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Abstract

This Organisational Improvement Plan aims to outline how to improve the organisation and delivery of professional development at a for-profit international school in the Middle East. It examines the organisational context of the school, and the structure of the greater system of which it is part. The role of its regional context is discussed, with the effect on the operation of the school made plain. As a vision for change must rest on solid theoretical foundations, the conceptual lens through which the problem of practice is explored, as are appropriate issues that arise in relevant literature. It then examines the various values of the stakeholders in the school. With these analyses completed, it outlines a tripartite approach to remedy the dearth of effective planning for professional learning. This allows the Organisational Improvement Plan to create a one-year change implementation plan that hopes to improve the delivery of professional development in the organisation.
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**Executive Summary**

This document begins with the author discussing the unique contextual factors at play in their current international school. This includes the intersection of the strong hierarchical oversight from the school’s Middle Eastern government and the supervision of the transnational corporation of which the school is a part. In conjunction with necessary practices arising from the need to maintain its current accreditation, the document isolates powerful sources of the school’s operational norms. After an examination of current academic perspectives on professional development, the planned change is outlined. This includes explaining the current role of the author, how they may leverage their current level of influence to effect positive change, and how ready the organisation is to change.

Using current theory in the field of organisational research, the second chapter then discusses both the core values of groups at the school, and what the stages of the planned change are. Once these are understood, in tandem with the fact that concerted efforts must be made to account for the constructivist lens of the author, possible solutions to the problem of practice are examined. As ethical considerations must lie at the core of any modern academic endeavour, issues in this area are examined at the end of chapter two.

The final chapter of this document begins by examining the reasons why the author feels that a one-year change cycle is sufficient. This then leads into an in-depth analysis of the triad of approaches the author recommends. By changing perceptions of what successful PD is, including faculty in choosing what PD to offer, and focusing on collaborative learning practices, the author hopes to improve their school. Following this is a discussion on how to communicate the need for change, and how to monitor said change. The document ends with an analysis of potential limitations of the plan, before offering some last thoughts to consider.
Author’s Note

As the author is the person driving the change at the school in question, the author will often refer to themselves as the change leader. This is done for two reasons.

The first is that the document wishes to highlight a unique characteristic of the EdD: that the scholar who writes the summative work of the doctoral degree is the same individual who is engaging in improving practice in a real-world educational context. So, when discussing the issue of a change leader in a theoretical sense, its use refers to the hypothetical agent as pertaining to organisational change theory. On the other hand, when using the phrase ‘change leader’ in relation to the school at the heart of this document, it refers to the author.

The second reason is the author/change leader wishes to avoid being repetitive, thus making the message more palatable for their audience. As will be seen later, the medium of a message is almost as important as the message itself.
Dedication

For Hope, my muse.
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Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

**CAS** – *Creativity, activity, service*: A mandatory component of the DP that focuses on having students develop themselves personally, not necessarily connected with traditional learning experiences.

**CELLS** – *Complex Evolving Loosely Linked Systems*: A lens for looking at organisations that focuses on the dynamic nature of the interactions that occur within, and how it shapes the future growth of the organisation.

**DP** – *Diploma Programme*: Aimed at students between 16 and 19, this acts as the final stage of the IB education system. Its diploma serves as the basis for entry to tertiary education in many international schools, as well as being used in some national systems.

**EdD** – *Doctor of Education*: An education doctorate that sees students as scholar practitioners who use research and theory to solve problems of practice in their organisation.

**IB** - *International Baccalaureate*: The name for the education system aimed at students between 3 and 19. It is managed by the International Baccalaureate Organization.

**ICT** – *Information Communication Technology*: The generic name for the broad field of technology that allows information to be shared across large networks.

**MOE** – *Ministry of Education*: The local government body that monitors all schools in SOME’s national context.

**MYP** – *Middle Years Programme*: Aimed at students between 11 and 16, this acts as the second stage of the IB education system.

**OIP** - *Organisational Improvement Plan*: This is a structured framework for a proposed plan to change an organisation. It serves as the final product of many doctorates in education.
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**PD - Professional Development:** This vast field is concerned with improving the professional behaviour of employees in almost any context. It is also called professional learning.

**PLC – Professional Learning Community:** A collaborative grouping of agents in an organisation that seeks to develop its collective practice.

**PYP – Primary Years Programme:** Aimed at students between 3 and 12, this acts as the first stage of the IB education system.

**SLT – Senior Leadership Team:** The group of educational leaders at SOME, comprised of the Principal, the Vice-principal, the DP Coordinator, the MYP Coordinator, and the PYP Coordinator.

**SOCE - School of Central Europe:** A member of the SOE group of schools, located in Central Europe. It only offers two intermediate years of SOE’s national curriculum.

**SOE – Schools of Europe:** The organisation, based in Western Europe, that manages the group of ten schools of which SOME is a part.

**SOME – School of Middle East:** The school, in a nation in the Middle East, on which the OIP is based. It runs all three stages of the IB programme.

**SOWE - School of Western Europe:** A member of the SOE group of schools, located in Western Europe. It only offers the MYP portion of the IB programme.

**TNC – Transnational Corporation:** A corporation that owns and manages smaller organisations in more than one national context. This OIP is concerned solely with TNCs engaged in international education.
Introduction

At the risk of seeming trite, schools are about learning. This does not just refer to the ostensive learning that takes places within its classrooms. Rather, it includes the ongoing evolution of resources present in the building necessary to prepare its pupils for the world around them. An example of this is the author’s experience of going to a specialised classroom during their secondary schooling to learn, what is now, rather basic computer science. Contrast this with the slew of 21st century tools in almost every classroom today, and the technological evolution is plain. Similarly, sociological evolution is evident too. Issues like gender identity and mental health are mandated by many national curricula, a positive shift from the more conservative background the author’s secondary school provided.

Yet both of these examples, technological and sociological, both rely on a third form of evolution in schools: the pedagogical. For without the constant, to use a recent extension to the English language, ‘upskilling’ of teachers, learning cannot move forward with these changes in schools. In other words, as science keeps discovering new things to teach to students, so the science of learning keeps discovering new ways to teach students.

Unfortunately, the author’s current organisational context does not reflect this fully. While the organisational vision (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017) plainly calls for the ongoing improvement of teachers in its schools, and the author’s particular school does in fact devote quite a lot of time and money to professional learning, the reality is quite different. The author contends that that while a positive view of teachers’ learning is reflected by the organisation in its documentation, the likeness is limited. In order to rectify this problem of practice, the author delved deeply into literature in a wide variety of fields, most notably professional development (PD) and organisational change. Over the course of this odyssey, and with many trials along the way, the author believes that they have found a vision for change that may realign their school with best practice.
However, as with many journeys, your choice of companions is paramount. Alongside the academic foundations and contextual considerations necessary to properly examine an organisation, the author proposes another companion who will be of help in finding the way forward. This fellow traveller is one famed for seeking to change things for the better, but eventually had to pay the ultimate price for his convictions. He will roam about this document, much like he did in ancient Athens, and serve as a useful tool to illustrate key ideas and concepts. This traveller is none other than Socrates, a famed teacher who constantly questioned his own, and his interlocuters’ views of the world. It is hoped that by being joined by such august company, the change proposed here will not only be enjoyable to read, but more understandable also.

Indeed, this recognition of the differing perspectives held by different people lies at the core of the proposed change. In the same way that teachers must consider the subjective experiences of each and every one of their students, the author contends that any change leader must do the same if they wish to make the change happen. Complementing this is the fact that “organizational systems theorists emphasize that solving important problems requires multiple perspectives and seemingly diverse approaches to the solution” (Kilgore & Reynolds, 2011, p. 7). As the vast majority of learning time in a school happens in discrete rooms, with teachers largely unsupervised in their day-to-day practice, any systemic change must be made in such a way that willingly brings along all in the school. If a change plan can make teachers believe that the change is good for both them and their pupils, momentum for the reform becomes possible. Also included must be those at the school who oversee its administration, though of course different levers need to be used in their case. After all, it’s not just about getting the right message out, it’s about how the message itself gets out too!
Chapter One – Introduction and Problem

As with any journey, it must have a beginning. However, this first chapter does more than simply describe the author’s school and their cultural context, it goes further than that. It relates the lens through which the author looks at the world, as well as the role and responsibilities they have at their school. Indeed, it is necessary to know these things to fully understand why the problem of practice is a problem at all. Before a change leader can even consider moving forward with a change initiative, they must first understand why it is necessary. This chapter discusses these aspects, before then examining how ready the school is for the proposed change.

Organisational Context

The School of Middle East (SOME) was established six years ago in a nation on the Persian Gulf. Being in a resource-rich nation whose economy is driven by the highly profitable petroleum industry, SOME’s cultural and economic context is shaped by the overarching spectre of this export-driven economy. Yet the very nature of this industry’s volatility, coupled with the effects of regional disputes over political influence, has led to the powers-that-be in the state to mandate educational objectives for all schools under its purview. As such, the state’s National Vision (2010) laid a groundwork for a set of sweeping reforms that seek to diversify the nation’s exports, and to improve its pool of human capital. Developing a “a highly-skilled labour force and competitive industries” (Action Canada, 2013, p. 3) is recognised as a core component of a 21st century economy, and indeed similar competing national strategies are being implemented in neighbouring countries.

In tandem with poor PISA results, and a negative review of K-12 education by another source (RAND, 2009), the state sought to improve its educational system by bringing
in Transnational Corporations (TNCs) to help ameliorate its deficiencies. This led to the provision of both licence and school buildings to SOME in 2012, allowing it to begin operation. This leads to a rather ironic state of affairs, where on the one hand the Ministry of Education (MOE) is wholeheartedly behind schools that pursue innovative initiatives that improve the national education system, but the monarchical power structure of the state, common across the region, leads to a very centralised approach to decision making. This political context places SOME in a position where it can have major change imposed on it, sans opportunity to object. Yet, for SOME, a hierarchical structure is not an alien environment.

Global forces

SOME is a member of a private, for-profit European chain of schools with campuses throughout Europe. It grew out of a school grouping established nearly a century ago, the Schools of Europe (SOE), and SOME was the tenth school to be formed. With the successful establishment of SOME in its regional context, SOE seeks to leverage this by expanding across the Middle East. Similar licensure needs to be sought in SOME’s host country’s neighbours, and a corresponding adherence to a national strategy will be necessary. However, while good relations need to be maintained with governments in this very politically stratified region, matters of school practice and policy are usually dealt with by the TNC’s corporate architecture. Indeed, the school group maintains a strong hierarchical organisational structure centred on the administration at its European headquarters. In practice, this means that issues at SOME relating to staffing, financial administration, and public relations are often overseen by individuals outside of the Middle East. For example, something as relatively straightforward as the setting up of a staff password for the wireless network requires permission of the ICT department in Europe.
This clearly places the institutional practices of SOME, and the SOE group of which it is a part, into a very stratified category. This is a very different understanding of global leadership than that discussed by Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009), where positive global leadership is defined by either having experience or competencies in different cultural contexts. As liaising with the MOE is integral to the successful operation of SOME, and the often-conflicting directions of the European office require a more decentralised approach, SOME frequently finds its ‘masters’ at cross purposes.
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**SOME operational norms**

**Figure 1 - Sources of SOME’s operational norms**

Due to its long history, it offers its own accredited secondary school diploma as well as a North American accredited high school diploma. This is based upon the learning made during the final four years of school. As outlined by the SOE Corporate Vision (2017), it is
“not related to grades, but more to descriptions and reflections on activities” (p. 55). This complements the organisation’s educational principles of individualising education, rewarding efforts, and promoting freedom of expression. Similarly, humanist values are stated in the *Ethos* section of the SOE Corporate Vision (2017). Examples of this are promoting universal solidarity across its members, encouraging pluralistic values in its students, and pushing for students to develop their own individual talents. As such it should come as no surprise that SOME also provides the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme at most of its schools. Many of the IB’s foundational principles correspond with aspects of SOE’s organisational vision and considering that SOE has been strongly connected with the IB for almost fifty years, this is also no surprise. However, as the IB encourages distributed instructional leadership in its schools (Lee, Hallinger, Walker, 2012), this does not correspond with SOME’s operational reality so well when both the MOE and SOE mandate so much of what happens at SOME. Figure 1 illustrates this plurality of pressures.

*Local forces*

SOME has approximately six thousand students across its ten campuses. SOE has a student body of roughly six hundred students, a teaching faculty of sixty, and an administration team of ten. This teaching faculty includes around fifteen teaching assistants who largely work with teachers up until grade five. In terms of educational leadership, there is one principal, one vice-principal, and three IB coordinators. These coordinators oversee the monitoring of the three IB programmes at place in the school, the Primary Years Programme (kindergarten to grade five), the Middle Years Programme (grade six to grade ten), and the Diploma Programme (grades eleven and twelve). Subject department head positions do not exist, with departmental decisions made by the relevant coordinator. In keeping with the IB system this means that weekly subject-specific meetings are run by the coordinator.
As a school in the Arab world, SOME has some contextual issues that are unique to the region. As mentioned earlier, oversight from the host country’s MOE is high, and for SOME’s Muslim students, Islamic Studies classes are mandated, with time being drawn from other subjects. For example, both Mathematics and Physical and Health Education are negatively impacted in terms of classes per week in many students’ timetables. The MOE’s stewardship of the taught curriculum in its bailiwick is a combination of ensuring that the local students who attend international schools are given an education aligned with the national education system and dealing with one of the major issues highlighted by the RAND report (2009). This issue is that great variance in educational achievement was found between the foreign-run schools and the wholly locally-managed schools. Surprisingly the MOE reacted by seeking to draw the international schools closer to the local schools. Topics such as evolution, sex education, and the Israeli state cannot be explicitly spoken of, and the censoring of school materials to remove phrases that could be considered indecent or blasphemous is decreed. Also, regular inspections are carried out, and the recommendations made by the inspectors must be carried out promptly or the school faces closure. Indeed, several years ago the school almost lost its licence for having in its possession material that portrayed a man and woman embracing on its cover. However, these inspections focus primarily on ensuring the school does not have teaching material that the MOE considers immoral as well as checking that SOME follows governmental building safety guidelines. Indeed, during the author’s time at the school, the only subjects that had MOE observers drop in for an observation were the Arabic and Islamic Studies classes.

While technically this monitoring of materials is to apply equally across all the grades, the practice is more complicated. As SOME takes part in the IB’s externally assessed examinations, this can be difficult. For example, a recent external IB examination, the grade ten online exam, had a pre-release reading which mentioned evolution and had a sketch of a
body undergoing dissection. Both are technically taboo under the form of Islamic law dominant in the state, but as completion of the exam is necessary to pursue the academic goals of the institution, they were permitted. This leads to a state where the traditional role of principal has become subsumed by the necessity to liaise with the MOE. Clearly this places the normal organisational role of principal as overseeing education in a school as being difficult to realise.

The student body is made up of over fifty nationalities, with just over twenty per cent being nationals of the host country. To those unfamiliar with international schools, this ratio may seem unsurprising, but in fact the inverse proportion is the norm in international schools across the globe (Hayden & Thompson, 2016). With most students coming from globally mobile expatriate families, many of whom have English as a second, third, or even fourth language, pupil turnover in the school is higher than in a national education context. Not only is most of the school community globally mobile, the regional dispute mentioned earlier has led to some economic uncertainty among local employers of these expatriate families. This has impacted upon the schools serving the expatriate community with greater competition for students. This is echoed in the staff, with staff staying on average three years. This problem of losing developed expertise is well documented (Adnot, Dee, Katz, & Wyckoff, 2013; Hayden & Thompson, 2009; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2016; Riggs, 2013). This problem of losing institutional memory is a common one among international schools. While the potential benefits of having a globally mobile student body are becoming increasingly clear (Westropp, Cathro, & Everett, 2016), the corresponding cost of having globally mobile educators at a school is a worrying counterpoint.

Indeed, SOME’s stated mission to leverage the international community of students to create 21st century learners is plain. The SOE Corporate Vision (2017) discusses extensively the benefits of having globalised pupils in its schools. Despite this, its documents neglect to
reflect the need to capitalise on, or even deal with, the movement of its teachers. This is especially surprising when the one of the four keystones of its definition of the educational community is that of being an “international vocation” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 13). Another key aspect of the organisational vision is to evolve its graduates into lifelong learners, with the ability to adapt to new environments and to make use of their individual gifts. This will position them as both productive global citizens and positive contributors to their communities.

**Leadership Position and Lens Statement**

As will be discussed later in the *Framing the Problem of Practice* section, the role of context and the beliefs of the school community are at the core of this Organisational Improvement Plan (OIP) proposal. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the author behind this OIP proposal sees the world through a constructivist lens. Using Creswell’s (2014) definition, that “individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences — meanings directed toward certain objects or things” (p. 8), the importance of how to understand, and leverage individuals’ subjective meanings to drive the change is vital. As adherence to monarchical/theocratical oversight is central to SOME’s continued operation within its Middle Eastern context, an illustrative example related to piety is fitting. Also, rather than simply being an interesting diversion that helps explain the worldview of this OIP’s author, not to mention their first love in academia, it also exemplifies the need for effective communication to be tailored to its audience.

In Plato’s *Euthyphro*, Socrates challenges a man, the titular Euthyphro, to define piety. Through a series of arguments, the gadfly of Athens demonstrates that a concept as seemingly straightforward as piety is far more complex than one would assume. Not only is
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this a fine example of the elenchus portrayed by Plato, it also serves to highlight the necessity for individuals to construct their own subjective meaning of the principles that they hold dear. As individual teachers must be worked with, and not against, by leaders (Dudar, Scott, & Scott, 2017), this example of someone willing to engage with the subjective understandings of others can be useful.

_A systems perspective_

Extending this, seeing schools as a collection of individual agents, who operate together in a complex system of multiple values is, in the view the author of this OIP, perfectly encapsulated by Fertig and James’ (2016) organisational analysis tool: Complex Evolving Loosely Linked Systems (CELLS). Seeing schools through a CELLS perspective is useful for several reasons. First, it encourages faculty and administration to recognise the interdependence of agents in a school. If a leader, and the author does, sees their organisation as one where the various stakeholders are connected via a network of values and tasks, the leader can then move forward in a change plan by leveraging various facets of the organisation. Second, recognising the complexity of an organisation puts a leader in a position where they consider the myriad effects that any school-wide action or communication will have across the whole organisation. Finally, the perspective that an organisation is always evolving is particularly suited to the realm of schools, particularly international ones. With both administration and faculty ever shifting year-to-year, the changing demands of international curricula, and the vicissitudes of local contextual forces, a leader must take such forces into account in how they perceive the state of the school. Only by being sensitive to the “shifting realities and demands of their environments” (Cawsey, Deszca, & Ingols, 2016, p. 2) can a school leader marshal the necessary response to these forces, or indeed recognise the appropriate response to take. This leader’s perception of the
correct leadership lens for SOME when seeking change is enriched by the continuous improver (Cawsey et al., 2016) perspective. However, before expanding on this, a complementary model is of use in further exploring this constructivist lens.

Senge’s (2013) systems thinking is another model that calls on leaders to see organisations as complex, interdependent, and evolving systems. Instead of seeing the world as being comprised of “separate, unrelated forces” (Senge, 2013, p. 3), leaders must learn to identify the forces that act upon their own organisation. Recognising the complexity of the systems within which educators work is essential to properly grasp the pressures on a school, particularly when one considers the multiple stakeholders: for example, administration, educational leadership, parents, students, teaching faculty, local government, and international accreditation bodies. Gardner (2013) also praises this approach for how a leader should look at their organisation. However, the utility of using system thinking to bolster a constructivist lens extends beyond this inclusive view of organisational forces.

