EMBRY-RIDDLE
Aeronautical University
SCHOLARLY COMMONS

Publications

12-28-2023

# Deep Change Theory: Implications for Educational Development Leaders

Caitlin Martin
*Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University*, martc148@erau.edu

Elizabeth Wardle
*Miami University*

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.erau.edu/publication

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Leadership Commons, Higher Education and Teaching Commons, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

## Scholarly Commons Citation

Martin, C., & Wardle, E. (2023). Deep Change Theory: Implications for Educational Development Leaders. *Changing Conceptions, Changing Practices: Innovating Teaching across Disciplines,* (). https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646423040.c003

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

EDITED BY

Angela Glotfelter

Caitlin Martin

Mandy Olejnik

Ann Updike

Elizabeth Wardle

# CHANGING CONCEPTIONS, CHANGING PRACTICES

## Innovating Teaching across Disciplines

# CHANGING CONCEPTIONS, CHANGING PRACTICES

*Innovating Teaching across Disciplines*

EDITED BY
ANGELA GLOTFELTER,
CAITLIN MARTIN,
MANDY OLEJNIK,
ANN UPDIKE, AND
ELIZABETH WARDLE

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
*Logan*

© 2022 by University Press of Colorado

Published by Utah State University Press
An imprint of University Press of Colorado
245 Century Circle, Suite 202
Louisville, Colorado 80027

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

The University Press of Colorado is a proud member of the Association of University Presses.

The University Press of Colorado is a cooperative publishing enterprise supported, in part, by Adams State University, Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Colorado, University of Denver, University of Northern Colorado, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, and Western Colorado University.

∞ This paper meets the requirements of the ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (Permanence of Paper).

ISBN: 978-1-64642-303-3 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-1-64642-304-0 (ebook)
https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646423040

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Glotfelter, Angela, editor. | Martin, Caitlin, editor. | Olejnik, Mandy, editor. | Updike, Ann, editor. | Wardle, Elizabeth (Elizabeth Ann), editor.
Title: Changing conceptions, changing practices : innovating teaching across disciplines / edited by Angela Glotfelter, Caitlin Martin, Mandy Olejnik, Ann Updike, and Elizabeth Wardle.
Description: Logan : Utah State University Press, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index
Identifiers: LCCN 2022040216 (print) | LCCN 2022040217 (ebook) | ISBN 9781646423033 (paperback) | ISBN 9781646423040 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher) | Academic writing—Study and teaching (Higher) | Interdisciplinary approach in education. | Curriculum change. | College teaching—Vocational guidance. | Educational innovations.
Classification: LCC PE1404 .C4728 2022 (print) | LCC PE1404 (ebook) | DDC 808/.0420711—dc23/eng/20220920
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022040216
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022040217

Support for this publication was generously provided through the Roger and Joyce Howe Distinguished Professor of Written Communication account at Miami University.

Cover photograph by Nkosi Shanga

# 3

# DEEP CHANGE THEORY

## *Implications for Educational Development Leaders*

Caitlin Martin and Elizabeth Wardle

### INTRODUCTION

While chapters 1 and 2 explore the promise of theoretical frameworks for making conceptual change that leads to innovative action around teaching and learning in higher education, they also point out the challenges to this kind of work as teams of faculty strive to lead change in their programs and departments after completing the program. To summarize our claims thus far: one of the goals for the HCWE Faculty Writing Fellows Program is to empower faculty who participate to return to their departments to make programmatic changes—changes they identify as central to their work and values and program culture. The kinds of changes we advocate for in the Fellows Program are initially conceptual—that is, we support faculty in learning new ideas about writing and assume they will then use their new conceptions to initiate change in curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and so forth. We don't tell them how to assign or teach writing in their courses but instead support them as they think through their own ideas for innovation. As many chapters in this collection illustrate, and as chapter 2 already illustrates, such change is possible, but it is not without challenge.

