, Scot Lingrell, Bill Estes
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	Presentation of KPIs and Peers and Aspirants: Cathi Jenks
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	BREAK
9:45 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.	Presentation of Departmental FY15 SMART Goals and Link to Institutional Strategic Plan: Camilla Gant (Mass Communications), Diane Hoff (College of Education), T.J. Peele (University Recreation)
10:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	Presentation of Departmental Survey Rollout Action Plans: Micheal Crafton (Academic Affairs), Brian Henderson (ITS), Mike Hester (Honors), Justin Barlow (Admissions)
11:00 a.m. – 12 noon	Next Steps FY15 and Beyond: "What Change Looks Like:" Dr. Janet Pilcher & Kyle Marrero
12 noon – 1 p.m.	Lunch

Revised 7.31.14

Appendix G: 2017 Presidential Scorecard

President's Scorecard 2016-2017							
1 - Alert	2 - Area of concern		3 - Goal met		4 - Met stretch goal		5 - Met super stretch goal
Imperative	Goal	Weight	Scale	Outcome	Score	Weighted Score	Status
Student Success	Graduation: Confer 2,450 degrees	12.0%	5 = 2,500+	2610	5	6	
	*Institutional record		4 = 2,451 - 2,499				
			3 = 2,400 - 2,450				
			2 = 2,300 - 2,399				
			1 = 2,299 and below				
Student Success	Progression: Achieve 6-year graduation rate of 41%	10.0%	5 = 42% +	41.21%	4	4.0	
			4 = 41% - 41.9%				
			3 = 40% - 40.9%				
			2 = 39% - 39.9%				
			1 = 38.9% and below				
Student Success	Retention: Maintain 30, 60, 90, SCH retention rate at 74%	12.0%	5 = 75.6% +	72.34%	1	1.2	
			4 = 74.6% - 75.5%				
			3 = 73.6% - 74.5%				
			2 = 72.6% - 73.5%				
			1 = 72.5% and below				
Academic and Operational Success	Faculty/Staff Median Salary: Increase Faculty Salary at 88% of CUPA median and increase Staff Salary to phase II of the new entry point for all 19 pay bands	10.0%	5 = 90+	88%	4	4	
	*Institutional record		4 = 88-89				
			3 = 86-87				
			2 = 84-85				
			1 = 83.9 and below				
Operational Success	Employee Engagement: Increase score on "Engagement" to 4.0 on Employee Engagement Survey	8.0%	5 = 4.2+	3.91	3	2.4	
	Previous year was 3.88		4 = 4.09-4.19				
	*Institutional record		3 = 3.9 -4.0				
			2 = 3.8-3.89				
			1 = 3.8 and below				

Operational Success	Total Enrollment (FTE): Increase FTE for all constituencies from 11,530 to 11,800	9.0%	5 = 11,900+	11877	4	3.6
	*Institutional record		4 = 11,801 - 11,899			
			3 = 11,701 - 11,800			
			2 = 11,601 - 11,700			
			1 = 11,600 and below			
Operational Success	Total Enrollment (HC): Increase total head count enrollment at all sites from 12,834 to 13,300	12.0%	5 = 13,450+	13,308	3	3.6
	*Institutional record		4 = 13,350 - 13,449			
			3 = 13,250 - 13,349			
			2 = 13,150 - 13,249			
			1 = 13,149 and below			
Academic, Operational, Partnership, and Student	Fundraising: Achieve $7M in total annual gifts and pledges	12.0%	5 = $8.0M+	$5,541,771	1	1.2
			4 = $7.5M - $7.99M			
			3 = $7.0M - $7.49			
			2 = $6.5M - $6.99			
			1 = $6.49 and below			
Academic, Operational, Partnership, and Student	Fundraising: Achieve $4M in VSE annual reporting	7.5%	5 = $4.25M+	$4,191,779	4	3
			4 = $4.01M - $4.24M			
			3 = $3.75M - $4M			
			2 = $3.5M - $3.74M			
			1 = $3.49M and below			
Partnership Success	Economic Impact: Increase regional economic impact from $463M to $480M	7.5%	5 = over $500M	$518M	5	3.75
	*Institutional record		4 = $481M - $499M			
			3 = $471M - $480M			
			2 = $463M - $470M			
			1 = $462..9M and below			
				FY2017 Score Final		3.275