As will be seen later when examining Nadler and Tushman (1989), a leader should understand that the evolution of a system usually takes place in small, though important, changes. Considering that “there is no inherent end to a system” (Senge, 1996, p. 15), systems thinking is useful in driving home that different perspectives need to be considered, that change is an ongoing process. Indeed, one finds it hard to think of a school that has achieved a state, whether it be in achievement, staffing, or enrolment, that it seeks to maintain as the status quo for an indefinite period.

As such, the author’s approach to leadership practice is firmly rooted in this constructivist, dynamic-feedback philosophy. Indeed, beyond its academic foundation, any other approach to leadership practice would go against the author’s experiences in education over the past decade or so. Whether it be drawn from how the author has noted the processes
of student learning in their classroom, the way a new practice has been disseminated to a teaching faculty, or even the oft-experienced difficulty of transitioning to a new organisational context every few years, the constructivist lens offers the keenest organisational insight. A key aspect of this perspective is the close focus on utilising an understanding of issues such as “interpersonal communication, group processes, social defences, and organization-wide neurosis” (Kets de Vries & Cheak, 2015, p. 307). This psychodynamic approach offers another way to conceptualise all the social complexity in an organisation. Yet, as cautioned by Fullan (2004) and Caldwell (2012), one must marshal one’s understanding of an organisational system to leverage real change, a return to classical Greece is necessary, as it so often the case.

While Socrates did indeed lead many through the meanderings of his mind as they ambled along the street of Athens, he often failed to foster a following from those with whom he disagreed. Perhaps if the gadfly of Athens had been more willing to moderate his manner of communication, his message might have been accepted more readily by his contemporaries, rather than having to immortalise himself by drinking poison. Simply challenging the ideas of others cannot be the way forward for an educational leader. Instead, a leader must seek to bring the diverse interests and beliefs of their colleagues on board through an equally diverse set of approaches, approaches that are tailored to each set of stakeholders. Indeed, the role of the researcher as seeking “to make sense of (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world” (Creswell, 2014, p. 8) is essential if one is to not only understand the multiplicity of values at SOME, but also to understand how best to communicate the need for change to all relevant stakeholders. Therefore, this OIP will utilise these theoretical frameworks and see how they can best be marshalled for change.
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**The author**

The author occupies a senior position with the secondary school English Language and Literature department and has good working and social relationships with his colleagues. Also, the author’s position to lead change is bolstered by having the highest standardised achievement test scores in his classes at the school. Furthermore, the author has the role of IB Creativity Activity Service (CAS) Coordinator which allows access to a specialised information network comprised of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and administration. However, due to the hierarchical nature, both within SOME, and from the structure of SOE, decisions for change require the author to seek approval from the SLT, and potentially SOE head office. As recommended by Cawsey et al. (2016), a change leader should examine not just their plan for change, but also their actual power to bring it about. Using Robbin, Langton, and Judge’s (2010) definition of power, “the capacity to influence others to accept one’s ideas or plans” (p. 186), the change leader recognises both the importance of communicating the need for change well, and the necessity of not proposing too radical of a change.

Consequently, of the four types of change leaders outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016), the one most suited to the complexities outlined above is that of the continuous improver. This type of change leader is firmly rooted in seeking minor ways to change an organisation that slowly build up into major systemic improvement. By marrying “types of change with methods of persuasion” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 272), the change leader can become the catalyst of change, moving SOME out of its currently ossified system of professional development. Finally, drawing on expertise from outside the SOE sphere will help lend credibility to the proposed change. Use of IB documents and easily-digestible academic resources are examples of this expertise.
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As should be clear by this section, the leadership framework that informs the approach of the author is that of transformational leadership. Defined as “a process that changes and transforms people” (Northouse, 2016, p. 161), it fits well with the foundation of the change plan, namely changing the underlying assumptions regarding PD at SOME. The primacy of this aspect of the proposed change will be made clear in subsequent sections, but in order to avoid having this change plan rest too much in the theoretical world, rather than the practical, the transformational approach will be mentioned periodically, rather than dwell on it to the detriment of other, more OIP-specific lenses.

Leadership Problem of Practice

As was made clear when looking at the context of SOME, there are many forces acting upon the organisational leadership. Be it the nation’s drive to improve the human capital of the state, the desire of students and parents to see academic achievement, or the vision of the organisation to achieve the “all-round perfection of human beings” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 12), SOME’s stakeholders pull the school in many directions. At the centre of this maelstrom of motivations is the classroom. Thus, any attempt to address these, and other similar, organisational aims must keep this in mind. Hattie’s (2018) work on the effect size of various factors in school is as equally well known for its detractors (Bergeron & Rivard, 2017) as it is for influence on education. Yet, despite its critics of the methodology employed by Hattie, the primacy given to the effect of good teaching practices cannot be ignored, particularly when one looks at the points with which he agrees with similarly influential thinkers in the field. For example, the work of Marzano also pays close attention to teacher practices, and how to improve them (Quinn, 2014). Consequently, if this OIP aims to meet the needs of SOME’s stakeholders and stay in line with the constructivist worldview that the author holds, it needs to address a problem of practice whose overall
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purpose is to improve teaching practices at SOME. It must also consider the unique contextual challenges faced by international schools. What follows is the problem of practice to be addressed in this OIP:

International schools deal with a complex web of forces in their operation. This can lead to difficulties in the provision of effective professional development. At SOME a repetition of poorly received professional development is the norm, and very little consultation of faculty is made regarding future directions. This has led to a fall in faculty motivation to both suggest new directions or to take part in existing professional learning initiatives.

What can a change leader in this international context do to improve the organisation and delivery of professional development at SOME?

Figure 2 - Problem of Practice

International schools are subject to complexities not found to the same extent in national education systems. Not only do teachers and educational leaders more frequently move between schools, they can also change the curriculum they teach and the type of organisational structure they work in far more frequently than teachers in a national context. As such, there can be a duplication of professional development taken, not to mention the philosophy in which it is grounded. Furthermore, the gain to organisational knowledge when
a new teacher joins the faculty is not always capitalised on. As such, the recognised problem of teacher motivation is compounded by these complications. Currently, the author’s organisation is failing to realise its organisational vision in this regard and needs to change if it is to properly address the needs of the stakeholders at the school. This OIP seeks to outline strategies that educational leaders in an international school can utilise to maximise the delivery and effectiveness of their efforts to improve professional development, and thus the teaching, in their unique context.

When considering this problem of practice, it must remain forefront why people seek to study organisations. Seeking to learn about, and improve an organisation is of such importance, particularly when it is a school. Therefore, understanding “what sort of world we have created and what alternatives we might desire” (McCauley, Duberley, & Johnson, 2007, p. 4) is why an OIP is far more than a simple academic exercise.

**Framing the Problem of Practice**

There are several frameworks that one must consider to properly address the POP in question. These conceptual frameworks shape both a response to, and an understanding of, the POP. First and foremost, as evidenced by the title of this OIP proposal, *PD in International Schools: Getting the Right Message Out*, the international dimension must be highlighted. As such, the research framework from which much of this POP must be viewed through is the International Schools research approach, as identified by Dolby and Rahman (2008). The justifications for such a choice are myriad, but the three core reasons are that it holds as key factors the culture of the students and faculty, the ‘purpose’ of the school, and the role that non-local auditors play in shaping the organisation. The OIP will now examine some of the forces at play at SOME.
**Relationships**

First, faculties need to be aware of the “diversity and complexity within not only other cultures, but their own” (Ryan & Louie, 2007, p. 414). This point is echoed by Stobie (2016), who also highlights the need for schools to think more carefully about PD, and its interaction with the diverse nature of the school. This extends far beyond simply considering the “diverse learning needs of each student” (Fabian, 2016, p. 97), but in building on the “worldwide learning community” (Tarc, 2009, p. 121) brought together at the beginning of an international school’s academic year. A lot of focus is paid to the effect of teachers failing to grasp the diversity of their classes, but the statement that it is “difficult for all of us to grasp that people shaped by other cultures will see and respond to the world differently than we do” (Dack & Tomlinson, 2015, p. 11) applies equally to the employees of a school. Using Northouse’s (2016) definition of culture as the “learned beliefs, values, rules, norms, symbols, and traditions that are common to a group of people” (p. 428), any school leader needs to be aware of any relevant cultural information that may influence the practice of the teachers in the school. In fact, the perceived characteristics of a good leader discussed by Northouse (2016) vary significantly, suggesting that leaders may need to vary their approach even within the teaching faculty.

To use a regionally-sourced example, the Arabic-term *wasta* (واسطة) is relevant. Power and influence that one has may arise from no formal position, but through connections one has through friends and family, is of great importance in the Middle East (Brahms & Schmitt, 2017; Harbi, Thursfield, & Bright, 2017). Defined as one’s ability to leverage one’s network of social and professional connections to advance a position (Hutchings & Weir, 2006), this particular aspect of Middle Eastern culture is an example of how leadership in different contexts requires different cultural understandings. While some see the practise of *wasta* as “an unfair influence” (Harbi et al., 2017) in organisational operations, there can be
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no doubt its role in SOME’s context must be recognised. This point is echoed by Shields (2010) when she states that transformational leadership “links education and educational leadership with the wider social context within which it is embedded” (p. 559). Similarly, Sun and Leithwood (2012) call strongly for any conception of transformational leadership to consider the full context of an organisation. This mirrors the systems perspective taken by the author.

As mentioned earlier the principal at SOME works very closely with the MOE in overseeing the school and its operation. This relationship has enabled SOME to be given special dispensation to sometimes allow students to engage in fundraising, despite this practice being officially frowned upon. Similarly, connections made by the Middle Eastern teachers with their peers at other schools are often leveraged to organise inter-school events.

Another example is the nature of SOE itself. Being based in a Western European country, with most of its campuses in that country, SOE has a clear majority of its staff across the organisation originating from the same state. This is echoed in SOME, with the largest single nationality represented in its teaching faculty hailing from SOE’s home. This is even more pronounced in the administration staff, with nearly half being from the birthplace of SOE. This places the culture of SOME at the intersection of the regional context, the dominant SOE culture, and the synthesis of the rest of the staff’s nationalities. Recognition of this complexity by a leader allows them to consider any potential boons arising from a more focused delivery of message. Northouse (2016) states that leaders must “adapt their style to be more effective in different cultural settings” (p. 451), and this point is echoed by Jones, Lyu, Runyan, Fairhurst, Kim, and Jolly (2014) when they argue that successful leadership must consider cultural values in any international setting. As such, the International Schools research approach considers the multiplicity of backgrounds in an international school,
something key to this POP. Unless this conceptual model is adopted, the proposed OIP simply will not be viable.

**Education industry**

Second, the organisational context is different than most national educational systems in that it operates as a for-profit institution. With the massive growth in the number of international schools, the majority of which are for-profit (Waterson, 2016), the field is becoming increasingly dominated by Transnational Corporations (TNCs), of which SOE is one. In fact, investment opportunities in becoming part of a school group are being advertised as being recession-proof (Waterson, 2016), clearly highlighting the fiduciary relationship schools can have with their boards. This neoliberal transformation of international schools is growing ever more pronounced, and as such more consideration of its effects has been called for (Ball, 2012; James & Sheppard, 2014). With the spending on overall education products jumping “from $4.4 trillion in 2012 to $6.2 trillion” (Ortiz, Chang, & Fang, 2015) from one source, and another source forecasting that fee income in international schools alone will be as high as $89 billion USD by 2026 (Morrison, 2016), there can be no doubt the role of fiduciary responsibilities must be considered in this problem of practice. Indeed, a good understanding of this is essential in mobilising SOME’s resources to engage in this proposed organisational change. When one considers that educational leaders usually value the learning that takes place in their schools over the economic well-being of their organisation (Machin, 2014), the need to use different approaches on how change should be disseminated is even more apparent.

This massive growth in international schools, estimated to have a student base of between eight and nine million in eight years (Morrison, 2016; Tate, 2016) has been noticed
by governments. In fact, the attempt to market a nation’s education system as a “quality product and a recognised qualification” (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2013, p. 60) is not unusual. Another strategy taken by governments is to spread their own accredited curriculum to satellite schools around the world (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2015). As such, the effect of internationals schools, and the need to consider their true reach is a potential component of many theoretical problems of practice. This is true regardless of whether potential solutions exist in an international school using a non-national curriculum or not. Indeed, like the International Schools research approach, the field of Comparative Education is a strong argument why any problem of practice may need to look beyond its national context for answers. Considering the longstanding practice of looking at the operation of schools in foreign lands, it has been called “a starting point for improving our educational systems” (Hayhoe, Manion, & Mundy, 2017, p. 2). One only must look at the attention in literature paid to both Finland and Singapore’s education systems to recognise the potential questions that foreign systems may or may not pose for all schools.

**Accreditation bodies**

Third, schools that operate in an international context face a very different set of external forces than those normally encountered by schools in a national context. Rather than just rely on a local MOE to provide validation to its curriculum and teaching, international schools seek accreditation from international bodies like the IB, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), or the Council of International Schools (CIS). As such, when positioning any problem of practice that rests in the international education sphere, this greater system must be considered. The necessity of this International Schools research approach is strengthened with the recognition, already mentioned, that most
students in international schools are citizens of the host country (Hayden & Thompson, 2016). Simply put, more and more students are being educated in international schools.

**Research on PD**

The last major framework to consider, apart from the actual proposed organisational change model to be discussed later, is that of the state of research on PD, and factors which influence its success. As well as integrating many of the findings that seek to outline what good PD is, crucial to this POP, it must reconcile this with the nature of the TNC organisational context. For example, the argument that “teachers’ own beliefs about, and attitudes to, teaching and the subject they teach are more important than immediately observable behaviours” (Creemers, Kyriakides, & Antoniou, 2013, p. 72) is especially important when you consider that international school faculties have a very diverse background, with training and nationality varying greatly. Even within schools, holding the international component aside, the attitudes that teachers have to PD varies (Avidov-Ungar, 2016). In looking at the literature, the issue of teacher motivation in PD activities is a complex one.

For Avidov-Ungar (2016), teachers’ attitudes towards PD are either guided by *intrinsic* or *extrinsic* factors. If a teacher wishes to reach some personal level of professional mastery for the sake of the students and a sense of individual achievement, this is an *intrinsic* motivation. On the other hand, if a teacher is concerned with being perceived as effective, seeks accreditation, or believes financial benefit can arise from the PD, then Avidov-Ungar (2016) terms this *extrinsic* motivation. As pointed out by Desimone (2009), the key question of teacher motivation is made even more complex by the fact that much research on PD is done with volunteers, perhaps indicating a pre-existing bias towards the belief in the efficacy
of PD. This questionable practice is replicated by leadership involved with PD, as Guskey (2014) points out that professional learning experiences are “rarely well planned” (p. 12).

As this OIP will explore later, the study of what makes good professional learning is a constantly evolving one (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015), but before moving forward, an idea of what the change leader recognises as best practice should be outlined. The work of Villegas-Reimers (2013) is used as this OIP’s touchstone for assessing the value of PD activities. The seven characteristics are outlined below in Figure 3:

**Constructivist** - Sees teachers as active participants

**Long-term process** - With follow-up, learning takes time

**Related to the context** - Connected to the actual classroom

**Connected to reform** - Complements evolving school culture

**Sees teacher as reflective** - Values real experience as guide

**Collaborative** - Is aimed at getting participants to share ideas

**Takes many forms** - Delivery may vary for purpose or place

*Figure 3 - Characteristics of good PD*

The change leader sees these characteristics as a guide to be used when assessing the value of past PD activities and deciding if possible future directions are to be taken. Not only do these characteristics echo the constructivist worldview of the author, they recognise the complexity of experiential learning. With greater focus on meaningful group interaction, and a plan to assess and reinforce a professional learning initiative *after* the activity is complete,
these characteristics can act as a signpost for the work explored in the Change Implementation Plan.

Also, the whole institutional practice of PD at a for-profit school, administered to a large extent by an office far removed, must be a core part of the framework of this POP. As such, the agency of the author in this organisational context cannot be overlooked. This allows the OIP to take a theoretical framework, including current thinking on PD, and move closer to the conceptual understanding needed for organisational change. This OIP will look more closely at this intricacy in the Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice section, as well as how it can be redirected in the section on Leadership-Focused Vision for Change.

Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice

The problem of practice’s potential at SOME is one that rests within a nest of complex ideas. As such, multiple lines of inquiry are necessary if the change leader is to turn theory into practical ways forward. These facets of the overall process require a firm understanding if the plan can be implemented. Indeed, otherwise what is the point? Organisational analysis is not solely about “trying to grapple with what sort of world we have created and what alternatives we might desire” (McAuley, Duberley, & Johnson, 2007, p. 4), it is also about figuring out how to make the alternatives reality. In fact, to return momentarily to the Athenian agitator, Socrates is famously credited with taking philosophy from being a purely academic pursuit to becoming an aid in how people live their lives. While this OIP cannot expect such high praise, it does seek to make similar strides in turning theory into practice. Often, people find themselves divorced from the initial purpose of their
endeavours, and those that work in education are no different. This “cognitive wedge” discussed by Burrell and Morgan (2011) must be dealt with, and this OIP aims to do so.

Looking at the SOE Corporate Vision (2017), it provides the change plan’s first challenge in addressing the problem of improving PD at SOME. The document clearly states that individualisation of the learning process is essential to guaranteeing true learning. This is now canon in education, to consider the individual learning needs of each and every student. Dack and Tomlinson (2015) push this point well, as does the author’s experience of being in education for over a decade. Yet, both the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) and the SOME School Prospectus (2017) then point out that the teachers should reflect the type of learners that the students should aspire to be. With the current organisational approach to PD being to repeat a cycle of PD, seldom changing, to all teachers, then clearly the reality does not reflect the stated vision of the school’s organisational documents. This divergence from the vision is made even more apparent when another aspect of the organisational approach is considered.

“Collaborative work for the teaching staff” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 64) is professed as the norm at all SOE schools. As will be made clear in the section entitled Organisational Change Readiness, this is another facet where the vision and reality of SOME do not overlap. Therefore, this question of how to communicate this must be addressed, but with perhaps more careful consideration than the gadfly of Athens is known for.

Considering that changing the organisation’s perception of PD is the foundation of the OIP, the next major question emerges from the structure of SOME, and indeed of SOE itself. SOME even offers places to schools in its city for the PD sessions it hosts. Not only does it provide a boost to the school’s reputation as a centre of learning, as the sessions are organised through SOME’s administration, they also serve as a seasonal source of income. This OIP seeks to improve both the delivery of PD at SOME, and also aims to vary the sources of this
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PD. This would put the vision for change in conflict with both the institutional practice of PD delivery, often organised at the European office, and the financial benefits accruing from the status quo.

A final question that emerges is how to improve the motivation of teachers at SOME when engaging with PD. Currently, the passive position of teachers creates a culture where professional learning is simply assigned to faculty, and their own self-assessed needs are largely ignored. This creates a culture where PD is not seen as a positive opportunity, but instead as a move to deal with “a deficiency in the teacher’s level of performance” (Avidov-Ungar, 2016, p. 655). How can one expect a teacher to take away a positive message from a workshop that delivers the same message they heard the previous academic year? A drive as to how to effectively communicate the new direction in professional learning must be dealt with when addressing the problem of practice. Only by communicating the change properly can the change leader alter the existing practices at SOME.