Since 2017, as we have followed and supported Fellows alumni as they have tried to promote larger changes in their departments and programs, we have been repeatedly struck by the challenges they face. We have come to recognize their challenges are representative of a set of systematic challenges to leading change in higher education: many individuals who want to act as change agents have no formal training in leadership or how to lead change. In addition, cultural norms, including those of departments and institutions, as well as individual disciplines and fields, serve to powerfully regulate behavior and constrain change efforts while also remaining largely unrecognized or invisible to those seeking to make change (Kezar 2018).

https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646423040.c003

Copyright 2022. Utah State University Press.
All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY
AN: 3446789 ; Angela Glotfelter, Caitlin Martin, Mandy Olejnik, Ann Updike, Elizabeth Wardle.; Changing Conceptions, Changing Practices : Innovating Teaching Across Disciplines
Account: s8860532.main.ehost

Ultimately, our argument in this chapter is that if educational developers seek to support faculty in making deep, meaningful change around not only how they teach but also how students learn and how curricula are designed across programs and universities, then educational development programs can't stop at providing seminars on research-based practices and theories of writing and teaching. Rather, they benefit from including direct discussion of what leadership entails, why faculty members can and should lead change efforts, and how change efforts can be meaningfully enacted. We have never seen a writing-related faculty development program that does this work—and our program at Miami has not historically done it, either. We came to the conclusion that we *should* be doing it only after watching our colleagues return to their departments and programs and face constraints and obstacles to enacting and leading change.

In this chapter we discuss the challenges of institutional and departmental culture change and the challenges of supporting faculty in seeing themselves as change agents who seek to make deep change in higher education. First, we outline two types of change that educational development leaders might find useful in meeting their own change goals and supporting others in changemaking efforts. We then discuss the challenges for faculty who attempt to lead deep, meaningful change around teaching and learning in higher education systems. We end with some methodologies that faculty leaders can employ to make change in their programs and departments.

## A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF TYPES OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

In order to act as change agents, individuals benefit from understanding different types of change and the ways those change efforts are led. As we briefly discuss in chapters 1 and 2, change theorists distinguish between two general types of change: *first-order changes* include changes to behavior and practices, while *second-order change, or deep change*, involves changing underlying belief systems that in turn change behavior and practice (Kezar 2018). First-order and deep changes involve different change processes, with first-order changes being more linear and rational while deep change is ongoing and recursive (Kezar 2018). The types of changes educational development leaders often seek can fall into both categories. Curricular change, for example, can be a first-order change that occurs in a linear and straightforward way, such as when it is mandated by a campus leader or committee. Curricular change can also be evidence of an accompanying deep change, such as

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

if changed conceptions lead teachers and faculty to make changes in their curriculum so it better aligns with their understanding of teaching and learning. Those seeking to make change around teaching and learning benefit from understanding both types of change in order to determine what change process best aligns with their desired outcomes.

If faculty members think about change, they typically think about first-order change, which often occurs in a planned, linear fashion. First-order changes often lead to new processes for doing work without necessarily changing the underlying mindsets or beliefs around that process. For example, the registrar's office may create a new process for overenrolling students in courses. This new process is communicated to faculty and students, who will take up the new process without changing their ideas about acceptable class size or why they might enroll students beyond the designated course cap. In this example, there is likely a designated leader or group of leaders who can help faculty and students understand the change and act in new ways. First-order approaches to change are already common in higher education contexts, such as organizational development, strategic planning, and total quality management, and, according to Adrianna Kezar (2018), there is a wealth of research available on leading first-order change.

In fact, first-order change actually dominates scholarship in change theory and also dominates the daily lives of most faculty members (often to their frustration). First-order changes can easily be pointed to and assessed, which likely accounts for the attention paid to these efforts in a culture where efficiency and accountability are the watchwords of the day. Programs and universities can easily point to new requirements as evidence of change. However, as we discuss in chapter 2, such first-order changes, while potentially important and useful, do not necessarily ensure something meaningful is happening in daily practice. If the problem is as we outline in chapters 1 and 2—that the current focus on efficiency and accountability does not in fact lead to deep learning—then deep change in the values and culture of the system itself must be pursued.