Leadership-Focused Vision for Change

The vision for change behind this OIP is centred on a very simple premise: if it can improve the practice of PD at SOME, a greater capacity for faculty to learn how to improve their collective teaching will come into being. Of course, while there are myriad complexities to be dealt with at every step of the change process, this straightforward vision must remain at the core. As things stand now at the school, the gap between the desired state of the organisation and the reality is clear. Neither the vision, or operational resources of the school, or its parent organisation are being addressed properly. As will be made clearer in the Organisational Change Readiness section, the desire to engage in the “perfecting of the teaching practice” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 111) is not being translated into practices
that can achieve this. Similarly, the motivations of teachers are not being leveraged to improve learning. With repetitive PD being simply assigned to faculty, rather than its choice of focus being aided by those who use it, the teachers, motivation of staff is not currently a priority. Before looking at who can help make the change a reality, for example the SLT, there is another dearth in the current organisational state. Indeed, a constructivist lens necessitates that the OIP considers the subjective experiences of agents at SOME, and how these experiences can be aligned with the desired future state of the organisation. A key example of this is necessity of the financial profile of the proposed change plan.

When the author was originally planning how to drive change at SOME, the for-profit hierarchical nature of the school was one that the OIP had to consider. As someone who sees themselves as a transformational leader, being able to take a “low-cost approach that can revitalize employees’ engagement” (Jensen et al., 2018, p. 358) is essential in an organisation that aims to make an annual profit. This means that the vision for change must be possible in an organisation with agents whose values lie not entirely in the educational domain. So, as will be seen later, the change vision to be outlined does not place any financial burden on SOME. In fact, it may even prove to be a fiscally prudent change in the school’s operations.

**Shifting ground**

If one considers a core issue of the organisational context at SOME, and other international schools, that teacher turnover hurts students (Adnot, Dee, Katz, & Wyckoff, 2013; Hayden & Thompson, 2009; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2016; Riggs, 2013), any desired future state should aim to ameliorate this loss. As educational leaders “need to be aware of how their interactions with teachers on a daily basis impact the success of their schools” (Mancuso, Roberts, & White, 2010, p. 321), it is
necessary to draw a connection between faculty motivation and the decision of teachers to leave a school. Surprisingly, some research (Chandler, 2010) even suggests that the geographic context of the international school is less important to teachers than the actual school environment in which they work. In fact, the author can personally attest to this, though admittedly in an anecdotal manner. A previous school that the change leader worked in was located in an African nation whose Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita was less than US$500 annually, whereas SOME’s national context has a GDP per capita almost 150 times higher (The World Bank, 2019). While the lack of developed medical facilities, very poor infrastructure, and security issues were indeed a ‘push’ factor for the author to leave their previous school, the ‘pull’ factor of a rewarding work environment, with positive school leadership, led to a tenure of three years. This exemplifies the role that subjective experiences can have in determining the motivation of employees, further justifying the importance of the constructivist lens this paper holds.

The effect of school leaders on retention rates is plain (Mancuso, Roberts, & White, 2010; Urick, 2016). When one considers that “collective teacher efficacy seems to be more dependent on the functioning of the school leadership or the school principal” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1065), it becomes very clear that the successful realisation of the proposed change could not only improve teachers’ motivation in PD initiatives but could also help improve retention. By refocusing the practices of professional learning towards appealing to the *intrinsic* motivations of teachers discussed by Avidov-Ungar (2016), faculty can become more invested in SOME. Building on this, McMillan, McConnell, and O’Sullivan (2016) point out this *intrinsic* motivation outweighs any *extrinsic* motivations when teachers decide to actively participate in PD. Indeed, even in other studies in teacher motivation, for example the willingness to act as a mentor to students of pre-service teaching programmes, an educator’s “principal focus is on their pupils” (Clarke, Triggs, & Nielsen, 2014, p. 191).
Apart from the obvious benefits to the learning at SOME of having teachers stay more than the average of three years, quite substantial financial savings can be made. The expense of organising visas, attendance at recruitment fairs, and paying shipping allowances are all factors that can be leveraged to encourage the administrative side of the school to support the change. After discussion with the administration staff at the school, the author ascertained the extra cost of bringing in a new teacher, as opposed to having an existing teacher stay. The subsequent figures are given in Canadian dollars, rather than in the local currency.

Bringing in a new teacher costs SOME over $5,000. This is broken down as $740 for new visa fees, $2,700 for recruitment fees, and roughly $1,700 for the moving allowance. When one considers that this is the cost to bring in one teacher, and that the school is also liable for the visa fees and moving allowance for dependents too, the financial burden on the school can be quite high. For example, the academic year of 2019/2020 will see an estimated change in teaching faculty of nine. This puts an extra burden of approximately $45,000 on the school, not to mention the loss to institutional memory changing faculty leads to. Therefore, any cultural shift at the school that lowers this rate of turnover would be welcomed by administration. For those concerned primarily with the management of the school, changing the existing culture of the organisation must be shown to have benefits beyond the classroom. While many stakeholders are mainly focused on the educational attainment of the students, a balance must be sought with other perspectives if the change is to take place.

*Building a foundation*

As Lewin (1948) put it over seventy years ago, “a culture is not a painted picture; it is a living process” (p. 46). Keeping this in mind when one considers that “cultures tell their members who they are, how to behave toward each other, and how to feel good about
themselves” (Schein, 2010, p. 29), a deeper understanding of change becomes apparent. If key assumptions of the culture can be altered, for example the shared understanding of effective PD, then aspects of the change can be self-sustaining once the initial spark is there. Simply put, some core aspects of change can start with a small group of change recipients, who can, in time, become agents of the very change that was targeted at them initially. Therefore, in the identification of change drivers, and their categorisation, it should be kept in mind that roles may shift as the change moves along the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016). Proper analysis of the forces both for and against change is founded on the need to cause disequilibrium in the status quo (Avolio & Hannah, 2008; Lewin 1948). Only with this dynamic perspective can one truly understand who or what may help drive the change. In this OIP, the term change driver or change agent is used to describe a person or force that can, and will be motivated to, help support the vision for change.

Initially, the author of this proposal will be the only driver for change. However, by presenting both internal (survey results, current divergence with stated organisational vision, etc.) and external data (academic studies that support the change, successful systems utilised in other schools, etc.) can the need to change be recognised. Also, as the externally-moderated standardised scores in the English Department moved to well above the world average since the author began informally leading the department, this can be leveraged to provide credibility for the necessity for organisational evolution. Once again, like Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) ‘tuning’, the author would be best described as the continuous improver in terms of the types of change leader put forth by Cawsey et al. (2016).

Yet regardless of the methodology, or drive of the author, it must be kept in mind that the constructivist worldview the author holds is predicated on the idea that the subjective experiences of people must be considered during the change. With such a light shone on the organisation, it would be remiss not to turn it on the figure behind the OIP itself. This leads to
the author questioning whether or not they can handle the increasing complexity, or workload, of the change as it progresses out of the awakening stage to the mobilisation stage, and beyond. In conjunction with teaching, coordinating the school’s CAS programme, and engaging in their own non-SOME based PD objectives, will the author be able to manage and drive the change alone?

Simply put, no.

Keeping in mind that “as change agents become immersed in the change, the volume of work increases, and the roles and skills required of them vary” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 277), the change leader must seek aid. This necessitates the inclusion of others in the change team. At this point, the survey results that will be examined in the Critical Organisational Analysis section, and their subsequent discussion will allow others to be identified as potential recruits to the change team. Once the change and its benefits are properly understood, the repetitive and poorly-received PD will be replaced with faculty-driven learning. Then, the all-important capacity building will begin.

Giving people “the opportunity to do things differently, to learn new skills and to generate more effective practice” (Harris, 2011, p. 627) will allow solution givers and process helpers to share ideas to further bolster the plan (Cawsey et al, 2016). As the mobilisation occurs, faculty will put forward change agents to call on who can make this happen. Also, working with both secondary school IB coordinators, as that is where the author works, will allow a stronger case to be made for driving the change. By this point, with the backing of both the faculty and the coordinators, the vice-principal can be formally brought on board to investigate ways of planning to institutionalise the presented process of change. Having reached this point, a team can be created to manage the burgeoning change in PD. This team, to be called the PD team, will be responsible for guiding the proposed change from the
mobilisation phase onwards. It will be composed of approximately six people. Along with three teachers who are respected across the school (determined through face-to-face interactions with faculty), the change leader, and one or two members of the SLT, the team will embody a concrete step forward for SOME’s organisational improvement. Ideally the member of the SLT who will definitely be on the team will be the vice-principal as this will lend weight to its operation.

As data is the key to framing change in an organisational context (Cawsey et al., 2016), results from ongoing surveys and post-workshop reflections will be examined. This data, along with notes from the subsequent discussions will be used to mobilise the school to continue to perfect the change path. Ideally, by this point, SOME’s culture where faculty are simply change recipients will end. They can become facilitators of the new system, supported by the author, the secondary school coordinators, and the vice-principal. External change agents, such as schools with admirable PD systems of their own and informal contacts at
other SOE schools, can also be consulted for guidance, however the core drivers of change will be part of the local SOME community.

If the vision for change can be successfully disseminated to the school, and the identified change drivers brought on board, the gap between the present and envisioned future state can be narrowed. A school where leaders and faculty collaboratively decide the PD direction of the school, with efforts made to appeal to the intrinsic motivations of all staff, is one that that this change is driving towards. Key priorities are promoting the benefits of the change to the various stakeholders, and with this complete, agents of change can be identified and leveraged. Yet, while individuals that may be of help have been discussed, how ready is the organisation as a whole?

**Organisational Change Readiness**

As Socrates stood in the Stoa of the Basileu, observers may have wondered why he decided to antagonise the court by suggesting he be maintained by the state upon being found guilty. Surely, if he had shown some level of contrition, his censure would not have been so severe. Of course, if he had pleaded for mercy he would have flown in the face of his life’s principles, and no doubt his tale would not have recounted in so humble a document as this OIP. He chose to stick with his beliefs and ended up dying for them.

While the principles behind seeking to improve PD at SOME may be, from the author’s perspective, sound, unless the organisational leadership is ready to take them on board after a comprehensive vision for change is put forth, then all is for naught. As Cawsey et al. (2016) warn us, “change agents need to demonstrate that the need for change is real and important. Only then will people unfreeze from past patterns” (p. 96). In other words,
principles are all well and good, but they must be communicated properly if they are to move principals.

If one ignores the existing culture in an organisation, the change leader faces an uphill struggle. There are several tools available to assess to what extent SOME is ready for change, however the readiness-for-change questionnaire put forth by Cawsey et al. (2016) will be used. Then Judge and Douglas’s work (2009) will be explored to delve deeper into the findings.

This readiness-for-change questionnaire allows the change agent to not only see where the organisation is in terms of how ready the system is to change, but perhaps more importantly, it allows the change leader to identify potential factors that may inhibit change. With permission from the SLT, acquired during the first half of the awakening stage, the author will use the survey functionality that comes as part of all staff’s software package. Training in this aspect of the suite has been offered in the past, and its ease of use allows all staff, of any tech skill level to respond. This is one of the strengths of the existing ICT systems at SOME. Stored in the compartmentalised cloud storage, the data can then be presented in any of the myriad ways that the survey functionality allows. Whether by simple quantitative feedback displayed via infographics, or by use of selected excerpts of participant commentary, the change leader can marshal the findings to encourage change.

As will discussed in more detail in the Critical Organisational Analysis, the utility of keeping some of these surveys anonymous cannot be overlooked. The many social networks that exist within a school must be considered when trying to understand a school system (Moolenaar, Sleegers, Karsten, & Daly, 2012), and thus any inhibitors to accurate data collection must be avoided. A person’s reticence to share opinions on organisational operations can be avoided if that person knows their opinion is anonymised. This reinforces
the necessity of keeping in mind the social constructivist perspective at the heart of this OIP, as only then can the change plan ensure that it can properly promote change through an inclusive and reflective process. Indeed, as Moolenar et al. (2012) remind us, social networks are a “meaningful concept to contextualise teacher interaction in support of teacher development and school improvement” (p. 67).

By identifying these obstructions before the change initiative begins, “change agents can take action to enhance readiness” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 108). In fact, they point out the danger of not fully recognising the complexities of the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations offered to change participants, a factor mentioned earlier when discussing Avidov-Ungar’s (2016) analysis of teachers’ motivation in taking part in PD. The questionnaire outlines seven dimensions that a change leader must examine:

- **Previous Change Experiences** – This criterion evaluates whether the organisation has undergone change recently, and if the change has been successful. It also assesses if the overall mood is upbeat, or cynical. The score in this category is 2/2.

- **Executive Support** – This discusses the role of the upper management in the proposed change, and if their support is present and necessary. The score in this category is 1/4.

- **Credible Leadership and Change Champions** – Are the senior leaders in the organisation trusted? Also, can the organisation recruit people who use network power to connect different levels of the system? The score in this category is 7/9.

- **Openness to Change** – Looking at both the ability of the organisation to monitor the change, and the culture of various strata when presented with change (particularly the proposed one), this criterion focuses on the flow of voices and how it can either promote or inhibit change. The score in this category is 8/11.

- **Readiness Dimensions** – This factor assesses the perception of the access to resources necessary to make the change occur. The score in this category is 4/4.
• **Rewards for Change** – Is the reward or punishment for change a force in the organisation? The score in this category is 1/1.

• **Measures for Change and Accountability** – This final criterion looks at how the organisation collects and manages the data it collects. Also, whether the information be successfully turned into momentum for change. The score in this category is 4/4.

With a range of -10 to +35, SOME scores at 28 in its readiness to change. The questionnaire clearly identifies that while there is high openness to change, with fluid communication and support for the proposed change by those not in the SLT, a lack of executive support is present. As such, the vision needs to make securing executive support a priority, particularly through appealing to their desire to be seen as change champions and highlighting the alignment of the proposed change with SOE’s strategic priorities.

If one uses Judge and Douglas’ (2009) work, there is an opportunity to expand on the questionnaire’s insight into the readiness for change at SOME. Some of their indicators of a high capacity for change are present at the school. Three of these are that:

• Non-executives can communicate their views openly.
• The IB coordinators are an effective link between various organisational levels.
• The school has a strong information and resource management system in place.

In addition to these positive indicators, Judge and Douglas (2009) recommend that a change leader who wishes to prepare for a change takes a perspective that is open to all forces, both internal and external. Such systems thinking is a core component of the author’s work, as was outlined in the *Leadership Position and Lens Statement* section. Perhaps the most important contribution that this extra analysis can provide is that it allows the change leader to communicate that change is possible, not just desirable.
As stated in SOE’s Corporate Vision (2017), the organisation seeks to ensure that teachers are given high quality PD, and to free them from routine work that inhibits professional reflection. This vision is made all the plainer when it speaks of the career and values of its main ideological champion: an educator who led SOE for many decades. The document cements their position by stating that they are considered “the most influential educator in the recent history of education” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 108) in the nation of SOE’s headquarters. It then goes on to state, from the perspective of this avowed visionary, that teachers must remain the main agents of improvement in the education system.

The proposed solution to the problem of practice, discussed in detail in the Possible Solutions to Address the POP section, complement both the vision of SOE and its organisational ‘hero’ perfectly. It is the contention of the change leader that including this fact in the communication of the need for change, particularly at the early stage to the SLT and senior teachers, will pay dividends. It demonstrates that while the practice of PD may not live up the goals of the organisation, corporate documentation can be marshalled in this regard.

Similarly, the SOME Prospectus (2017) also emphasises the role that reflection plays in improving teaching, and states that a comprehensive suite of PD is in place. Yet, ‘on the ground’ at SOME, PD programmes are simply announced, with little or no consultation with staff to ascertain need, or direction. This means that when the annual cycle of PD is outlined to staff, foci are most often on areas not of concern to faculty or have even been offered before to the same staff. In other words, the same workshop leaders are brought in, year in, year out, regardless of the reception their previous workshops received. The faculty often discusses the repetition of workshops as being a major source of professional frustration. Indeed, one teacher who has been at SOME for four of its six years has taken the same workshop three times. The readiness to embrace a change to the structure of professional
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learning is, as pointed out by the openness to change criterion in the questionnaire, abundantly present in the faculty.

Also, the ongoing reflection on the efficacy of new learning initiatives is missing. Therefore, in terms of both the motivation of teachers towards PD, and the system through which it is chosen, SOME is flawed in its current organisational state. Clearly the variance between SOE’s, and therefore SOME’s, organisational vision and reality needs to be properly communicated before it can be ameliorated.

Despite this, it’s essential to keep in mind the hierarchical nature of the organisation in determining if it’s ready for change. The necessary ‘tuning’ of the organisation, as termed by Nadler and Tushman (1989), requires the change leader to make the change incremental, and not require any major organisational shifts. In the context of a hierarchical TNC, another concept from Nadler and Tushman (1989) bears direct relevance to this OIP proposal: the Investment-and-Returns Principle. If the OIP cannot promise major improvement quickly, then any major investment of time and resources will be unlikely. This unwillingness to decentralise large-scale control and the corresponding oversight of resources means that a major proposed change would probably face organisational opposition. Therefore, the necessity to make the change smooth and gradual, to tune, and its presentation to SOME as being simply that, is paramount.

The proposed future state of SOME, where PD initiatives are driven by learning needs, and distinct efforts are made to motivate staff to engage well with such initiatives, is not just desirable, it is possible. As stated, there is already a clear link between the goals of the organisation and the proposed change. Indeed, the score of 28/35 in the readiness-for-change questionnaire by Cawsey et al. (2016) is a very positive indicator of the potential for change to actually occur. To build a system whereby leadership actively seeks guidance on
what PD to offer, and then understands how best to promote its learning is a goal that the organisation is ready for. Another factor that demonstrates the readiness of SOME to embrace this change is its role as the first school that SOE has opened in the Middle East. Greater adherence to what is considered best practice in many national contexts will increase its ability to garner more accreditation. In this very competitive environment for for-profit schools, the author seeks to use this to bolster the proposed change. For example, as evidence of organisational improvement, the proposed change is excellent evidence of how professional learning can be improved at the school. Indeed, at the school’s last accreditation visit by a North American accreditation body, PD was an area that was discussed in depth. Finally, the change leader hopes to incentivise the administration by promoting such a shift as complementary to the financial and reputational benefits that accrue from being a venue for PD workshops.

Yet, while the need and potential for the change are clearer, more attention must be paid to the *how* of the change. Chapter two will outline the approach to be taken in this OIP, as well as discussing the triad of triage needed at SOME, beginning with changing perceptions of what successful PD actually looks like.
Chapter Two – Planning and Development

This second chapter of the OIP does quite a lot. It begins by discussing the approach to leadership taken by the author, as well as justifying why such an approach is necessary. In fact, some of the complexities of the constructivist lens are expanded upon here in order to bring the reader closer to the approach. The chapter then describes the dominant theoretical framework behind the change process, and what other theories were either discarded or synthesised into the main scheme. This synthesis of theory is a fundamental part of this OIP, as the author feels that any good system of thought must recognise the complementary effects of other ideas. This openness to seeing other perspectives is also at play in the organisational analysis of various stakeholder groups at the school. Next, this chapter outlines possible solutions to the problem of practice, before concluding with a discussion of the ethical considerations of the OIP.

Leadership Approach to Change

In chapter one, the Leadership Position and Lens Statement section made clear the reasons for adopting a constructivist approach to leadership. With the necessity of bringing others on board with the change a key component of this OIP, the leadership approach to change must hold this fundamental understanding close. In any organisation, change must be considered with regards to the effect on the people on whom successful implementation relies. As Cawsey et al. (2016) put it, people working in an organisation “are thinking individuals, trying to make sense out of the change and its impact” (p. 217). Any successful leadership approach must address this. However, consideration of the effect on change recipients, and seeking to bring potential change agents on board is easier said than done. A return to classical Athens may help further illustrate this complexity.
When Xenophon led an estimated ten thousand soldiers on a fighting retreat across Persia, he cemented his position as one of the most famous military leaders in history. Indeed, his work *Cyropaedia* has been used for millennia as a guide to leadership by noted thinkers like Machiavelli. A contemporary of Xenophon, Alcibiades occupies a similar position in classical thought. Over the course of a lifetime, the effect of this military and political leader was widespread. Indeed, like Xenophon, Alcibiades is a respectable figure for analysis for modern leadership studies (Mantzouranis, 2018). Yet, it is another tie between both these classical giants that serves as the most noteworthy to this OIP.