In contrast to first-order change, deep change is a change "that is so substantial that it alters the operating systems, underlying values, and culture of an organization or system" (Kezar 2018, 85). Deep change is, as might be expected, extremely difficult; as Kezar puts it, "Research is not encouraging" for individuals who want to lead deep change. Deep change is often likely to be resisted, especially if "change is too radical or is vastly different from the existing system" (71). Deep change *does* lead to structural changes of the same sort that might be led through first-order change strategies, including "substantial changes to the curriculum, new

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

pedagogies, changes in student learning and assessment practices, new policies, the reallocation of funds, the creation of new departments" (86). These changes represent deep change when they are accompanied by implicit evidence of deep change, which does not lend itself to traditional assessment and reporting approaches, such as change in attitude and culture shifts, the "way groups or individuals interact with one another, the language used by the campus . . . or the types of conversations that occur, as well as the abandonment of old arguments or the emergence of new relationships" (86). The difficulty, of course, is knowing when a first-order change has meaningfully resulted from deep change or whether it is the result of surface-level mandates.

One of the fundamental challenges to leading the kinds of deep change we advocate is that it cannot be mandated. It requires more than changing practices that can be easily tracked or assessed. Instead, deep change "involve[s] constantly helping others to understand the nature of the change and reinforcing why it is important for learning" (Kezar 2018, 71). Deep change requires, then, an ongoing learning process using methods like sensemaking and organizational learning, through which higher education stakeholders are introduced to new ideas and given the time and space to integrate these new concepts with their existing beliefs before developing new approaches to curriculum or pedagogy. Because of its underlying emphasis on change as a learning process, deep change benefits from distributed leadership that involves a variety of institutional stakeholders. As educational development leaders, we are most interested in how faculty members can, from the bottom up, lead deep change in their programs and departments, not just in their individual classrooms. Yet supporting faculty to lead these meso- and macrolevel changes requires a deeper understanding of institutional culture and appropriate methods for leading change. These system changes also face a variety of challenges, to which we now turn.

## CHALLENGES TO MAKING DEEP CHANGE

If educational development leaders want to lead deep change or empower others to do so, they benefit from considering the wide variety of challenges change agents might face. Institutional and departmental cultures can afford or constrain change efforts, and many change agents will need support in navigating multiple layers of institutional culture in order to lead change. In addition, faculty may not see themselves as change agents, and the nature of the promotion and tenure system typically does not reward curricular leadership.

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

*Institutional and Departmental Culture*

Any effort by individuals or groups within a university setting to effect deep change around teaching and learning is bound by larger rules of the game. Institutional and departmental cultures are important considerations for all change initiatives but particularly so when leaders want to facilitate deep change. Culture is a “powerful norm” that can regulate behaviors (Kotter 2012), but “the cultural system is implicit,” so “change agents often overlook it” (57). Faculty members pursuing change, then, must understand the existing culture (of their department, of the university, of the system of education overall and its current embodiment of a disintegrative view of learning), a task that requires them to bring to consciousness tacit assumptions and conventions. The work of uncovering existing cultural norms and assumptions can help potential changemakers understand the relationship between existing culture and the change they seek. In higher education in particular, there may be multiple cultures to navigate within a single institutional context, including departments and institutions themselves, as well as the norms and practices of individual academic disciplines. While not all changes require cultural change to be successful, the culture always bears on what any potential change agent can do.

One way of understanding how cultures bear on local change efforts is to think about Pierre Bourdieu’s conceptions of field and *habitus*. Programs, departments, divisions, and universities are all part of what Bourdieu describes as a “field”—in this instance, the field of higher education. Thus, no person or program, no matter how powerful, operates with complete agency. Rather, “our modus operandi are bound in various ways by ‘the rules which define the ordinary functioning of the field’ ” (Bourdieu 1991; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 101). Everyone working in universities is a “social agent” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 115) in the “social game.” For the most part, we as individuals feel the pull of the larger field and its rules on all we do, even if only with a vague sense of frustration. For example, our program budgets may be cut while we are also required to provide more formal assessment reports; we are frustrated, but we may not recognize the way the rules of the game have changed, resulting in this frustration: what states view as valuable and worth funding has changed over time, and thus education budgets are cut while accountability initiatives are increased (Newfield 2018), a point we return to in the afterword. Individual faculty feel the results of this change even if they are never explicitly told what the larger “rules of the game” are. This frustration matters for our purposes in this collection because it is important to recognize that no individual or team

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

who completes an educational development program is simply free to make any change they desire. They are constrained by the "rules which define" the "ordinary functioning" of the field of higher education. And they are additionally constrained by the rules that define the functioning of their local institution, their division, and their department.

Each institution has what Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke and Ciaran Sugrue (2020) call a "dominant institutional orientation" (19), and the leaders of those institutions have "implicit leadership theories" that influence what those dominant institutional orientations are. These are rarely if ever explicitly named or discussed, but together, these orientations "create a force field in which . . . employees and students are obliged to play the game" (19). We all, of course, have some agency, but this agency has limits. Sometimes the resistance individuals feel around change efforts is linked to implicit attitudes, values, orientations, and dispositions that are never named but clearly influence how easily particular changes can be effected. In chapter 2 we suggest conceptual change around writing, teaching, and learning that leads to changed practices should be a goal of writing-related faculty development (and other educational development) programs. This goal, much more than smaller goals around specific curricular practices, is likely to butt up against the *habitus*[1] of the field—the local university and larger education system—in ways that can make change very difficult. If, for example, faculty recognize that deep learning of threshold concepts or disciplinary ways of thinking and practicing require students to fail and struggle for extended periods of time within liminal spaces, the types of assessments typically mandated in higher education as imperative evidence of accountability must be dismantled. Such a change would require taking on currently accepted rules of the game, leading change in the system or field itself. This work is extremely difficult and requires faculty members to understand how leadership works within bureaucratized systems and how change can be effected within such systems.

### *Leadership in an Academic Environment*

So far in this chapter, we have established that the deep changes we want to support faculty in making are difficult. While faculty teams who have changed their own conceptions of writing return to their departments with plans for changed coursework, curriculum, and assessment, they often encounter roadblocks identified in chapter 2. Others in their department do not share the same ideas of writing, teaching, and learning that the departmental teams have developed and as a result might

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

be apathetic or even antagonistic toward the changes individuals want to make. In addition, larger cultural assumptions and values of their universities and the educational system in general are always influencing what changes can be made. At this stage of changemaking efforts, then, leadership is crucial (as is an understanding of the nature of and constraints to change). Yet faculty members (and department chairs and program directors) rarely have training in either leadership or leading change efforts (Collins 2014; Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020). James Collins (2014) has outlined a number of problematic assumptions about academic leaders that have resulted in "many institutions of higher education" simply not offering "leadership-training programs for the average faculty member, even after someone commits to administration" (561). This overall lack of leadership preparation, paired with the difficulty of making some types of change, is a key challenge for change agents to act on their changed conceptions as they hope to.

When educational development leaders lead programs like the Faculty Writing Fellows Program at Miami, they assume and hope faculty will return to their departments and programs and lead, formally or informally, meaningful change in curricular design and implementation of research-based pedagogical practices. Neither of these is a given. More often, faculty tend *not* to see themselves as leaders, not to know *how* to work to effect change beyond their own classrooms, and not to be prepared when the larger changes they seek encounter resistance from a field that enacts quite different values and assumptions.