At the Battle of Delium, Xenophon’s life was saved by Socrates, while at the Battle of Potidaea, Alcibiades was also rescued by the gadfly of Athens. As a result of these actions, Socrates gained two pupils. Both Xenophon and Alcibiades joined a host of thinkers whose own personal characteristics were bountiful enough that wilful participation in the teaching of another was surprising. Socrates devoted himself to putting himself on the same ground, whether field of battle or field of thought, as his contemporaries, and consequently gained supporters. In a school as diverse in background and experience as SOME, the change leader behind this OIP recognises the need to engage with the school at various levels, in a manner that understands the needs of a leader to engage with the change recipients’ view of their role in a greater system. This, as Cawsey et al. (2016) put it, psychological contract is a crucial contextual variable that requires a leadership style that is responsive to the concerns of the elements of the system at all stages of the proposed change. By having “an emotionally intelligent management staff” (Nesterkin, 2013, p. 573) a change leader can avoid much of the opposition to a change initiative. How else could Plato’s teacher have counted two such notable leaders in his retinue? The practicalities of addressing the POP with regards to this personalised approach will be outlined in chapter three’s *Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process*. 
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Building on this leadership approach, another major principle of this OIP’s framework is to make concerted efforts to emphasise the systems thinking nature of the author’s view of change. While it is all well and good for a leader to understand that their organisation is a complex linked system, this facet of the POP requires the author to spread this understanding throughout SOME. While the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) states that their school operate through a social learning network, where teachers are required to engage with others outside their subject fields for the benefit of learning, at SOME this is most often not the case. Clearly, this needs to change.

Practices such as responsibility charting and showcasing the professional knowledge of colleagues allow a leader to awaken the understanding that a school is a system of people working towards the common goal of student learning. The constructivist lens puts the onus on a leader to make a change multi-faceted, and to make sure that is seen as such.

Considering that “research shows that supervisors/managers have a significant influence on how the change is perceived and reacted to by their direct reports” (Cawsey et al, 2016, p. 235), opportunities to expand the school employees’ understanding of the effects of their efforts on colleagues cannot be missed. Targeted efforts to address a school subgroup, for example the Human Resources department or the Secondary Science department, and their individualised understanding of their role in achieving whole-school learning, enables the change leader to have all members of the school see the need for change. Similarly, framing the change properly by “establishing starting points for change, designing the change journey, and communicating principles” (Cawsey et al, 2016, p. 264) allows all members of the system to recognise the new vision. This collective identity in thrall to a commonly understood goal is essential if SOME is to embody the vision for change (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2013). Yet, while both faculty and staff agree on the overall vision of improving
student learning, and agree on the role that PD play in achieving this, how does this OIP aim to connect both these understandings in service of the proposed solutions to the POP?

When Socrates sought to examine fundamental concepts such as wisdom or love, he did not begin by making grand statements that were universally applicable *sans* context. Instead, he and his interlocuters discussed ideas and situations, then gradually moved towards the overall goal of achieving understanding. As an educator who defined himself by always seeking to improve himself and others, one cannot but agree that Socrates would concur with the necessity of improving how teachers learn in a school. The very nature of the Socratic elenchus is to continually modify and improve a vision and move ever closer to a shared understanding of an important idea. This approach has a direct parallel in this OIP, already mentioned in chapter one’s *Leadership Position and Lens Statement*.

Along with explicitly recognising the individualised perspectives of faculty and staff at SOME and seeking to foster a more systems-oriented view across the school, the final leadership approach that will allow change to be propelled forward is to champion the continual improvement model at the school. In the same way that Socrates continually modified and improved the collective understanding of an idea, the author wishes to impart the same understanding of change as being an evolutionary process.

As Cawsey et al. (2016) advise us, unless members of an organisation monitor and question, any proposed change may be perceived as threatening. Not only does the chosen leadership approach aim to foster an engaged and interrogative review by all stakeholders over the course of the proposed change, it plans to do so in a manner that gradually shifts the current PD practices at SOME. The benefits of this are to make the change achievable, and not relegate this OIP to simply being a mere academic exercise. Chapter three’s *Change Implementation Plan* will outline the specific actions that the change will entail, but at their core, all three can be accomplished via the tuning process outlined by Nadler and Tushman.
(1989). As part of awakening the need for change, the change leader will begin to change the perception of what successful PD is. This does not mean simply holding an information session and seeking to suddenly shift whole-school perceptions, but rather building up a network of proven resources that can be used, slowly gathering, then sharing an understanding of the vast untapped human capital that rests within the faculty. To illustrate this, the secondary school counsellor recently attended a major international event in Europe that discussed the needs of tertiary-level education in the 21st century. Yet this information has not left the notes of the counsellor’s laptop. Indeed, the counsellor has told the change leader behind this OIP that no ‘debrief’ of any substance was sought by the SLT. At some of the previous schools that the author has taught at, sharing of this type of learning was encouraged, yet at SOME, PD is still seen as being entirely within the bailiwick of expensive, and often poorly-received, external providers.

Finally, as made clear in chapter one’s section on Organisational Context, the hierarchical nature of the SOE organisation and the close monitoring of the local MOE mean that grand sweeping change would be very difficult to propose at SOME, let alone achieve. Ongoing changes implemented by the MOE mean that even relatively minor powers such as the approval of field trips no longer rest with the principal, but instead student excursions must be licensed by the MOE. Therefore, in tandem with the need for a leadership approach that makes the proposed change seem both possible and incremental to faculty and staff at the school, the change cannot be drastic enough that the school needs to engage with the MOE or SOE head office, bringing in even more potential obstacles.
Framework for Leading the Change Process

When considering the relevant framing theories for this OIP, the author looked at several possibilities. The field of leadership studies is broad, and as such contains a plethora of theories that purport to offer the way forward. After much consideration, the Change Path Model outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016) is the framework settled on for this proposal. However, before examining said model, some explanation is needed why another model was first considered, but ultimately ruled out.

Kotter’s (2012) Stage Model of Organisational Change initially felt like a natural fit for the OIP being examined. It focuses on the importance of communication and building on small wins, two key facets of this OIP Proposal. As discussed earlier, the need for the faculty and staff to not only understand the need for change, and their role in making it happen, is fundamental to addressing the POP. Indeed, Kotter (2012) also echoes this OIP’s goal to make the change a process of slowly building momentum, rather than simply proposing and implementing a major systemic change. However, upon closer reflection, the lack of “threats to the system” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 47) in a school with growing enrolment and the lack of importance paid to the multiplicity of stakeholders in the model (Polack & Pollack, 2015) meant that for efforts to change both the PD practice and culture at SOME, Kotter didn’t fit.

However, before looking at the Change Path Model in more detail, two other frameworks must be mentioned. As discussed in chapter one’s Organisational Change Readiness section, Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) view of making change gradual is inherent to the OIP. Furthermore, Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) Competing Values Model will later be utilised in the organisational analysis and identification of the change drivers. Its adherence to the belief that different people in an organisation have different values fits perfectly with the complex nature of organisational change in SOME’s context. It is the contention of this paper
that these other frameworks will bolster the effectiveness of the Change Path Model, hence their explicit recognition.

While looking at various theories, the author concluded that one single theory would not be sufficient to deal with the complexity of the vision for change. Integrating various perspectives became necessary to properly articulate a real possibility for organisational change at SOME. This practice of seeking out many models and synthesising a new understanding is endorsed by Riel and Martin (2017). Indeed, it is hoped that the synthesis of these frameworks will enable the very multiplicity of perspectives needed for the change leader to not just conceptualise the vision for change, but to then outline how to make it happen. This OIP will now look at Change Path Model as outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016).

Figure 5 - Change Path Model

Awakening

Beginning with a critical organisational analysis, the awakening phase of the Change Path Model is aimed at getting the change leader to critically assess their organisation. This includes “looking at the dynamics internal to their institutions” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 53) and deciding on the embryonic vision for change. It also involves disseminating throughout the organisation the necessity for change, showing that “the need for change is real and
important” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 96). As Nesterkin (2013) reminds us, organisational change “is impossible without the individual change” (p. 575). When one considers the very nature of a school, where educators usually work alone in classrooms, led by an overarching system, it is quite plain that the vision for change must focus heavily on the individual if change is to occur. This drives home the realisation that when planning a change in a school, in any attempt to awaken the understanding of a need for change, focused attention must be paid to addressing this micro-political factor. As will be seen later in chapter three’s Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process, dealing with these complex organisational mechanics require specific strategies. An example of this is the role of face-to-face interaction, something recommended by Klein (2012), among others (Fadzil, Hassan, Mohamad, Zainudin, & Ali, 2019). As “staff interactions are embedded in operational and social structures which are dynamic” (Fasso, Knight, & Purnell, 2016, p. 205), any attempt to modify something as fundamental, and valued differently by a multitude of stakeholders, as PD, the awakening phase must be more than simply disseminating whole-school circulars.

In terms of the awakening phase at SOME, not only will a more in-depth organisational analysis be undertaken, with the identification of factors that can be marshalled to produce change, a raising of awareness of the potential benefits of changing PD practices will begin. Also, the call to reaffirm the importance of effective PD, and the necessity for collaborative reflection will be bolstered by explicit use of the SOME Prospectus (2017).

**Mobilisation**

The embryonic vision for change is fostered by deeper analysis of the relevant topics and drawing in others to create organisational momentum. It is this stage that allows change
leaders to learn just what others may know about the best way to achieve the desired change. As the change leader may be able to identify change agents at all levels of the organisation here, “multiple communication channels” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 53) must be used. Furthermore, a more detailed and nuanced understanding of the system through a more thorough organisational analysis is essential here. Recognising the gap between where the organisation is, and where the change leader wants it to go is paramount. At SOME, once the core idea for the proposed change has been disseminated to the school, discussions with both faculty and administration will allow a more in-depth understanding of not just who may be of aid, but what, or who, might be barriers to change. Resistance to change can take many forms (Nesterkin, 2013), therefore a uniform approach to dealing with opposition cannot be taken. For example, change recipients who doubt the benefits of changing PD at SOME can be convinced by use of specific, and actionable, examples of how sharing their past experiences at previous schools can aid other teachers. Another example is to highlight the increased autonomy that teachers will have in choosing the direction that professional learning takes at the school. Indeed, this directly addresses one of the more common forms of resistance highlighted by Nesterkin (2013): reactance.

Over the course of the writing process for this OIP, the author has engaged in detailed discussions with both the educational leadership and administration of the school to better understand the levers which can be used to mobilise the school. As the change process moves further along, this integrative approach needs to continue, as understanding that “your perception is only one of many” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 389) is essential. This OIP shall examine the importance of this further in the Leadership Ethics and Organisational Change Issues section.
**Acceleration**

As the change leader creates a coalition to help bring about the change, as well as having defined a clearer vision, the system will begin to see shifts in the operation of the organisation. Capacity building will occur, further accelerating the potential for even more change. It is this capacity building that is core to any organisational success (Harris, 2011). All successful markers of the change need to be shared across the system to ensure better understanding of the need for change. Even minor steps taken towards the vision need to be disseminated as it not only allows the school to celebrate success, and those who achieved it, but also keeps the change process forefront in the minds of the school. As Guskey (2014) reminds us, an “essential but often neglected aspect of organizational support is feedback to teachers on the results of their efforts” (p. 15).

Action planning tools such as responsibility charting and backwards planning with collaboratively chosen checkpoints are some of the tools that can be of use here. Creating an open school database of what PD has been both offered by SOME and the PD taken by faculty at other schools is a simple and straightforward way to show that change is happening. Both administration and faculty will see the wealth of professional learning already present, and available to share in SOME’s own professional learning community (PLC). This limits the need for sole reliance on the externally-provided workshops cyclically offered now. This enables teachers to know who to reach out to about certain topics and helps avoid the dissipation of organisational knowledge that Hargreaves (2007) warns of.

**Institutionalization**

At this stage of the Change Path Model, the organisation is ready to fully shift into the new state. As with any change, there is a danger of simply falling back into previous
structures. Gardner (2013) cautions readers that “leaders must institutionalize their leadership” (p. 26) if they wish their change to become permanent. With change being monitored throughout the whole change process, a better picture will be available as to what the final iteration of the new system may be. The change leader, and at this point the SLT too, will aim to put in place structures, both formal and informal, that ensure that the change will become the new status quo. Cawsey et al. (2016) share a wide range of tools that can used to measure the success of a change, and indeed the successes of the change can be communicated to different shareholders via whichever value system they esteem most. As data (including faculty surveys, projected financial savings through less reliance on bringing workshop leaders to the school, etc.) is gathered at SOME concerning the choice of, and response to, a new system of PD, this information can be leveraged to encourage the adoption of the change for the long-term future. Creation of an end-of-change-cycle report that presents the accumulated data clearly can increase the potential of institutionalisation taking place. This example of an effective use of data epitomises just one way how data can be used to improve the PD culture at a school (Dudar et al., 2017). Similarly, use of a constructivist lens allows the OIP to decide on data collection methods at the beginning of the change process which better aid in seeing SOME how is currently is, rather than just pontificate on how is should be.

**Critical Organisational Analysis**

When beginning to critically analyse an organisation, there are a wide range of tools at this OIP’s disposal. Not only is the data gathering aimed at simply getting a better understanding of the systemic state, it can be used to identify people and processes that can be of aid. Of course, this data can also come from existing “structures, culture, policies, and standard operating procedures” (Leithwood, Harris, & Strauss, 2013, p. 263).
In the context of SOME, the first tool to be used to assess the state of the organisation is that of anonymous surveys. As illustrated in chapter three’s *Timeline for Change*, the first phase of the awakening stage involves priming the organisation for the proposed change. This priming involves seeking first approval of, then support for, the schoolwide data collection. As the faculty is highly trained in the suite of tools offered by a major tech company, there are no procedural issues here. This “multichannel communication system that allows everyone to connect to everyone else” (Schein, 2010, p. 369) is firmly embedded in the operational routines of the school. Examples of this are the use of online data collection tools, posting and accessing of collaborative documents on a commonly accessed cloud server, as well as periodic training offering by the tech company so that SOME can maintain its status as a member of the corporation’s select group of schools in the region. In fact, the ICT department actively discourages the use of programs offered by a major competitor to the tech company the school has a relationship with. The refusal of the ICT department to allow the use of a college counselling website created by the secondary counsellor exemplifies this, in part because it was created at their previous school, using the aforementioned competitor’s suite of tools. Finally, SOME recently hung a large banner in its main hall celebrating the corporate partnership between SOE and its chosen tech company. As an aside, this last example serves as another indicator of the increasing corporatisation of international schools mentioned in chapter one’s *Framing the Problem of Practice*. Furthermore, by keeping the surveys anonymous, it encourages frank and open responses, as people will “say things that they would not feel comfortable stating publically [sic]” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 311). This Fragmented Social Mirror (Bergstrom, Harris, & Karahalios, 2011) allows the change leader to gain trust throughout the organisation from the very beginning, as well as serving as the first iteration of a series of surveys that will be used to monitor the change as it progresses. However, it should be kept in mind that many of the
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faculty are well versed in educational research, so particular effort must be made to assure the participants that their responses are indeed anonymous. With deception a component of many apparently anonymous data collection methods (Drew, Hardman, & Hosp, 2007), some faculty will require the personal assurance of the author and/or the SLT that the responses will be truly anonymous.

Making the surveys accessible via a shared hyperlink, rather than through the online, password-authenticated school portal will allow staff at SOME to access the survey anonymously. Not only will these surveys create a baseline on attitudes to PD and what the past experiences of faculty professional learning are, they will allow the change leader, and later the PD team, to identify areas that must be focused on. Also, the end-of-change-cycle report during the institutionalisation stage will highlight longitudinal shifts in the school culture.

One of the forms of resistance to change discussed by Nesterkin (2013) is that of inertia. He defines this as the “passive avoidance of taking any action that deviates from status quo” (Nesterkin, 2013, p. 574). Whether one is plotting the change at the beginning of the path or doing so during the process of monitoring the change, it is essential to get honest feedback.

As such, if one is to properly articulate the gap between the current and desired state of PD provision at the school, the anonymised surveys serve as a useful counterpoint to the more public stages of the gap analysis. For example, if soliciting opinions during a scheduled PLC meeting, some teachers may feel reticent to share their views. As stated earlier, the micro-political climate of an organisation is essential to consider. While one can imagine a school where all faculty and staff feel free to share their opinions openly, this utopian model does not exist anywhere, as indeed the etymology of the word ‘utopia’ suggests! While the
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author certainly does not believe that hemlock will be administered to those who veer from the organisational direction, as was to Socrates, the political nature of any complex organisation cannot be ignored. As Schneider, Judy, and Ebmeyer (2014) counsel us, trust in a school “is achieved through a complex web of social exchanges, often in instances where the parties have unequal or asymmetrical power relationships” (p. 40).

Yet, simply creating a well-crafted survey and analysing the views at SOME with regards to PD is not enough. Indeed, sharing the results with people at SOME will allow the change leader to “raise awareness and understanding, advance the analysis, and build support and commitment for actions” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 311). This will not only allow the change leader to grow understanding of the vision for change, it begins to change the very understanding of what professional learning is at the school. In fact, by sharing the results via the weekly meetings, face-to-face briefings with key change participants, and schoolwide emails, the PD team can then communicate identified ways to shift teaching and learning at SOME. This will demonstrate the utility of the surveys and encourage greater participation in the change process. Finally, as recommended by Klein (2012), multiple media routes will reinforce the message of the OIP and keep the change at the centre of organisational awareness.

Currently, the role of teachers in relation to PD is simply to attend the mandated sessions. As mentioned in chapter one’s Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice section, this does not recognise the self-assessed needs of teachers in improving their practice. Similarly, the synthesis of the readiness-for-change questionnaire outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016) and the insight offered by Judge and Douglas (2009), highlights the lack of reflection on the success of any past professional learning at the school. It should be noted that this synthesis is another example of the integrative thinking encouraged by Riel and
Martin (2017), a practice that the author firmly believes is necessary for successful systems thinking.

When this OIP examined the role of *intrinsic* versus *extrinsic* motivation, as defined by Avidov-Ungar (2016), it demonstrated an understanding that makes it all but impossible to class SOME PD as being anything other than *extrinsically* motivated. This problem lies at the core of the current organisational state. Therefore, the move to the desired future state of the organisation must address this rift. If the OIP wishes to shift the faculty and staff’s motivation from being mainly *extrinsic* to mainly *intrinsic*, then the leadership approach of encouraging systems thinking, paying attention to the psychological contract staff have with the school, and individualising the way change is driven must be taken. Shifts in professional learning practice at the school arising out of the change process, in particular the more transparent process of how PD directions are taken will demonstrate to the community that their voices have been heard. Mobilising the school culture and community to not only direct the path that professional learning takes, but in also reflecting on how effective PD is, takes a strong step towards bridging this gap.

The next tool to be used to critically assess the organisation is an analysis of who are “the people who are critical to the change process” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 314). This involves looking at both the formal and informal organisation (Nadler & Tushman, 1989), and who plays what role where. This will allow the change leader to discuss with others the need, and potential processes to enact change. Here change recipients may be identified as possible future change facilitators. Considering that this OIP requires buy-in from people at all levels of the school, and that this author concurs with Nesterkin (2013) that an individualised approach is necessary to avoid obstacles to the vision to the change, a comprehensive stakeholder analysis is necessary to articulate the gap between the current and future organisational state.
Initially, the author was drawn towards the PRINCE model of stakeholder analysis, which “involves the systematic use of expert data to build a projection matrix” (Wankel, 2009, p. 1303), thus turning an analysis into actionable data. However, this admittedly policy-focused tool recommends an analyst having a long tenure in a context before conducting an analysis, far longer than the author has had at SOME, just over two years. For this reason, while an interesting model, the PRINCE model would not provide a true analysis. So, as mentioned earlier, the Competing Values Model (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) will be the primary tool for stakeholder analysis.

![Competing Values Model](image)

When a leader understands the values of the diverse agents in an organisation, increased potential for change exists (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2013). Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) model allows just that. For the purposes of this OIP, its main use during the awakening phase is to ascertain the values of various agents within the school, giving the change leader a greater understanding of how best to communicate the vision for change. Finally, diagnosis of the dimensions via a quantitative study can be undertaken to reinforce applicability (Belasen & Frank, 2008).
Adhocracy View

The Adhocracy View of the organisation is that taken by those who operate in an individualistic and temporary system (Cameron and Quinn, 2011). Considering the migratory nature of international school teachers, and an understanding of the ever-shifting nature of micro-political environments as they move from school to school, most of SOME’s teaching faculty is best understood as having this view. To exemplify this, the relatively high turnover at international schools means that many minor leadership roles change as faculty shift from year to year. As mentioned in the section on Organisational Context in chapter one, the IB encourage distributed leadership in its schools. This means that there are several minor leadership roles to be found in IB schools that do not exist in non-IB schools. Personal Project Supervisor, Extended Essay Supervisor, and CAS Coordinator are just a few of the many of these positions that are held by teachers and shift around as faculty changes each year. This means that much of the faculty has experience in leadership roles from previous schools, but then needs to adapt to the new organisational structure when they arrive at SOME.

As the organisational ‘product’ of agents with these values are student achievement and a feeling of being part of a system that values their role, a shorter-term and externally validated (when teachers compare their school to other schools) view of change is taken. So, while the faculty work within the organisation of SOE, much of their future career rests on maintaining strong links with the pedagogy and ideals of either the IB or their own national education system (should they plan on returning home to teach). Therefore, the current state of PD does not address their needs, as the existing system at SOME is mostly on training that does not translate to other contexts, particularly in terms of certification. For example, the workshops held at the school are given by external providers and are not licensed by the IB or other accrediting agencies. This means that the certification provided draws its legitimacy
from the SOE corporation. As mentioned earlier, participation at these workshops is often mandatory, no follow-up is undertaken, and is repeated despite poor reception from the faculty.

This clearly places the desired future state of the organisation as being one where those with learning gained at other international schools are encouraged to do so. A state where faculty can help chart the annual professional learning course, and where staff feel more part of the system. This would be desirable for this group.

*Market View*

As discussed earlier, the administration of SOME is tied very closely to the main office of SOE, with financial and operational administration often preparing reports for perusal by people higher up in the SOE hierarchy. With SOE planning to expand further into the Middle Eastern educational market, the *Market View* can best be attributed to this group. Additionally, as the principal’s *de facto* role is to liaise with the local MOE, and does not involve herself in educational matters, one can place the principal here.

Here Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) Investment-and-Returns Principle helps us. If little or no financial investment is required, and there is a potentially high return (if communicated properly by the change leader) in terms of school culture, then little or no opposition is expected to the organisational change. As discussed in chapter one’s *Organisational Context, section*, there exists a lot of competition between international schools in SOME’s national context. As such, enrolment numbers and growing the market share are core values of those with the *Market View*. This means making the proposed change financially sound, and one that could be leveraged to encourage other schools to attend the workshops held at SOME. Having teachers from other institutions come to the school to learn
from SOME teachers would be a future state highly desirable by this group. In fact, this year the school was used as venue for a national conference organised by the tech company the school has ties to. With the proposed change requiring no financial expenditure, rather a reorganisation of time spent in planning and implementing professional learning at the school, the change leader feels that those with the Market View could be brought on board to support the change. Similarly, the potential for reducing teacher turnover through the faculty’s greater participation in school decision-making (Mancuso et al., 2010; Urick, 2016) is one that would appeal here.

**Hierarchy View**

Third, the Hierarchy View is that usually taken by those who monitor and manage the organisation. These agents focus on ensuring that rules and procedures are followed, and that their role as leadership is well-defined. In other words, reliable and predictable behaviour is valued by this group (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). At SOME, the vice-principal, who is mainly in charge of educational matters, and the three IB coordinators hold this value of control as core. The behaviours outlined by O’Neill and Quinn (1993), “handling paperwork, reviewing and responding to routine information, and carrying out inspections, tours and reviews” (p. 2) encapsulate their roles perfectly.

As such, communication efforts to bring about change with these roles must emphasise Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) ‘tuning’, rather than sweeping systemic change. This means that if this group is to be brought on board with the vision for change, the change must be communicated as being manageable. For example, the proposed modification to the current annual cycle of PD, whereby a PD team would analyse need and potential for future professional learning initiatives must be shown to be accessible via the current data.
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management system utilised by the school. Also, for this group a longer-term, and internally focused view of change is usually taken. However, it must be added that there is overlap with the next view among this group, as distributed leadership efforts are a core part of the IB philosophy, and to maintain IB certification, steps must be taken in this regard. As such any change to the procedures valued by those with the Hierarchy View must be both manageable internally, and consistent with the cyclical re-accreditation needed by international schools.

Clan View

The Clan View is the one that the change leader would most like to foster in the organisation. Only by having agents in the organisation who see themselves as part of semiautonomous teams who receive communal reward (Cameron and Quinn, 2011) can this OIP succeed. To briefly return to the transformational leadership approach, seeking to “raise the consciousness in individuals and to get them to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of others” (Northouse, 2016, p. 175) is key here. This group already holds these values as fundamental and may serve as a source of change champions. Cameron and Quinn (2011) see this group as one where a small team can direct itself within a larger system, and see success in group, rather than individual terms.

At SOME, the successful spreading of systems thinking, with a focus on individual development that is transferrable to other schools, would marshal this group to engage willingly with the vision for change. The current state where individuals engage in PD, and do not then collaborate or reflect as a group does not engender positive professional learning with those holding the Clan View. By aiming to shift people to value goals outside of their traditional sphere, values (such as the importance of improving PD) can become dynamic. Furthermore, as Mills and Gay (2016) point out, longitudinal survey studies can empirically
track these shifts in values, meaning that not only is the desired future state monitorable, the very act of monitoring further bolsters its institutionalisation via repetitive transmission of the new value PD has.

Possible Solutions to Address the POP

When one looks at the vast array of literature on what works in PD, three main issues arise. First, there is a lot of literature (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015; Desimone, 2009; McMillan et al., 2016) that devotes much time to simply trying to define what good professional learning is. When one reflects on the number of educators that undertake professional learning annually, this lack of cohesion is especially surprising. Next, considering that the market for school PD is ever-expanding, with 3.5 billion USD spent last year in the US alone (Statista, 2018), figuring out what is academic and what is advertising becomes increasingly difficult. Also, as a large proportion of the literature is produced from a small number of countries, efforts must be made to avoid cultural biases when conducting research on what sources to internalise. As mentioned in the section on Organisational Context in chapter one, there are many nationalities at SOME. Therefore, the implementation of this OIP must take these three issues into account.

Many at SOME see professional learning as simply bringing in, often at great expense from overseas, workshop leaders. Contracted by SOE, the lecturers deliver professional learning in an area that they are deemed to be experts in. These workshop leaders then give an often poorly received extended presentation over a few days, with no follow up to review its implementation. As the school holds certain pedagogies, for example concept-based learning, as an integral part of its identity, SOME is well-intentioned in mandating this training for new members of faculty. However, as many new teachers have undertaken
extensive training in concept-based learning at previous schools, and many current teachers have been required to take the training multiple times, the practice leaves something to be desired. However well-intentioned a policy may be, if it loses sight of the overall organisational objective in service to bureaucracy, then it must be re-examined.

Clearly, the view on what exactly is good professional learning in the organisation must change. Using Villegas-Reimers’ (2013) concept of seeing good PD as being based in constructivism, a long-term process, contextually based, reflective, and collaborative (see Figure 3), it is clear that SOME’s practice of PD is a core problem to be addressed. Moreover, its use of resources is currently aimed at meeting a set financial and hours-spent target to demonstrate that professional learning is being offered. The change leader behind this OIP feels that the financial expenditure could be reduced. Finally, SOME’s choice of source material for its PD seldom seeks inspiration from non-occidental origins. Considering the global nature of both faculty and students, as well as the potential positives being overlooked, this should also change.

When initially considering a way forward, the author examined utilising a continuum of professional learning that could be spread across the SOE organisation. This would be a periodically reviewed set of key skills and knowledge that all faculty across the SOE family of schools would have training in. It would take the vision and values stated in the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) and use it to outline a plan of professional learning that all teachers, whichever of the ten SOE schools they worked at would engage in. While a call to make a school have an “interactive learning dynamic” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 16) or to “balance the physical and digital worlds” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 65) in relation to learning seem standard, 21st century approaches to education, some areas of conflict exist within the SOE family of schools that would make this continuum difficult to realise.
While SOME is wholly devoted to implementing and delivering the IB’s “high-quality and challenging educational programmes” (SOME School Prospectus, 2017, p. 3), not all schools within the SOE family are geared towards that goal. For example, the School of Western Europe (SOWE), a thirty-year old school in a nation in western Europe, has a wholly different focus. SOWE takes students between the ages of twelve and sixteen, and only offers the IB MYP diploma. However, as is made clear in its school literature, the “aim of the programme is for students to learn and master English while coming in contact with the culture of the country in a natural setting” (SOWE School Prospectus, 2017, p. 6). As an almost direct parallel, another member of the SOE family, the School of Central Europe (SOCE) states that the “aim of the programme is for students to learn and master French while coming in contact with the culture of the country in a natural setting” (SOCE School Prospectus, 2017, p. 3). Clearly, the learning needs across the family of schools cannot be simply integrated into an organisational-wide framework.

Another reason that a whole-organisation approach cannot be taken is that of the context in which SOME is located. Despite the fact that the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) calls for students to have “unlimited access to information” (p. 34), limitations at SOME exist in this regard. Examples of this include extensive censoring of literature, removal of the names of certain states from class maps, and much of the internet being blocked. In tandem with this, the need for approval for almost all major initiatives by the MOE is another obstacle to a SOE-wide continuum of professional learning. Therefore, for all the reasons outlined above, this OIP relies solely on a modification to PD at SOME itself, without outside consultation with either the MOE or SOE headquarters.

However, the idea of a continuum of professional learning does not need to be discarded entirely. Indeed, the collection of existing PD knowledge in the faculty and analysing how it relates to the goals of SOME lies at the core of the proposed solutions. Once
the school begins to leverage existing knowledge, real shifts in professional learning can occur. As Robinson, Bendikson, McNaughton, Wilson, and Zhu (2017) put it, a “focus on data use in teacher professional-learning communities” (p. 14) can positively impact the existing culture at a school. This OIP shall return to this later in this section after having examined, then discarded another possible solution to this POP.

If SOME cannot draw its professional learning from an organisation-wide continuum, then what about from the other transnational organisation of which it is part, the IB? The IB continues to grow across the world and is now considered an implicit prerequisite for entry into many of America’s top-ranked universities (Tarasawa, 2013). It has moved beyond the world of private international schools, and most IB World Schools, meaning those that offer the Primary Years Programme (PYP), the Middle Years Programme (MYP), and the Diploma Programme (DP), which cover from ages three to eighteen, are now public schools (Tarasawa, 2013). The IB offers a comprehensive range of online training, as well as regional workshops that faculty can attend. In fact, SOME frequently sends teachers to these workshops, be they in its local national context, or outside the country. So why could this OIP not simply adopt the IB continuum of training as its model for PD?

As many of the teachers hired by SOME are coming from other IB schools, they are quite often already trained in their subject area regarding IB certification. While refresher courses can of course be of use, as indeed they are required in some national contexts (NSW, 2017), mandated participation in previously taken workshops can be demoralising. Further training can be taken to encourage the distributed leadership roles mentioned in the Critical Organisational Analysis, and this can prepare faculty for roles at future schools but may bear little relevance to their current classes. Exemplifying this is the lack of this kind of training offered to teachers to SOME, unless it is directly applicable to their role. This puts SOME in
PD IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS

a position where it cannot simply adhere to an IB continuum for professional learning. Also, over-reliance on IB professional learning raises other issues.

While the IB is extremely powerful in the realm of international education, and indeed some national systems (Tarasawa, 2013), it may not be forever. As pointed out by Walker (2016), the rate of growth of the IB is far slower than that of international schools in general. While this does not imply that the training is any less useful, it does place teachers who are solely IB trained as being less able to cope with non-occidental learners. Stobie (2016) cautions against this turning away from what many may call more Confucian ideals, that if one focuses entirely on the way one teaches, and not on who one teaches, an educator can run the risk of failing students. As constructivism is at the core this OIP, and indeed the author’s worldview, providing teachers with professional learning that is not solely derived from one, Western-dominated source, is necessary if educators are to adequately deal with a diverse student body. Recent development in thought, such as Boaler’s (2013) research on the importance of hard work in a growth mindset is an example of how the pendulum is swinging eastwards. As Northouse (2016) reminds us, a leader must be aware of the effect of having diverse cultures in a school, and any solutions to the POP must keep this in mind.

With both an SOE and IB derived continuum unsuitable as possible solutions for the problems existing in professional learning at SOME, a plan for change is necessary that can address the organisational needs properly. While a wealth of literature exists on what can be considered good PD, and in light of it being a huge industry and thus subject to constant revision (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015), a literature review undertaken in preparation for this OIP narrowed down much of this to key principles that guide this OIP. These principles include, but are not limited to, a constructivist, systems thinking based approach, with particular attention paid to improving motivation to take part in professional learning at the school. With simply defining what is good PD a task that occupies much of the research, with
differing definitions arrived at (Avidov-Ungar, 2016; Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015; Cheng, 2017; Desimone, 2009), this OIP takes the approach of Villegas-Reimers (2013) in simply using characteristics as a set of criteria to ‘test’ professional learning against. Before continuing, it should be pointed out the alphabetical approach the author took in highlighting the variance in definitions. This is to exemplify the sheer quantity of perspectives encountered during the preparatory literature review. The list could go on through the alphabet for quite a while!

*Change perceptions of what successful PD is*

The first proposed solution to the POP rests entirely within this domain of how to define what good professional learning is. When McMillan, et al. (2016) recommend policymakers spend time ensuring that teachers want to engage with PD at their school, it is predicated on the understanding that faculty share a common understanding of what professional learning is, and what it is for. At SOME, no such common understanding exists, as beyond the mandated workshops, no discussion of professional learning exists outside the SLT.

Therefore, the change leader wishes to engage in a movement that starts with bringing a more useful, and widespread of understanding of what good PD is. With a focus on changing perceptions in the organisation from seeing professional learning as being a passive and isolated experience, the change process can begin to awaken the need for change in the faculty. An example of this is the bringing in of resources that the faculty may not consider traditional professional learning. With many being concerned with the proper development of 21st century skills in schools (Griffin & Care, 2015), proper training in the possibilities of industry tools would enable teachers to better design more real-world tasks in the classroom. Recently, the Design and Technology teacher at SOME has been pursuing certification from
a noted software company. This teacher has stated that the tools he is becoming more proficient with have allowed him to better prepare his students for more relevant applications of the subject’s curriculum. This is perfectly in line with the “collaboration with the ed-tech industry” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 18) called for in the organisational vision, yet his work takes place entirely outside of school, and receives no attention or recognition from the SLT. With 21st century learning increasingly taking place outside of the traditional sphere of classrooms (Massis, 2016), PD at SOME must also seek learning outside of repetitive workshops.

Another facet of this reorientation of what is considered professional learning is to highlight the potential of learning within the PLC, from the PLC. As teachers move quite regularly in international schools (Hayden & Thompson, 2009), there is a danger that many schools do not assess what knowledge is being brought on board, and what is being lost. At SOME, this is quite clearly the case as no attempt is made to ascertain past experiences of the faculty beyond the interview process. This is made even more glaring as much of the faculty, including the author, were hired by a member of the organisation based in SOE’s European headquarters who travelled to international recruitment fairs. This is direct opposition to the call by Hargreaves (2007) to not only recognise past knowledge, but to then capitalise on it. In chapter three’s Change Implementation Plan it will be clarified how this redefinition of PD takes place, both in terms of looking further without (non-traditional professional learning sources), and further within (existing faculty knowledge).

This shift in understanding can be accomplished with existing resource conditions at SOME. As faculty is encouraged to share their professional experiences, the time required to provide the data is distributed across the faculty. To illustrate this, assuming that only 50% of faculty engage with a ten-minute data collection tool, this would mean that five hours of data entry would occur. Once the change leader creates the technological system necessary for
such data entry, of which the school has access to many such systems, the diffusion of such an entry point is simple. To illustrate this, the vast array of recommended professional learning resources that would be gathered as part of this data-collection would be a mammoth job for a single change leader to collate. While the author has of course ideas of potential professional learning avenues, for example, the classroom applications of growth mindset thinking (Boaler, 2013), this OIP is centred on turning the traditionally passive PD culture at SOME into an active and collaboratively-driven one. This matches well with the understanding of transformational leadership outlined by Northouse (2016) earlier.

**Include faculty in choosing what PD to offer**

Once the process of awakening the need, and appetite, for change begins, the next stage of the creation of a PD team informed by both administration and faculty can begin to gain momentum. This team will not only review the existing institutional knowledge of the faculty, and how it can be leveraged, but will also research new directions for professional learning at SOME. It can also begin to evaluate the effect of any past professional learning workshops undertaken at SOME and pass recommendations to administration whether they should be repeated.

With faculty starting to understand the new view of professional learning proposed by the change leader, and their role in generating its future direction, the change can begin to accelerate. With traditional PD often seen as outdated and ineffectual (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015; Guskey, 2014; Villegas-Reimers, 2013), and teachers lacking real motivation to engage properly (McMillan et al., 2016), special care must be taken to leverage teachers’ true motivations. Managing teacher motivation is an important issue in any school and is no less true in professional learning (Hadar & Brody, 2013).
As explained in chapter one’s *Framing the Problem of Practice*, teacher motivation is a very complex matter. So, if the change leader wishes to mobilise support for the creation and maintenance of a PD team, among both educational leadership and teachers, attention must be paid to both *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* motivations (Avidov-Ungar, 2016). For teachers who are concerned with acquiring skills that increase learning in their classrooms, they can be encouraged by pushing the idea that the new collaboratively-decided professional learning system will allow just that. On the other hand, for teachers focused on improving their chances of promotion or simply wishing to feather their nest of certificates, promotion of the role that they can have in making their preferred PD take place that achieves these goals must be encouraged. Indeed, it is essential for “close listening to the voices of those involved” (McMillan et al, 2016, p. 165) to be a core part of this constructivist OIP. Initially it may seem that attempting to balance these two different motivations may be impossible, but Hadar and Brody (2013) argue that truly collaborative PLCs will in fact increase both motivations identified by Avidov-Ungar (2016).