Let's consider the first obstacle. Faculty may not see themselves as leaders for many reasons; one is that in the US promotion and tenure system, faculty members are typically *not rewarded* for leading pedagogical efforts. "The reward for committing seriously to education [and] education leadership is perceived to be very much less than that gained through commitment to and success in research" (Beckman 2017, 156). As Jose Coll (2007) puts it, the only advice new faculty members tend to get is "publish as early as possible and develop a research agenda that could garnish [*sic*] external funding." Faculty are rewarded for publishing and, at some schools or in some roles, for teaching effectively. They are not rewarded most of the time in any tangible way for rocking the boat and trying to effect large-scale curricular changes; quite often, they are actually punished for this behavior instead. Institutional culture, in terms of the lack of value it places on innovating pedagogy and curriculum, can limit whether individuals who *want* to make change see themselves as change agents who can lead change efforts. This reality may be even more complicated for faculty in some kinds of teaching-track

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

positions, where they may not be rewarded for doing *any* institutional service (although at some schools, non-tenure-track teaching innovations are rewarded, as chapter 4 discusses). Faculty without long-term contracts or job security may feel the frustrations of institutional culture and want to make change but realistically be constrained by their own positions within the university hierarchy and lack of job security.

Implicit assumptions about who is able to lead in higher education may also present challenges for individuals, especially faculty members who want to lead change but may not already see themselves as change agents. Many individuals view leadership as inherent in "persons" or "positions" (Grint 2013); that is, a person either has inherent qualities that make them a leader, or they hold a formal institutional position that grants them leadership authority. In higher education hierarchies, faculty members may not see themselves as holding the authority to lead changes they want to make. And there are "few programs designed to cultivate a broader number of individuals or the structures to support shared leadership" (Kezar and Holcombe 2017, v)

When faculty members *do* see themselves as change agents or decide to lead changes despite the limited rewards for doing so, there is another obstacle: many individuals, even those in formal leadership positions, lack "systematic training" in leadership (Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, xx). In most academic disciplines, training in pedagogy and curriculum are scarce, and scarcer still is training in how to work across a full program or department to lead innovative change in pedagogy and curriculum. When faculty try to lead, there are no scripts for them in leadership roles. As a result, the burden to define and find such leadership scripts falls "largely on the individual" (21; see also Henkel 2002). Formal academic leaders such as provosts, deans, and chairs without formal leadership training tend to fall back on their personal ideas about leadership. According to research conducted by Solbrekke and Sugrue (2020), this leads to implicit leadership styles that tend to focus on "influence directed toward the achievement of goals" and overlook questions such as, "What is the source of the goals to be pursued?" and "By what process is influence to be exerted?" (22). This focus on achieving specific goals may lead to a focus on first-order changes because the cultures, conceptions, or attitudes that underlie those goals are invisible to leaders. Because they work from implicit approaches to leadership, individuals may actually be hindered in their attempts to lead change as they draw on strategies that are not beneficial to their goals (Kezar 2018).

We don't identify these challenges to faculty leadership as criticisms of the alumni of the Fellows Program. As this collection illustrates, many

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Fellows do see themselves as change agents and are working toward deep change in their programs and departments. As we have worked to support faculty in these efforts, however, we have identified ideas and strategies in the leadership and change scholarship that we can explicitly include in our educational development in order to support faculty as agents of deep change around teaching and learning in their programs and departments.

Educational development leaders who want to support faculty as change agents might begin by reframing leadership, challenging the personal and positional views in favor of process-oriented leadership (Grint 2013). Solbrekke and Sugrue (2020) suggest helping faculty reconceive of leadership by asking them to explore the idea that "leading implies teaching, and teaching implies leading" (72). In our view, helping faculty think of leadership as teaching and teaching as leadership is a promising avenue for helping them embrace their role as leaders. Those who come to educational development programs tend, for the most part, to see themselves as teachers if not as leaders. Helping them see teaching as leading might be a first step toward reimagining their role as potential leaders. This shift is particularly important for individuals who desire to lead deep change, as effecting such change requires an ongoing learning process on the part of participants.