With the existing information network system in place at SOME, this faculty-wide communication can easily be managed. The schoolwide email system, notifications board in the staff room, and the weekly department meeting allow for a diverse range of media. Where modifications need to take place is in the management of time in the current PLC structure. With the current weekly meetings often centred around the relevant IB coordinator simply reciting the same audio-visual presentations as were displayed the previous academic year, or else reviewing issues already discussed and resolved via e-mail communiques, the educational leadership of the school must be convinced to allow modifications to take place. The manner in which this takes place will be outlined fully in chapter three’s *Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process*. Similarly, the *Change Implementation Plan* will explore the PD team and both its creation and role in more detail.
Focus on collaborative learning, forming support networks that can follow up

The final proposed solution is perhaps the most drastic, but also the one most likely to cause long-term institutional change. In the same way that Plato and Xenophon promulgated the teachings of Socrates long after the hemlock did its tragic work, any institutionalisation of the change, as explained by Cawsey et al. (2016), must survive the constant shift in faculty so common at international schools. While the formation and operation of collaborative learning networks begin at an earlier stage of the change process, it is in their institutionalisation that their true worth becomes apparent. As teachers arrive at SOME, the knowledge that they bring can transform the PLCs in ways impossible to predict by this OIP’s author. Indeed, the possibility of a better model of professional learning provision may be known by a new member of faculty. If SOME creates a support network where such ideas can be shared between teachers, the benefits are clear. In fact, Cheng (2017) highlights the need for these networks to be both formal and informal.

The type of support networks envisioned by this OIP are ones that do not currently exist at SOME. As things stand, in the weekly PLC meeting teachers are divided by their IB section, either PYP, MYP, or DP, and they only meet and discuss whole-school issues. Information is disseminated in a one-size-fits-all manner, where teachers with three years’ experience sit quietly next to teachers with thirty years’ experience. There is also a weekly subject-specific meeting where, for example, the MYP Mathematics teachers meet with the MYP coordinator and discuss curricular objectives. If the change process aims to successfully shift the current structure, clearly the approval of the vice-principal (mainly in charge of educational matters) and the three IB coordinators is needed. How this can be gained will be discussed in chapter three, however first the OIP shall examine the solution of improving the PLC more closely.
With the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) stating that teachers engage “with an open and flexible educational model that enables interaction with other agents” (p. 66), the organisational vision is one in which such a stratified PLC should not exist. Examples of the proposed change in the learning community are the implementation of a mentoring system, and the grouping of teachers with similar professional learning goals. With this form of focused capacity building, that is the growing of a skill or resource base in an organisation, SOME can match need with the appropriate human capital. The current model of grouping teachers during the PLC meetings by their IB section, or else by their subject, does not address the core needs of many teachers. The understanding gained by the professional learning data collection allows the change leader and/or the PD team to recognise where certain members of faculty can aid others. Issues like the classroom use of the all-important 21st century skills (Griffin & Care, 2015), and the role that classroom management skills play in creating good learning environments are not subject-specific, rather can be shared across expertise and experience. As a matter of fact, the role of aiding struggling teachers with classroom management through mentoring, a practice recognised by studies as being beneficial (Aloe, Amo, & Shanahan, 2014; Creemers, Kyriakides, & Antoniou, 2013; Dicke, Elling, Schmeck, & Leutner, 2015) can be leveraged to encourage organisational buy-in from those with the Market View at SOME. Higher rates of teacher retention bring substantial financial benefits in the international school world, not to mention the improvement to actual classroom learning. The Change Implementation Plan will explain this solution further, but a final point must be made.

The benefits of understanding the diversity of cultures in a school (Ryan & Louie, 2007) will allow SOME to move beyond the purely occidental sources it currently uses. This is in line with the global outlook expressed by the SOE organisation and the IB organisation. Using this as a lever, the necessary resources of dedicated time for the creation of these
support networks and the approval to tune the current PLC system should be forthcoming. An individualised approach to improving professional learning is fundamental to this OIP, and in tandem with the creation of a broader understanding of the wealth of human capital in the system, the author believes that the proposed change at SOME can move from being a plan, to an actionable reality.

**Leadership Ethics and Organisational Change Issues**

In chapter one’s *Leadership Position and Lens Statement* section, it was outlined how Socratic elenchus failed to reach a consensus on what exactly piety is. Yet while the *Euthyphro* did not arrive at a definitive answer, it did reinforce the necessity of examining such core concepts if one seeks to live well. Sergiovanni (2005) recognises this too when he outlines his set of virtues that leaders must seek to embody. Interestingly, he does arrive at a definition of piety, though one more in line with secular 21st century liberal values, stating that it “embodies showing loyalty, respect, and affection” (Sergiovanni, 2005, p. 120) to one’s community. Building on what is meant by a community, Vogel (2012) argues that it is the very common understanding of group norms, ethically speaking, that can be used to create the very communal identity itself. Northouse (2016) echoes this when he states that one can define culture “as the learned beliefs, values, rules, norms, symbols, and traditions that are common to a group of people” (p. 428).

Considering the diverse nature of SOME students in tandem with the fact that the majority of faculty and administration do not adhere to the form of religious ideology dominant in SOME’s national context, it can be argued that the very idea of group norms at SOME is in a difficult position. While the literature of both SOE and its schools clearly promulgate very liberal and secular values (SOCE School Prospectus, 2017; SOE Corporate Vision, 2017; SOME School Prospectus; SOWE School Prospectus, 2017), the
Organisational Context section plainly demonstrates that its implementation at SOME is not in line with these values. Yet does this mean that group norms cannot exist at SOME?

Quite simply, the answer is no. Yes, there is divergence of opinion between the MOE, the educational leadership, the administrative staff, faculty, the student body, and the parents on what the author considers key issues, for example, freedom of expression, recognition of diverse sexual identities, and gender roles, but some common norms do exist. These norms are a desire for student learning and for the school to be a positive and enjoyable place. While the extent differs to which all stakeholders can be said to value these two norms, their universality is without question. During the author’s life, he has spent time in classrooms in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and of course the unique region of the Middle East. Throughout this rich variation of contexts, he has seen these two norms being central to the schools’ stakeholders.

However, the understanding of what student learning is, be it simply good PISA scores or the more ambiguous “all-round perfection of human beings” (SOE Corporate Vision, 2017, p. 12), may vary. Similarly, some may see a school culture as one where the teachings of the mandated Islamic Studies classes guide the pupils’ experience, and others may understand the IB’s globally-focused and secular environment as being the more positive. The leader’s role is to create a school culture where the shared norm of a positive and productive learning environment is felt by all, without a pre-defined set of prescriptive values (Berger, 2015). Integrating multiple sets of values is a necessary characteristic of educational leaders (Vogel, 2015), and the main ethical component of the proposed change.

Furthermore, this understanding of the diversity of perspectives and still recognising the common bonds is an essential quality for any leader, especially in an international school setting. If a leader maintains an ethnocentric view and puts their own cultural perspectives “at the center [sic] of their observations of others and the world” (Northouse, 2016, p. 429), they
will fail to be able properly lead change in any diverse organisation. This returns to the constructivist approach taken by this OIP in seeking to address the multiplicity of understandings of the change process itself. In practice this means maintaining a flexible approach to issues in the school, respecting both the diverse values of the different groups, and the need to provide a globally-transferable education that prepares students for the world.

Another ethical consideration for this OIP arises out this recognition of the multiplicity of values at SOME. Northouse (2016) argues that studies of leadership ethics only arose in the last thirty or so years, completely ignoring the vast area of work in this field stretching back millennia (most famously, Machiavelli’s *The Prince*). While Northouse does recognise the contribution of Western ethics made by ancient Greeks etc., he fails to explicitly connect the philosophical underpinnings of works like Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* or Plato’s *Republic* to leadership ethics. Similarly, and perhaps ironically, he ignores the development of ethics arising from Confucius, a Chinese thinker predating classical Athens. Northouse does, however, outline a set of virtues that an educational leader should have, none of which would violate the group norms discussed earlier. Yet, his ethnocentrism relegates Northouse (2016) to being primarily an occidental resource.

In finding and presenting potential professional learning initiatives to SOME, there is a danger of finding oneself solely utilising the most commonly available resources. For example, the Villegas-Reimers (2013) source mentioned earlier relies primarily on Western sources. While there can be no doubt of the fact that much of the research’s prevalence is due to it being published in the *lingua franca* of academia, English, another issue is at play.

As evidenced by Northouse’s (2016) lack of recognition of the role of Confucian ethics in his work, one can see a clear example of what Mills and Gay (2016a) would call a failing in evaluative validity. This means that the writer’s own bias, in this case ethnocentrism, led Northouse (2016) to gloss over a field of thought that a substantial
proportion of the world’s population holds dear. Stobie (2016) on the other hand recognises this vast section of humanity in his work. One can see this again in the reams of research on both Finland and Singapore, two darlings of the field of Comparative International Education. Finland’s success is often attributed to embracing distributed leadership in its schools (Risku and Pulkkinen, 2016; Vitikka, Kroksfors, & Hurmerinta, 2012), and similarly, Singapore’s to giving teachers more time to pursue their own educational initiatives (Lee, Hung, & Teh, 2016). However, for Singapore, bias on the part of researcher often attributes success to be the result of simple rote learning many assume is the norm in Asia (Seith, 2016; You & Morris, 2016).

As such, special care must be taken when addressing the POP to cast a wide net when looking for PD resources, and to be careful not to rule out potential initiatives simply because it does not arise from an occidental source. The past experiences of the diverse faculty at SOME can be utilised quite effectively here. A final example to illustrate this point is of use here. Earlier, when discussing *wasta* (واسطة), it gave an insight into Middle Eastern culture (Brahms & Schmitt, 2017; Harbi et al., 2017). There is much complexity to understanding a culture, and indeed Harbi et al. (2017) stress its importance if one seeks to lead. Similarly, Sun and Leithwood (2012) argue that any leadership approach, particularly the transformational one taken by this OIP, must consider the full context of the organisation. In fact, they criticise many transformational leadership scholars because “they do not acknowledge the context in which leaders work” (Sun & Leithwood, 2012, p. 440). This OIP takes the position that it does. In leading the change at SOME, the author seeks to avoid cultural biases in search of new professional learning initiatives and in ways to motivate diverse stakeholders at the school.

The final ethical consideration in this OIP is the one that has both the most obvious ethical difficulty, and the one with the least chance of being addressed by the change leader.
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As things stand at SOME, if a member of faculty engages in professional learning in one academic year, and later informs the school that they do not seek to stay at the school the following academic year, they must repay half of the cost of the professional learning. With many teachers and members of the SLT flying to other continents, needing hotels, and then paying the cost of the PD workshop itself, the costs can be quite high. Therefore, some teachers turn down international professional learning opportunities in case they decide they do not wish to renew their contract. This is a clear application of Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) Investment-and-Returns Principle, with the organisation unwilling to fully invest in a teacher’s professional learning if the recipient will soon move to another school. When Sergiovanni discusses with Mullan (2009) the role of an educational leader, he describes a moral leader who holds “people, relationships, and community are at the center [sic] of democratic practice” (Mullan, 2009, 188). The striving to attain human perfection so emphasised in the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) would seem to jar with this purely financial accounting of professional learning. Yet in line with the need to make the proposed change a gradual process for all stakeholders, the author has decided to leave this policy discrete from their plan to improve professional learning at SOME. Too drastic a proposal such as this would perturb those with the Market View at the school and would raise opposition to other aspects of the OIP. To bastardise the gadfly of Athens, let him who would move the organisation, first move small parts of it. Chapter three will explain how to do just that.
Chapter Three – Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication

As the previous chapter demonstrated, there is not just a clear path to change, but also a series of groups in the school who will see that route differently. Chapter three solidifies the work of the OIP into explaining how the change will be implemented, and how it can be monitored and communicated too. A particular strength of this OIP is that it is designed in such a way that both the monitoring and communicating of the change actually bolster the implementation itself. This is exemplified by the feedback loop of the implementation plan, as will be discussed later. This chapter concludes by outlining the rationale of why the proposed change requires no extra financial expenditure, and how the communication of this aspect is key to the confirming of the change process.

Timeline for Change

When considering the proposed change at the beginning of the OIP process, the author was faced with the difficult decision of envisioning the timeline of the change. On the one hand, if the change process is too brief, the change may fail to become part of the institution. On the other hand, if the change process is too protracted, momentum can be lost. Also, the unique context of international schools further complicates matters. With the factors and effects of teacher retention being quite complex in international education (Mancuso et al., 2010; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009), any proposed change timeline must take the increased turnover rate into account.

As the 2019/2020 academic year begins, SOME is expected to experience a teacher turnover of approximately 15%, including one member of the SLT, and see three of the ten administration staff leave for other organisations. This rate of change is by no means unusual; thus, the change timeline should recognise this. It can do this by not dividing the change
process into one which relies on discrete periods of transition spread over many years, which would be made more complex with attrition to the cast of change agents, and potentially the change leader themselves. With the composition of the PD team or a mentoring partnership potentially changing as SOME moves forward in time, the change process must be shielded from such attrition, or as Lambert (2007) puts it, “as long as any one individual is indispensable, sustainability is a distant dream” (p. 311). Before moving on, it should be noted, as earlier in the Leadership-Focused Vision for Change section, that literature that discusses teacher turnover focuses on the role of subjective experiences in determining the willingness of teachers to stay at a school (Craig, 2017; Mancuso et al., 2010; Urick, 2016).

Another characteristic of the organisation that must be taken into consideration when planning the timeline for change is that of the hierarchical nature of the organisation itself. As was discussed in chapter one’s Organisational Change Readiness section, this means that change must be incremental, and not require major long-term systemic change. This ‘tuning’ (Nadler & Tushman, 1989) or continuous improver (Cawsey et al., 2016) nature of the approach to change, leads the author to wish to tie the change process to a single academic year, with the lessons learnt informing how the PD reform can be improved in subsequent years. By keeping the change timeline restricted to an initial one-year cycle, it remains wholly a SOME-based initiative. Should it be extended to a multi-year process, then its efficacy would be impacted by SOE and MOE oversight. Typically, all plans that officially extend beyond one academic year need to be added to policy review procedures, a process over which SOE has oversight.

Indeed, as discussed in the Possible Solutions to Address POP segment, not all schools under the SOE umbrella have the same goals. For example, SOWE and SOCE are geared towards having students acquiring fluency in a language not spoken in the nation
where SOE is based. Therefore, any involvement of the parent organisation may bring unforeseen complications.

In tandem with the issues of staff turnover and the hierarchical nature of SOME, another important point must be made to support the single academic year nature of the proposed change. As made clear in a literature review by Al-Haddad and Kotnour (2015), short-term change is more effective than long-term reform. This is echoed by Fullan (2010) and Levin (2010) in their exhortation to change leaders to focus on a smaller number of important goals. As this OIP primarily aims to change perceptions of PD, along with changing two core aspects of PD practices are at SOME, it positions itself neatly into having a small number of important, but achievable goals.

A factor, particular to SOME, is one discussed in chapter one’s Organisational Context. With the vice-principal in charge of educational matters, and the principal mainly concerned with dealing with issues related to the national context, it is clear that the vice-principal would be the point of contact in relation to the proposed change. Yet, as mentioned earlier, staff turnover is an issue to be considered. This means pointing out that the current vice-principal of SOME is moving to another school, possibly SOWE, at the beginning of the 2019/2020 academic year. While on the one hand, Lambert (2007) counsels to keep the change process and any one individual separate, the issue of turnover, particularly in relation to those with strong agency should also be kept in mind. With Schneider et al. (2014) emphasising the role of asymmetrical power relationships in a school, and the fact that the author is not a member of the SLT, the timeline should be designed in such a way that important agents for change, like the new vice-principal, are less likely to leave during its implementation. Avoiding what Hargreaves (2007) calls ‘degradation’ of knowledge in an organisation is important, especially when one considers the relative brevity of the change.
Finally, by tying the change process to a single year, the change leader can emphasise the potential for it to actually happen. The readiness-for-change questionnaire (Cawsey et al. 2016) clearly indicates that potential for change exists, and by emphasising the incremental, though necessary nature of the shift in SOME PD practice, the one-year timeline is possible. The clearly delineated timeline, with emphasis on teacher participation, draws heavily on the constructivist lens of this OIP. After all, “people want to know where things are going, and why” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 242). With an eye on the problem of practice, that the organisation and delivery of PD at the author’s international school is done sans the necessary collaborative and evidence-based procedures necessary to improve teaching and learning, the constructivist lens ensures that the OIP keeps in focus the lived-experiences of those at the school. As such, due to the reasons mentioned in this section, the one-year timeline is not just useful, but necessary.

*Figure 7 - Timeline for proposed change*
Looking at Figure 7, one sees the Change Path Model outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016) spread out over the course of an academic year at SOME. Specific aspects of each phase will be explained in subsequent sections, but this OIP must reiterate the mutability of the timeline before moving on to the implementation plan itself. As is made clear by the timeline, the implementing, monitoring, and communicating necessary for a successful cycle of change are interwoven throughout the year. Indeed, always seeking to tune the change process to newly collected data and face-to-face feedback allows the plan to evolve as the year progresses. Whether one looks to modern literature that says leaders must be ready to “modify their plans to pursue new options” (Cawsey et al, 2016, p. 263), or back almost two-and-a-half thousand years to The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates when it says that it is better “to change an opinion than to persist in a wrong one (Xenophon, 2006, p. 154), it is clear that the proposed timeline may shift in response to unforeseen factors. That being said, the timeline does represent the author’s best approximation of each phase, and when each aspect can be implemented. The next section will examine the implementation plan in detail.

**Change Implementation Plan**

When discussing the *Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice* in chapter one, it was pointed out that both the SOE Corporate Vision (2017) and the SOME School Prospectus (2017) support the idea of teachers having control over both the direction of PD and the manner of a school’s collaborative environment. Yet as was made clear elsewhere in chapter one, the reality at SOME is far from ideal. The *Critical Organisational Analysis* section’s use of Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) Competing Values Model (see Figure 6) demonstrated the diversity of values extant at SOME. Therefore, if the change leader is to be successful in changing professional learning culture at the school, it must not only take these values into account, but also improve the organisational situation of the stakeholders at
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SOME. The systems thinking that permeates this OIP relies on evolving the very concept of PD at SOME before further improvements can occur. This primacy of purpose (see Figure 9) means that any implementation plan must target each value group specifically and seek to avoid any actions that may increase resistance. An example of this is the rather self-contained and parallel structure of the proposed team.

With the concurrent operation of the PD team being used to help direct the professional learning decisions made by the administration team and the SLT, rather than replace their respective decisions, it avoids any reorganisation of the organisational charts of responsibility. Indeed, this would not trouble those who hold the Hierarchy View as it does not diminish their position. Those with the Market View would see the lack of necessary financial input versus potential gains via increased retention, and those with the Adhocracy View would see their opinions explicitly sought out. Similarly, those with the Clan View would see their values writ large across the school. The OIP will now look at the three elements of the implementation plan, with particular focus on the timeline and the role that stakeholder participation plays in term of success and support.

Figure 8 - Change Implementation Plan
**Change perceptions of what successful PD is**

As stated, many times in this document, the single most important aspect of this OIP is the proposed change to how PD is understood by both faculty and administration at SOME. By taking a transformational leadership approach, the author hopes to foster this change in perspective at SOME. As Figure 8 illustrates, changing PD perceptions is essential to accomplish the other two aspects. The cycle of change creates a feedback loop, whereby improvement in one reinforces the others. An example of this is if increased faculty inclusion arises, it will encourage more collaboration in others by shifting change recipients to having another way of thinking. This way of thinking will be closer to the one mentioned by this OIP’s idea of effective PD (see Figure 3), where it should rely on collaborative and evidence-based procedures necessary to improve teaching and learning.

Without successfully implementing this shift, the seeds of the plan that involve faculty more in professional learning direction and creating a more collaborative PLC simply cannot take root. As is shown in Figure 8, the plan begins with seeking to modify how the school sees professional learning. With the problem of practice stemming from a disconnect of the organisation and delivery of PD from best practices, despite there being organisational ethos saying otherwise, the author needs to awaken an understanding of this disconnect as soon as they can.

The first step of this begins, as expected, during the awakening phase. Through discussion with the SLT, and teachers who have worked at SOME for a number of years, the proposed plan is outlined. Feedback on how to deliver the change and potential issues, particularly with the proposed timeline, can be sought here. As this requires a shift, however incremental it may be, the need to highlight the need for change is key. A combination of anecdotal and academic evidence, not to mention referencing the organisational mission and values, can be used to drive home the issues with the current practice of PD at SOME.
However, care must be taken at this stage to frame past experiences as being stepping stones to the desired future state, and not as past failures. A good starting example of shifting PD from simply bringing in external workshop leaders periodically to something more practical, can be found in the realm of ICT. This would enable the change leader to show the SLT and others how the proposed change can effect real change, for the good of both the faculty and the student body.

As the school is heavily involved with a major tech company, and strongly encourages the use of their software and products across the school, this can be leveraged here to potentially shift some of these stakeholders into being change drivers. As the primary role at SOME of the change leader behind this OIP is that of an English Language and Literature teacher, with further responsibility for monitoring CAS activities across the school, an opportunity exists. In the experience of the author, many of the students at SOME demonstrate a dearth of tech skills that is surprising. Examples of this are not being able to utilise anything beyond basic functionality in word processing programs, being unable to add simple improvements to presentation formats, and even being ignorant of how to research using Boolean operators.

Yet while it is easy to lament the failings of students, an educator must be reflective enough to recognise the failings in their school. While teachers at SOME are taught how to utilise the suite of ICT for organisational management purposes, something that aids the change process greatly, there is no similar uniformity when it comes to ICT approaches in the classroom. With both national bodies (Australian Government, 2016; National Government, 2010; UK Government, 2013) and academic sources (Griffin & Care, 2015; Grogan, 2013; Li, 2013) calling for greater focus on how ICT is used in the classroom, this dearth of uniformity is wrong. Brief workshops led by educators at the school that share key ICT skills could be integrated in the weekly meetings. This is a simple, zero-cost way of improving
learning across the school. With students expected to submit work of a standard high-quality, rather than a vague level that shifts from teacher to teacher, SOME can greatly improve core 21st skills in students.

While such a practice is considered normal at many schools, unfortunately at SOME, this would not be seen as ‘proper’ PD in the change leader’s context. By highlighting the improvements that can be made with existing resources, this first phase of the awakening can actively address questions and concerns face-to-face and aims to avoid pitfalls that may lie ahead. Such a starting example sees the SLT and others through a constructivist lens, and treats them as “thinking individuals, trying to make sense out of the change and its impact” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 217). Once initial buy-in is achieved, and change agents identified, the focus of the implementation can move on to the broader group of stakeholders that make up the organisation.

Using academically-verifiable resources, presented in a format palatable to a busy school (such as postings on the intra-school forum, weekly emails, updates during PLCs, etc.), the change leader can continue to alter how PD is seen at SOME. Starting by notifying the SOME organisation of the overall goals of the change, in a manner discussed further in Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process, the change leader can begin to demonstrate the need for change. It should be stressed at this point that this OIP rests firmly on a position that the very communication of the need for change overlaps with the most fundamental aspect of the change: to change the perception of what effective PD looks like. In other words, if a person at SOME recognises that professional learning practice at the school is currently not as it should be, then the change has already begun. As Socrates himself would no doubt agree, getting the organisation to recognise its own ignorance is half the battle.
Figure 9 - Primacy of PD perceptions in the change process

It should be noted that this initial, though most important aspect of the implementation, continues throughout the timeline. Whether one looks at the targeting of resistors to change during mobilisation (October to November), the sharing of learning experienced during external workshops in the second phase of acceleration (January to March), or even the distribution of the end-of-year PD report in June, the changing of PD perceptions is paramount. This also means that should there be any serious resistance to the change which inhibits the success of the other two pillars of the implementation, then potential exists for change in the future that builds on the shift in professional learning perceptions, however minor, that has occurred.

The second phase of awakening includes the collection of PD data at the school. With the survey functionality of the ICT system at SOME offering ways to collate the detail quickly, and the ability to highlight key findings via easy-to-understand infographics, the data can be shared with the school rather quickly. However, as the change leader seeks to bring more people on board with helping direct the change initiative, it is recommended to discuss the findings with change agents before whole-school dissemination. Apart from being used to
seek out aid in bringing about the change, this ‘premiere’ of the collected data will help alleviate some of the concerns that the SLT and others may have about the change. As Cawsey et al. (2016) counsel, one should demonstrate that one has a “rigorous review process in place for the assessment of a change” (p. 162). Also, as experience with “past change initiatives is also likely to trigger the moods or emotions associated with them” (Nesterkin, 2013, p. 580), special care must be taken to involve those who hold the *Hierarchy View* as per Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) values. After all, this group, composed of some senior teachers and the SLT, will wish to ensure that the data is presented as an opportunity for future growth, not as evidence of past failures.

Using the collected data, the change leader can demonstrate that the wealth of experience that is already in the school can be tapped. For example, there are some teachers with decades of experience across many subjects, there are newer teachers coming from progressive faculties of education with new ideas, some teachers conducting their own action research as part of further education, and other teachers who could share successful practices from whatever cultural background or whatever school context via the PLC. By awakening the organisation to the need to change to a more effective manner of delivering PD, people would see that they can be more involved in the learning at the school. After all, Daly, Moolenaar, Bolivar, and Burke (2010) emphasise that if a school improvement plan is to succeed, teacher involvement is critical.

As “much can be learned from the systems and procedures that others have used elsewhere” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 275), to overlook the practices that raised student achievement at teachers’ previous schools is foolhardy. This is especially reckless when one considers the competitive nature of seeking employment at many international schools. By pointing out that teachers were hired for what they could bring to a school, but then not asking them to share what they know, is certainly not in keeping with fully utilising internal
sources. Indeed, once an external source of knowledge, a teacher at another school, becomes an internal source, their knowledge of another organisation’s successes should be capitalised on. Furthermore, when a new teacher comes to a school, they can be approached to share these fresh ideas (Cawsey et al., 2016) before their enculturation takes place.

As will be mentioned in the section entitled *Potential Limitations and Other Future Considerations*, this initial cycle of change would breed change in subsequent academic years, further institutionalising the change. At SOME, this would put in place an entry survey where new arrivals to the faculty could record their experience of PD at other schools. Indeed, Kilgore and Reynolds (2011) highlight the importance of bringing consideration of professional learning needs into the entry process of teachers to a new school. As the new intake of staff undergo a two-week induction at the beginning of the academic year, before students return, there is ample time for the entry survey to be not only administered, but also to explain its purpose. Indeed, this would demonstrate to inductees the value placed on both future professional learning needs and past experiences that they bring to the organisation. This would be integrated with the database of PD taken by existing staff. As this database grows, and upcoming professional learning initiatives are planned, it could be consulted to ascertain if any faculty have engaged in them before, and what their view of their value is. This would move SOME from being simply being awakened to the need to change to also being mobilised to make it happen. This movement is captured by Figure 7 as it shows the transition to the next step of the implementation plan.
Include faculty in choosing what PD to offer

With teacher motivation in relation to PD a serious concern (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015; Cheng, 2017; Yates, 2007), the change leader aims to institutionalise strategies that encourage teachers to engage more fully with the professional learning process. Whether in the weekly PLC meetings, or via a new online forum (using the existing online staff portal), teachers will be able to suggest and comment on potential professional learning directions. By sharing ideas on what PD they feel that they need, other teachers will begin to recognise their own areas to seek to improve, further strengthening the process. Yet, for all the openness and sharing that the weekly PLC meetings or online forum may offer, it requires direction from a new group in the organisation: the PD team.

Beginning in October, the mobilisation phase of the change model put forth by Cawsey et al. (2016) starts with the creation of the PD team (see Figure 4). This team would be made up of the change leader, at least one, possibly two, members of the SLT (preferably one being the vice-principal), and three teachers. While initially it was considered to have a member of the administrative staff as a member, the fact that so much of the group’s discussion would revolve around educational matters precludes this possibility. The PD team would analyse the collected data, seek out professional learning that addresses some of the school’s concerns, and present it to the faculty and administration. It would also invite teachers to propose their own PD ideas via the portal mentioned earlier for consideration, ideas that may not have been expressed fully in the collected data. While this step may seem unnecessary if the data collection process is designed well, it allows for three things. First, faculty can share ideas that were not present during the awakening stage of the change, second it further reinforces the idea that the burgeoning professional learning system at SOME is driven by teaching and learning, and third it demonstrates that the change avoids the pitfall of many PD initiatives, being planned poorly (Guskey, 2014).
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These proposals could include workshops being given by an external provider, ideas garnered during a teacher’s own studies, or even the sharing of a proven classroom practice with their peers. Discussion on its applicability and any financial or operational considerations would then be had. By keeping these issues in mind at the early stage of the PD process, any questions that may arise from those with the Market View, in particular school administration, can be dealt with quickly later on. As teachers are frequently sent overseas to attend IB workshops or conferences, and as many teachers have previously taken part in workshops that other teachers may plan on going to, past experiences of the workshops’ value could be shared. Once these factors are considered a decision can be made through the team.

This decision-making will vary depending on the form of professional learning being discussed. For example, if an upcoming accreditation requires a portion of the faculty to be versed in a certain pedagogy, then the PD team will be constrained to make certain decisions. However, for other PD, such as choice of focus at an upcoming in-service day, then direct feedback can be sought from faculty. Once the professional learning direction has been chosen, the PD team would make the necessary arrangements. This could include seeking approval from administration should finance be involved, assessing if the professional learning scheduling negatively affects the IB coordinators’ schedules of assessments or planned field trips, or seeking out stakeholders who may help the professional learning take place. However fine the operation of the team may seem, another facet of the integration of faculty into the PD process arises.

As the constructivist lens of this OIP emphasises paying attention to the lived experiences of the people in the organisation, attention must be paid to the social networks at operation in the system of the school (Moolenar et al., 2012). While a proportion of teachers at SOME seem to have no problem sharing their perspectives on activities openly, this is not
true for all of the faculty. For some people, a preference for being able to share things anonymously is important (Cawsey et al., 2016), or even just face-to-face, must be kept in mind. As discussed in chapter two’s Critical Organisational Analysis, using a Fragmented Social Mirror (Bergstrom et al., 2011) allows people to present ideas without fear of personal judgement. The change leader therefore must make these two avenues, anonymously via the school portal, or in face-to-face communication with a member of the PD team, apparent to the faculty throughout the whole change process. If the author, or the PD team as a whole fail to do so, a potential obstacle to change arises.

The diffusion of responsibility in organisations, where people assume others will step forward to make decisions is a danger here (Cawsey et al., 2016). As such, creating an open climate where people can share their views on the change is essential to avoid having teachers simply seeking to avoid the change. Framing participation in the change as being inherent with the value of improving student learning, and a chance to be given time to share their own expertise would lower chances of a lack of buy-in. Also, as the change leader has both good professional and personal relations throughout the faculty, key players who can influence others would be approached to form coalitions that would champion the change alongside the author (Cawsey et al., 2016). These central connectors are essential if the change is to spread properly (Cawsey et al., 2016).

Finally, it should be noted that the crafting of this very OIP is an example of faculty being more involved in professional learning development at SOME. Over the course of the work that has gone into this change plan, the author has engaged in many conversations with colleagues regarding its direction. In fact, some co-workers have sought the change leader out to not only ask questions about what the author’s scholarly research says about effective PD, but also offered suggestions on potential routes that the OIP could take. The collaborative support network nature that currently exists between those with the Clan View at the school
can be marshalled in service to the greater change. Indeed, as the OIP writing progressed, this became more and more apparent to the change leader. This is a perfect example of how the EdD transitions the role of doctoral student from being isolated in an ivory tower to instead being a living, breathing scholar practitioner, fully involved in the system within which they operate.

Focus on collaborative learning, forming support networks that can follow up

Simply put, well-run PLCs work to enhance student learning (Harris, 2011; Lomos, Hofman, & Bosker, 2011). However, as identified by Fink and Markholt (2013), unless sufficient expertise is present in the group, progress can stall. This means that the change drivers need to form PLC groups that each possess established expertise in a topic, and that time is given to allow this expertise to be shared. In fact, one could argue that the awakening phase of the change process, with its seeking of approval from the SLT, is itself an example of a PLC hopefully giving time for expertise in PD acquired over the course of this EdD to be shared. Whether the learning is derived from external providers, from practice and knowledge shared internally, or indeed from the University of Western Ontario, time must then be set aside to reflect on its implementation or else it will not raise collective capacity in the long term.

The PD team would have oversight of utilising the database of professional learning experiences and planned upcoming initiatives to ensure that the relevant expertise is spread appropriately throughout the various sub-groups in the PLC, divided by, for instance, grade, skill to improve, or interest. For example, in practice this means that a teacher who demonstrated an ability to improve homework completion in a previously lackadaisical class could be paired with another teacher who is having difficulty managing another group of
students’ homework output. As the change leader develops this practice at SOME, beginning in the second phase of acceleration, positive feedback from successful pairings is used to accelerate the participation of other teachers. This is a good example of why the author sees themselves as a proponent of gradual, but ever-present positive change, or as Cawsey et al. (2016) term it: a continuous improver.

A strong understanding of the values of the staff is essential here as careful management can match expertise with faculty capable of using it. Unless the team can successfully recognise the strengths extant in the faculty, and not necessarily strengths held by members of the team, the danger is that the biases of the five or six people in the group will end up stifling potentially profitable pairings. For example, if the team focuses entirely on one particular area for growth, then “unidimensional perspectives in some contexts can result from over-zealous representation of a particular stakeholder perspective” (Dudar et al, 2017, p. 46). This reinforces the need for the faculty to help direct the professional learning, in this case offering up key skills they possess that they would be willing to mentor others in.

As Harris (2011) puts it, “capacity building implies that people take the opportunity to do things differently, to learn new skills and to generate more effective practice” (p. 627). A firmer understanding of the expertise already present at SOME will cause the change to be accelerated and allow responsibility charting to begin. This means that professional learning initiatives, whether internally or externally sourced, can be properly followed up on. These mentor systems that begin in the second phase of acceleration, so important in schools with a huge diversity of experience, will be better set up to succeed, with past teaching experience being used for school success. Indeed, “the past should be a motivator, not a museum” (Hargreaves, 2007, p. 231).
Another aspect of this penultimate stage of the change process is that of sharing workshop experiences. Over the course of the year, many teachers attend workshops overseas. Upon return, the only sharing of experience is restrained to a few comments about the food or sights, and maybe a comment on how the usual icebreaker activity was received. The change leader plans to change this.

Using a template that the author created at a previous school, faculty who travel to a workshop must be prepared to not only post on the school portal a report on the workshop upon their return, but then share a summary with their colleagues at the next PLC meeting. While some teachers may not wish to have to fill in such a document, or even present their experiences orally in front of their peers, it is hoped that the shift in perception brought about by the first stage of the implementation plan will help avoid some of this resistance. In fact, if one is frank, then one must be honest in admitting that many teachers volunteer for overseas workshops since travel is often its own reward. This may in fact deter some teachers from seeking the overseas workshops who are not doing so for the specific *intrinsic or extrinsic* motivations (Avidov-Ungar, 2016) discussed in chapter one. Returning to Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) Investment-and-Returns Principle is useful here. No doubt this new practice would appeal to those holding the *Market View* as either the investment would reap more rewards (sharing learning across faculty), or SOME could lower overseas workshop requests.

With the current organisational state meaning that no follow-up occurs after a PD initiative has taken place, this completely opposes the idea of professional learning espoused by Villegas-Reimers (2013) mentioned in chapter one. Most notably, the school’s current practice of professional learning being neither a long-term or reflective process is one that flies in the face of what effective PD is. Therefore, a final aspect of following-up on professional learning is that of the end-of-year report. This not only serves to monitor the
change process in its one-year timeline (as well as being used in subsequent cycles), it also acts as a celebration and reflection on the professional learning done that year. Seeking to institutionalise the new approach to professional learning is of course an important aspect of the PD team’s report, thus the author wishes to use this report to do that. However, its use as a tool to publicly reflect on successes and identify unforeseen problems in the annual professional learning cycle cannot be overlooked. The change leader envisions it as not being simply a ‘cold’, formal document. Of course, it would include a review of the PD undertaken, and feedback from participants, but the author sees it as a tool to foster the collaborative environment further. As such, it would include images, quotes from mentor and mentee partnerships, and anecdotal sections on key takeaways from various learning sources. The data collected during the change is key here, as will be made clear in the next section.

Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation

When one looks at how the change leader aims to both monitor and evaluate the change process at the heart of this OIP, one must not relegate these processes to being merely exercises in data collection. Instead, as the constructivist lens of the author keeps reminding us, the thoughts and experiences of staff at SOME should be kept in mind. Therefore, this OIP plans on using the very processes of monitoring and evaluating as change drivers themselves. As the organisation, and the people, move along the change path, their perspectives will undoubtedly evolve. With both the implementation and communication of the change fundamental to this transition, integrating new evaluative processes in SOME’s professional learning practice will drive this change. These new reflective stages will not only be used in the initial change itself, a single academic year, they will further institutionalise the cycle of change as it moves forward in time. What follows are the six approaches to be used to monitor and evaluate the proposed change at SOME.
**PD survey**

The first tool used to monitor the new change is the creation, and distribution of the PD survey. Initially, the change leader will demonstrate this to the SLT and senior teachers. This will serve three purposes. First, it exhibits the manner in which professional learning experiences can be recorded on a cloud-based, and easily accessed format. This format also requires no expenditure of resources, beyond that of time during the survey’s creation. With survey being finalised with the SLT during the prechange approval phase, the author will have created a draft version over the summer in the leadup to the change plan. As a data collection method that appeals to those with the *Hierarchy View*, i.e. allowing information to be managed well, and of use in deciding priorities (Cameron & Quinn, 2011), it can be a single port of call for many reasons: collating information needed for the cyclical accreditations that SOME undergoes, seeing the efficacy of past PD, and assessing faculty-identified professional learning needs.
Second, its ease of use, entirely based within already existing ICT systems, in which all staff are trained, will prevent the initial participants from worrying that its sharing schoolwide will be onerous on a busy faculty. This is an example of the continuous improver (Cawsey et al., 2016) approach the author has. Third, as the change leader is seeking to not just elicit feedback on how to improve the survey, but to also recruit change agents for the change process, this first viewing will bring others on board the change as it will now include their ideas and/or approval.

A point should be made here in relation to ethical leadership and the collection of data during the change process. With empirical evidence “found for a negative relationship between pressure at work and teachers’ self-determined motivation toward their work” (Pelletier, Séguin-Lévesque, & Legault, 2002, p. 193), the change plan must seek to avoid negatively affecting perceptions of work pressure at SOME. Therefore, participation in this PD survey should avoid harming the complex social fabric at the school. As mentioned earlier, being aware of the complexity of social forces in a school is important in any process of change (Daly et al., 2010). In line with the constructivist lens of the change leader, considering how people make sense of the world is a valid approach to take. As Sergiovanni (2005) reminds us, ethical leadership “is more about helping people understand the problems they face, helping them manage these problems, and even helping them learn to live with them” (p. 122).

This view of ethical leadership echoes the transformational approach of the author quite well, particularly as the OIP is aimed at changing a fundamental understanding at the school, namely what good professional learning is. This puts this survey data collection method in a place where its use may help foster the very change it is being used to monitor. The Fragmented Social Mirror (Bergstrom, Harris, & Karahalios, 2011) approach discussed in the Critical Organisational Analysis allows the data to be collected in a manner that does
not put social pressure on faculty to respond positively about past PD experiences at SOME. It also helps ameliorate “one of the greatest challenges educational researchers face” (Brevik, 2013, p. 17), getting a sufficiently high response rate to gather meaningful data. Being an ethical leader requires data collection to respect the people being surveyed, so trust will need be a core aspect of how the surveys are designed.