In addition to seeing "leadership" as "teaching," faculty also benefit from understanding a "distributed" perspective of leadership (see Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, 72; Spillane 2006), or what Kezar (2018) describes as "collective" or "shared" leadership (134; see also Pearce and Conger 2003), with both formal and informal leaders (Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, 20). This view sees leadership as not "vested exclusively in the most senior personnel in higher education organisation" but rather as "both formally and informally enacted across the whole organisation, in vertical as well as horizontal relational dynamics" (24). This is a grassroots method of leadership, rather than a traditional top-down method that relies on "positions of power" (Kezar 2018, 135). Distributed leadership seeks to understand the goal of change as a "shared responsibility." Faculty who return to departments after educational development seminars to try to enact meaningful, research-based changes cannot act alone. However, enacting a distributed model of leadership is not simple. It requires creating "cultures and structures" that empower and motivate individuals to work with others to be responsible for change and "build collaborative and trusting relationships" (Carbone et al. 2017 quoted in Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, 29). A distributed leadership model is likely quite a different model of leadership than faculty

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

typically imagine when they hear the word *leader*. There is often a sense that upper administrators (not faculty) are the ones who lead, and at many institutions faculty distrust these leaders, feeling high-level decisions are made without regard for deep learning or faculty expertise. This concern seems to be increasing for reasons we allude to in chapter 1 and take up further in the afterword, as institutions of higher education embody "apparent instrumentalist entrepreneurialism that privileges competitiveness, internationalisation, and rankings" (Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, 18). In other words, the disintegrative paradigm in which we are currently operating may mean faculty members (typically focused on learning and research) and administrators (typically focused on operations) may struggle to find common frames for approaching problems and enacting change.

A challenge for those leading educational development programs "is [how] to encourage colleagues to take ownership of" their shared leadership responsibility for pushing for meaningful change around learning in their programs but also in the larger educational system. Achieving this aim requires engaging faculty in "an ongoing, deliberative process" and suggests an opportunity for educational development leaders to act as brokers as they work to help faculty engage in this way with the work of the university[2] (Solbrekke and Sugrue 2020, 31).

## METHODS FOR LEADING CHANGE

Once educational development leaders are aware of the challenges faculty members face in leading change and determine they want to directly support these change efforts, developers need methods for leading change that are available to different kinds of institutional stakeholders.

Change theorists note that not all individuals who desire to lead change have the same methods available to them. Leaders who are invested with institutional power and authority have methods for leading change that most faculty do not. They have at their disposal strategic plans, mission and vision statements, budget and resource allocation, rewards and incentives, and the ability to hire and restructure. These leadership strategies are, as Kezar (2018) puts it, only available to "organizational elites" (136) and thus are not our focus here. Rather, we want to consider how faculty teacher-leaders can act from a distributed-leadership model to effect deep change. Those leading from the bottom up have other strategies available to them. Kezar describes nine strategies they can leverage, some of which are hard or even impossible for

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

top-level leaders to leverage. These include creating intellectual forums, providing meaningful faculty development opportunities, recruiting like-minded applicants for pivotal positions, finding seed money to test out innovative ideas, creating coalitions with students, generating awareness and consciousness through classroom practice, gathering and using data, joining networks with common interests and goals, and partnering with key external stakeholders (139–42; see also Kezar and Lester 2011).

In order for shared or distributed leadership to be successful, change agents must learn to work in leadership groups, something faculty members (and leaders in general) are sometimes not adept at. Kezar (2018) notes that successfully working in such leadership groups requires cultivating a number of skills:

- "interpersonal skills such as conflict resolution, empathy, communication, and emotional competence" (145);
- an understanding of how groups work and how to create functional processes and bring newcomers on board (145–46);
- how to create a "shared sense of purpose, values, and goals" (146);
- how to facilitate "shared cognition" or "similar mental maps regarding their internal work, as well as the nature of the external environment" (146) while also recognizing that shared cognition "does not mean groupthink" and instead supporting diverse perspectives and establishing trust over time (147);
- facilitating regular and ongoing communication; and
- addressing differing levels of power and status among the members of the leadership group (148).

While this advice regarding strategies to leverage and skills to cultivate is useful, it can feel somewhat abstract. What, specifically, can groups of faculty do when they return to their departments and programs and seek to effect deep change that extends across the program's courses and faculty? Solbrekke and Sugrue (2020), along with Molly Sutphen, Tomas Englund, and Kristin Ewins (2020), argue for the role of *deliberative communication* "wherein participants agree to have or try out a set of dispositions, including a willingness to reflect on one's biases . . . ; to engage in collective will-formation; to be open to the views of others" (81). This form of communication, developed by Englund (2006) and based on the work of John Dewey and Jurgen Habermas, is intended to help "create conditions for participants to reflect on a problem or situation and be used for a public good" (Sutphen, Englund, and Ewins 2020, 81). Deliberative communication asks participants to reflect both individually and collectively, allows all voices to be heard, hears and respects different perspectives, but also asks participants to reach

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

"legitimate compromises in a web of possible contesting commitments" (Bergh, Solbrekke, and Wickstrom 2020, 92). It also stimulates collective learning (Bergh, Solbrekke, and Wickstrom 2020), without which meaningful change within a community of practice is unlikely to occur.

Deliberative communication is similar to what Kezar (2018) calls "sensemaking," which "is about changing mindsets, which in turn alters behaviors, priorities, values, and commitments" (87). One way "people undergo sensemaking is that they develop new language and new concepts that describe a changed institution" (87). One example of sensemaking is the first four weeks of the Fellows Program, which we describe in chapters 1 and 2. As Fellows participants examine their disciplinary written practices and discuss them with people from other disciplines, their mindsets and ideas change—they are making new sense of writing and its teaching. A forum/space must be carefully designed to facilitate this kind of sensemaking. For an example of deliberative communication or sensemaking in action at the level of a full department, see chapter 13 of this collection, in which teacher education revised its mission statement, guiding principles, and curriculum around social justice.

Faculty members who return to their departments hoping to enact change could invite their colleagues into deliberative communication around conceptions of writing and the implications for teaching. While they might initiate the conversation, the goal of deliberative conversation is to ensure that all voices are heard and that people with expertise can bring their ideas to the table and reflect. Thus, distributed leadership is enacted. We have seen some Fellows alumni return to their departments to do something very much along these lines. Teacher education, history, and philosophy all facilitated some version of deliberative communication. Their chosen structures for these follow-ups were very much democratic and dialogic, without one expert or authority leading them. Philosophy and teacher education asked the two of us to assist with at least the first conversation, while history facilitated its own discussion. In all three cases, the department chair had participated in the Fellows Program, making it easier for the conversations to be scheduled with ensured participation. Even the most deliberative and democratic model of leadership and shared learning across departments requires someone to suggest and schedule times for conversation. And, given the nature of academic institutions, participants need to feel their time will be valued in some demonstrable way—which is easier for a chair to ensure than a rank-and-file faculty member. However, in all three of these cases, the chair did not assert authority over the

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

discussions themselves; the chair simply ensured the discussions happened. To build on our argument in chapter 2, then, we note that it is helpful for chairs to be part of the Fellows teams, but we want to clarify that this participation is not so they can force others to adhere to their changed ideas about teaching and writing but rather so they can set the table where meaningful discussion about teaching and writing can happen among the full faculty.

## CONCLUSION

In this chapter we argue that leading deep change that supports creating meaningful learning environments for students requires challenging and changing systems and their culture or *habitus*. Faculty need support if they are to return to their departments and take on such change efforts. They benefit from understanding the nature of distributed leadership and the resources they can leverage in their efforts, and from having access to programs that will support them in building the skill sets around teamwork that academia has historically rarely provided.

In the process of making this argument, we greatly complicate and extend the nature of the work that educational development leaders do: in addition to facilitating training in teaching and learning, we might also provide support for leadership and change. While we can't lead change *for* programs and departments, we can support them in these efforts, acting as boundary brokers (Wenger 2000) and modeling the same learning and sensemaking processes faculty might use to lead change themselves.

We note at the beginning of this chapter that our own program has not historically done the work we are currently calling for. It is through our efforts to support Faculty Fellows in their leadership and change efforts that we have come to articulate the challenges they face and have begun to develop programming around supporting change initiatives. After working with department chairs in philosophy, teacher education, and history, for example, we invited four Fellows who served as program or department chairs to engage in a leadership and change reading group focused on higher education change theories we discuss here. Now, we are developing programming specifically aimed at empowering Fellows as leaders in their change efforts, regardless of their academic positions. In the 2020–21 school year, we piloted a year-long initiative called the Leading Change Institute. Even though we had not initially articulated the need to support faculty in their change efforts, we have nonetheless seen powerful examples of Fellows leading change in their

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

programs and departments. The next two chapters illustrate how the Fellows Program served as a sensemaking opportunity in which faculty engaged in deliberation about writing, teaching, and learning in their disciplines in ways that led to changes in their programs and departments. These chapters from economics and philosophy faculty teams illustrate what happens when faculty are successful at leading change from within.

## NOTES

1. Bourdieu (1990) defines *habitus* as "a system (i.e., a set of interacting elements) of durable, transposable dispositions" (53). John Thompson, his editor, summarizes Bourdieu's view of *habitus* as "a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. The dispositions generate practices, perceptions, and attitudes which are 'regular' without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any 'rule.' The dispositions which constitute the habitus are inculcated, structured, durable, generative, and transposable" (Bourdieu 1990, 12).
2. While it is not the focus of this chapter, we believe educational development leaders are working as what Etienne Wenger calls "boundary brokers" who participate in multiple communities of practice and introduce practices from one into the other and vice versa. For more on this role see Wenger's *Communities of Practice* (2000).

## REFERENCES

Beckman, Elizabeth A. 2017. "Leadership through Fellowship: Distributed Leadership in a Professional Recognition Scheme for University Educators." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 39 (2): 155–68.

Bergh, Andreas, Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke, and Johan Wickstrom. 2020. "Deliberative Communication: Stimulating Collective Learning?" In *Leading Higher Education As and For Public Good: Rekindling Education as Praxis*, edited by Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke and Cianan Sugure, 92–106. New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carbone Angela, Julia Evans, Bella Ross, Steve Drew, Liam Phelan, Katherine Lindsay, Caroline Cottman, Susan Stoney, and Jing Ye. 2017. "Assessing Distributed Leadership for Learning and Teaching Quality: A Multi-Institutional Study." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 39 (2): 183–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1276629.

Coll, Jose. 2007. "Rethinking Leadership Development in Higher Education." *The Evolllution*. https://evolllution.com/managing-institution/operations_efficiency/rethinking-leadership-development-in-higher-education/.

Collins, James P. 2014. "Leadership and Change in Twenty-First Century Higher Education." *BioScience* 64 (7): 561–62. https://doi.org/*10.1093/biosci/biu080*.

Englund, Tomas. 2006. "Deliberative Communication: A Pragmatist Proposal." *Curriculum Studies* 38 (5): 503–20.

Grint, Keith. 2013. *Leadership: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Henkel, M. 2002. "Emerging Concepts of Academic Leadership and Their Implications for Intra-Institutional Roles and Relationships in Higher Education." *European Journal of Education* 371 (2): 9–41.

Kezar, Adrianna. 2018. *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading, and Enacting Change*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Kezar, Adrianna, and Elizabeth Holcombe. 2017. *Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Important Lessons from Research and Practice*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Shared-Leadership-in-Higher-Education.pdf.

Kezar, Adrianna J., and Jaime Lester. 2011. *Enhancing Campus Capacity for Leadership: An Examination of Grassroots Leaders in Higher Education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kotter, John P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Newfield, Christopher. 2018. *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pearce, Craig L., and Jay A. Conger. 2003. *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Solbrekke, Tone Dyrdal, and Ciaran Sugure. 2020. *Leading Higher Education As and For Public Good: Rekindling Education as Praxis*. New York: Routledge.

Spillane, James. 2006. *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sutphen, Molly, Tomas Englund, and Kristin Ewins. 2020. "Intellectual Virtues for Leading Higher Education." In *Leading Higher Education As and For Public Good: Rekindling Education as Praxis*, edited by Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke and Cianan and Sugrue, 80–91. New York: Routledge.

Wenger, Etienne. 2000. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EBSCOhost - printed on 12/28/2023 10:38 AM via EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use