Faculty at SOME will be “assured that the data will be held in strict confidence to protect anonymity” (Drew et al., 2007, p. 67). In tandem with assurances given through discussion at a PLC meeting, the actual manner in which the data will be collected will be equally transparent. As mentioned elsewhere, the staff at the school are familiar with the ICT suite the organisation uses, and how it can collect data via anonymised surveys. Indeed, some teachers currently use it to have students offer suggestions for improvements to their classes. Also, the actual data collected will be stored in the cloud-based file management system that the school uses. Access to this raw data will be held by the PD team. By explaining all of this to the faculty, the author feels confident that the level of responses will be high, particularly as the vision for change will be outlined at the same time. Participation in the survey will provide people at the school their first chance to demonstrate their recognition of the need for change.

**Strategy maps**

This communication of the need for change will also serve as the genesis for another tool for monitoring the change. After discussion of the proposed change has taken place, with ideas from the SLT assimilated, a “visual representation of the end state and the action paths that will get them there” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 353) can be created. By creating tools like responsibility charts and backwards planning maps, the change leader can collaboratively
design the first iterations of strategy maps. This step will be reviewed with the newly created PD team during the mobilisation stage of the change, but early work on this can serve as another indicator of the change’s progress. Indeed, the refinement of the strategy maps at a later stage will act as an indicator of what has worked well, and what or whom has resisted change. As this monitoring tool is reliant on input from change agents at the school, the exact nature of the strategy maps cannot be outlined.

**PD database**

Identifying these, what Judge and Douglas (2009) call change champions, is essential before the wider group of stakeholders is approached. With the SLT, senior teachers, and the author, being among the first to participate in the initial data entry, this will help signal to faculty that organisational change is both approved and approaching. It can then be shared, via the existing ICT ecosystem, with all faculty. In tandem with the anonymised surveys preferred by many (Bergstrom et al., 2011), the distribution of the survey will be done alongside the release of the new PD database. As mentioned before, this database will serve as a collaborative cloud-based repository of reflections and resources from all subsequent professional learning experiences. The PD team will not only lead by example, as recommended by Kotter (2012), through adding their own reflections on past experiences as a template for faculty additions, they will curate the collection to make it as user friendly as possible. Indeed, for the monitoring and the change it serves to succeed, the core change agents must demonstrate the new psychological contract that the school expects in relation to professional learning. Also, as called for by Saleh and Khine (2014), modern transformational leadership requires a shifting in perception of educators. This shift is that faculty integrates more 21st century technology in their practice if they are to successfully engage in effective collaboration.
This first evaluative phase begins during the second stage of the awakening (see Figure 7), though as discussed earlier, in subsequent years it is shifted to the staff induction process at the beginning of an academic year. As the data collection moves beyond the SLT and senior teachers, the first way one can monitor the change is the rate at which teachers populate the PD database. Without this initial buy-in by staff, the subsequent changes will be made more difficult. In fact, it could be argued that the level to which the database is populated by staff could be used to assess the collective belief in the system. Assessing belief in an organisation is an important indicator of organisational culture (Cawsey et al., 2016), and this “systematic evaluation of past decisions, practices and behaviors [sic]” (p. 349) is key to understanding what stakeholders feel about professional learning at SOME. As the year progresses, and even into the new academic year with the arrival of new faculty, the extent to which the database has become a ‘living’ source of data will be apparent. While the collection of data in the second stage of awakening phases builds a roadmap which the PD team will consult, the database can continue to be updated as professional learning experiences accrue across the faculty.

As well as demonstrating existing strengths to be shared within the PLC, and identifying weaknesses to be ameliorated by both the PLC and external providers, reflection on experiences via the database will become part of the faculty’s usual PD experience. For example, the author will be attending a CAS workshop in October of this year, and currently there is no system for the sharing of knowledge or resources acquired. As per the proposed system’s structure, the change leader would write a brief reflection on the workshop highlighting its main points and uploading (after scanning, if necessary) any useful resources acquired at the workshop. Quite simply, if a member of faculty attends an external professional learning event, they need to share this learning via the database, and potentially
in-person to their peers during the PLC meetings (as planned for in the second phase of acceleration).

**Attitudinal surveys**

Anonymised longitudinal surveys, as described by Mills and Gay (2016) are the next planned tool to monitor change. In line with Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) call to monitor culture change over time, these PD-perception-focused surveys would be given out four times over the change process. These would be at the beginning of mobilisation (October), during both phases of acceleration (mid-November and mid-January) and during institutionalisation (mid-April). These checkpoints are timed to coincide with periods where there are no major drains on faculty time, for example external assessments, and also at stages where the feedback would inform the change appropriately. With timed checkpoints, as recommended by Cawsey et al. (2016), the monitoring of the change would track the shift in perception, as well as seek feedback on what to improve. The results would not only serve as direction for the PD team, but also would be used as part of the end-of-year evaluation on how successful the most fundamental aspect of the OIP is: changing perceptions of what good PD is.

As mentioned earlier, operational concerns are negligible here, as all faculty are comfortable with the suite of online tools the school uses. With changing the culture of PD a core component of the OIP, tracking the changing view of professional learning, and the response to the new practices is essential. As “leaders need to be aware of and monitor the impact they have on others” (Northouse, 2016, p. 271), change cannot move towards the institutionalisation stage unless this core aspect is monitored and tuned as necessary. With the constructivist lens firmly on the subjective experiences of the stakeholders, one can evaluate their reaction to elements of the change and respond accordingly. Another use of periodic
surveys is to assess whether the newly-organised PLC groups see any positive changes in classroom practice arising from the sharing of expertise. Of course, the mentoring system will only be in the early stages of its implementation, but as celebrating ‘small wins’ is part of the continuously improving approach of the change leader, not to mention being validated by many thinkers (Cawsey et al., 2016; Kotter, 2012; Nadler & Tushman, 1989), all successes will be celebrated. Considering that “classrooms must be the center [sic] and guiding force for all prototype and systemic change planning” (Adelman & Taylor, 2007, p. 74), this is an essential component to monitor.

**Financial savings**

Our last tool for monitoring change is not just to be used to assess change but is also best suited to appeal to the financial and operational administration of SOME, those with the Market View (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). As Cawsey et al. (2016) ask, “if the vision for change is achieved, how will it look from the perspective of the financial results achieved?” (p. 353). Using the projected spending on teachers’ professional learning as a baseline, the change leader, in collaboration with the PD team, will simply aim for a new target, lower than the baseline. In fact, the change leader has already approached the administration department about this data, and surprisingly, it is available!

Currently, the school spends roughly $800 per year on each teacher’s professional learning. While some teachers go over, and other teachers go under, this is the approximate mean given by administration. With a teaching faculty of sixty, this places the annual spend on PD at almost $50,000. Also, as was pointed out in an email from administration, this total does not include the in-house professional learning events that occur at the school, rather just the use of external providers at outside venues.
Based on the new practice of sourcing more of the PD internally and using the improved PLCs as vehicles to share expertise, reliance on external providers should be lessened. As the change accelerates along the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016), buy-in from this group will increase the chance of institutionalisation occurring. In the experience of the change leader, financial considerations can be a powerful lever at a TNC, something borne out by research (Odland & Ruzicka, 2009).

**PD report**

Finally, the end-of-year PD report in June is to act as both a tool to evaluate the success of the change process, and a means to embed it within SOME’s organisational culture. As discussed in the previous section, *Change Implementation Plan*, the report is to act as a celebration of the professional learning that occurred at SOME in an academic year. With a greater move towards the *Clan View* brought about by the shift in perceptions of what effective PD is, faculty and administration will be more prone to recognise how success in portions of the system benefit the system as a whole. This appeals to those with an *intrinsic* motivation for professional learning (Avidov-Ungar, 2016). Also, explicitly praising key change participants for effort put in over the course of the year will encourage future participation from *extrinsically* motivated teachers (Avidov-Ungar, 2016). Furthermore, PD initiatives that were not undertaken in the initial change cycle can be recorded here for public viewing, bolstering awareness of the need for change to continue in subsequent academic years. Finally, as leaders must seek out ways to institutionalise their actions in ways that will survive their leaving the organisation (Gardner, 2013), the end-of-year PD report can become an expected annual review of the year at SOME.
In the same way that “multiple sources of evidence for development and performance” (Lambert, 2007, p. 313) are needed to monitor the development of learning in a classroom, something that the change leader attests to in their professional experience, one must include many monitoring and evaluation stages in the change process. In fact, as there is almost “no shortage of possible measurement indicators” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 344), a danger lies in adding far too much unnecessary complexity to the process. On the one hand, if one can use a measurement tool as a way of driving the change itself, its inclusion seems obvious, but adding too many can in fact inhibit the change. Therefore, in line with the single-year timeline for the initial cycle of change, the wish for the change to be incremental, and the need to consider the other draws on the change leader’s time, this section encapsulates the tools to be used in the monitoring and evaluation elements of the change. Yet, all the monitoring in the world will be for naught unless the school is not just made aware of the need for change, but also how the change will occur too. This essential aspect of the OIP is the focus of the next section.

**Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process**

As has been made abundantly clear throughout this OIP, the need for SOME to change its approach to professional learning is plain. One need only look back at the example given in the section on *Organisational Change Readiness*, where one teacher has taken the same workshop three times, despite openly professing (along with other participants) its lack of efficacy. As Duck (2001) reminds us, unless one considers the emotional responses to change, a leader may see a negative reaction ensue. A notable example of this was recounted in chapter one when during his trial, Socrates’ principles led him first to death, then immortality. Luckily, in line with the constructivist lens of the change leader, a less stringent adherence to personal biases will be held, with the author more willing to frame ideas.
persuasively for different sets of stakeholders. If there is one thing that the Competing Values Model (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) teaches us, it’s that the OIP’s constructivist approach must recognise that truth differs for different people. This means that the author’s plan to communicate the need for change must not only be dynamic to deal with different stakeholder groups, it must shift its medium depending on the audience.

The communication plan to be used in this OIP is drawn from the four-stage model outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016). One of the reasons that this communication plan was chosen is its explicit recognition of the variation in perceptions held across an organisation. In fact, Cawsey et al. (2016) directly state that “much of the confusion over change can be attributed to the different levels of understanding held by different parties” (pp. 319-320). This neatly links to the values model put forth by Cameron and Quinn (2011) as well as the necessity of understanding the “participants’ views of the situation” (Creswell, 2014, p. 8) called for by constructivist theory. Another, though far more prosaic motive is that the author sees logic in aligning the source of the communication plan with the chosen change model, whose choice was explained in chapter two’s Framework for Leading the Change Process.

Therefore, it should be quite clear the necessity of having a plan, while still allowing it to be open to dynamic feedback. With the purpose of communication shifting over the course of a change process (Goodman & Truss, 2004), special care must be paid not just to the message and medium, but also to when and where the message is sent. As this OIP takes a social constructivist perspective, considering the shift in beliefs of the people making up the organisation as the change progresses is essential. Simply put, the communication plan needs to balance not just the variation in values held by people at SOME, but the ongoing shift in the values that this OIP rests on. As discussed in chapter one’s Leadership Position and Lens Statement, Senge’s systems thinking (2013) and Fertig and James’ CELLS perspective (2016) both are predicated on the idea that organisations, and their people, evolve over time. This is
reiterated by Cameron and Quinn (2011) when they highlight the cultural shifts that organisations undergo. Considering that SOME is only six-years old, it is to be expected.

While the MOE may prohibit the topic of evolution from SOME’s Science curriculum, there can be no denying the fact that this change plan relies on the evolution of perceptions across the school. To put it plainly, the constructivist lens wholly endorses the view that “people are continually learning how to learn together” (Senge, 2013, p. 3).

Consequently, as Figure 9 illustrates, this OIP sees shifting perceptions as the driving force of the change process, therefore the communication plan must reflect this. As Avidov-Ungar (2016) points out, attitudes to PD vary within schools, and the Competing Values Model (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) used in the section entitled Critical Organisational Analysis confirms the multiplicity of viewpoints across SOME. As this OIP moves through each phase of the plan, different communication strategies and their relevant audience will be discussed.

Figure 11 - Communication plan
Prechange approval phase

This phase is focused on gaining the support of those “with the influence and/or authority to approve a needed change” (Cawsey et al., 2016, pp. 319-320). This involves connecting the change to the stated goals of the organisation, and how it can best be achieved. With those who hold the Internal Process View as being mainly responsible for directing educational objectives at the school, both the necessity of the change and the gradual ‘tuning’ nature of the change (Nadler & Tushman, 1989) should be emphasised. In line with the author using the continuous improver approach to leadership, any misconceptions that the proposed change will be sweeping and sudden must be dealt with. The change leader cannot hope to simply change the kind of leaders that the initial contact group are, and turn them into frothing adherents to the new creed of PD. Instead, recognition of the different strengths and weaknesses is needed (Gardner, 2013). As emotionally intelligent leaders can bring about a “greater lowering of reactance” (Nesterkin, 2013, p. 586), one can see further validation of the constructivist lens of the OIP.

This initial communication will be primed by informal and individual discussions with the SLT and senior teachers. This group holds both positional and network power respectively, essential elements needed for change. The other two forms of individual power identified by Cawsey et al. (2016), knowledge and charisma are, this document humbly submits, present in the change leader. As is important in communicating change, face-to-face communication can be of great help (Fadzil et al., 2019; Klein, 1996). The author will bring a brief outline of the proposed timeline, and an explanation of the stages, to these discussions. Not only does this demonstrate that the change leader is confident in the plan, it also shows that the plan was thoroughly investigated before it was brought forward. This reduces resistance in stakeholders (Cawsey et al., 2016). Another point to mention is that it enables the author to properly address any and all unforeseen questions that may arise. As such, the
change leader needs to ensure that they are intimately familiar with the change process and are able to explain it succinctly. Indeed, a famed contemporary of Socrates, Pericles, is well known for exhorting people to make sure that they do not only have the knowledge of a topic, but the means to express it too.

This will be capitalised on by a more formal discussion at the weekly SLT meeting. Demonstration of the embryonic PD survey, an outline of the central online repository of professional learning information, a plan for the management of the PD database, and the proposed new PLC plan will be discussed in readiness for dissemination to the school. Suggestions to improve these will be interrogated, and if approved by the group, be integrated into the change plan. This OIP sees this group as key agents of change, particularly as “one of the primary purposes of formal structures and systems is to place the right information in the hands of appropriate individuals in a timely fashion” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p.149). As such, the concept of the database should appeal to this group. A strength of the proposed change is that the database will ease much of the cyclical work that is required for the multiple accreditation processes the school undergoes, and that the change complements the organisational vision perfectly. This was discussed in more detail in chapter one’s Organisational Change Readiness. As mentioned during the section dealing with implementation, particular attention will be paid to turning the vice-principal into an agent for change, as their role is primarily concerned with the education at SOME.

Developing the need for the change phase

With the approval of the powers-that-be, the change plan can be communicated to the whole faculty and administration. This second stage of the communication plan rests on three core aspects. The first aspect is the ongoing use of face-to-face meetings to discuss the vision
for change. Due to their role as CAS Coordinator, and their good working relationship with the faculty, there are ample opportunities for the change leader to seek out stakeholders and discuss the change. With open discussion being a key way to “amplify the likelihood of organizational change success” (Fadzil et al., p. 93), the change leader can leverage their established position to drive change. The change leader will use personal discussion with key players in the school culture who can influence others to accept the change. Being able to explain the rationale to members of the organisation is of vital importance (Cawsey et al., 2016), and this first aspect allows that. Furthermore, as Jensen et al. (2018) put it, face-to-face communication “helps to make transformational leadership successful” (p.359), and as this is a core part of the author’s leadership approach, its importance cannot be overstated.

The second aspect of developing the need for change is the sharing of the PD survey via the ICT ecosystem. This is the initial foray into bringing more stakeholders into a collaborative professional learning culture, a necessary element for success according to Villegas-Reimers (2013). As highlighting the role that senior leadership had in approving and suggesting improvements to the change is important, this will be done in conjunction with the sharing of the survey. This second aspect signals to the school that change is approaching, and indeed once the data is analysed, its publication will demonstrate the need. Existing strengths within the organisation (for example the laudable past accomplishments of faculty or suggestions for future PD) and areas to improve (for example the poor reception of the cyclical external providers currently used, or the lack of input faculty currently has) will be demonstrated. Sharing of this data via the new PD section on the staff ICT portal will help develop the need for change. Explanations of the findings of the survey will be communicated to faculty at the weekly PLC meeting. At this point the gap between the current PD system and the desired one will become apparent to all, with prompting from the change leader of course!
Communicating the creation of the PD database represents the third aspect of developing the need for change. Also located in the newly created PD section of the staff portal, the database will be shown to faculty. During a PLC meeting, with face-to-face follow up with certain members of staff who had questions or seemed reticent, the change leader will model how the envisioned new practice will operate. Using the samples created by the change leader and the embryonic PD team, the utility of the database will be emphasised. Indeed, the manner in which the issues identified by the survey will be ameliorated by the database’s use will be highlighted.

Also, as some will see this change as simply being another pointless PD initiative, the shift in the psychological contract (Cawsey el, 2016) whereby they are no longer simply on the receiving end of mandated and cyclical PD must be emphasised. The importance of spreading the message repetitively and through multiple media is key here (Klein, 1996). With use of direct dialogue, spreading of the survey via email, and the modelling of the database in person at a PLC meeting, multiple media are indeed being used. However, it is in the midstream phase that the communication plan truly expands.

**Midstream change phase**

As the school sees the data being gathered and begins to analyse the ongoing feedback being sought (through for example, longitudinal surveys), attitudes to the change that are either positive, ambivalent, or negative (Cawsey el, 2016) will arise. Indeed, recognising the reactions of stakeholders is fundamental if the change is to truly capture the school’s attention. Concerns about increased workload or sweeping shifts in practice could derail the change process if left unaddressed, as indeed would a belief that this change is only temporary. In fact, unless the need and opportunity for change is understood, some
stakeholders may even seek to subvert it (Bańka & Orłowski, 2012; Barth, 2013). Like the author, Senge (2013) has a predilection to return to ancient Greece for inspiration. He calls this shift in perception a *metanoia*, and this is exactly what the five aspects of this stage of the communication plan wishes to foster.

The first aspect of the midstream portion of the communication plan is the announcement of the creation of the PD team. Having sought out these key change drivers during the face-to-face meetings, as well as asked for volunteers during the database modelling, the transition from embryonic to evolved will be complete. In tandem with staff-wide announcements via the ICT ecosystem, an official ‘greeting’ will be made at a weekly PLC meeting. During this stage, the long-term professional learning goals will be shared, as well as how the team will seek to address them. Any and all concerns that were addressed in previous stages will be shared to demonstrate the transparency of the new collaborative PD system. Communicating to staff that they can push change themselves will show that previous practice where the professional learning direction was simply announced is over, and the situation where “multiple people are involved [sic] and everyone stands by, assuming someone else will act” (Cawsey et al, 2016, p. 97) no longer exists.

As part of this meeting, the discussion of how SOME will now define PD will be had. This will lead to the second aspect of this stage of communication. This is not be an esoteric grasping for perfection, but instead a grounding in core principles. As academia has different views on what professional learning is (Bautista & Ortega-Ruiz, 2015; Desimone, 2009; McMillan et al., 2016), SOME will instead look to the characteristics put forth by Villegas-Reimers (2013). These characteristics, first mentioned in *Framing the Problem of Practice*, will be then collaboratively woven into a faculty-derived formula that is to be shared across the school via both the ICT ecosystem and a poster in the faculty lounge.
With a new understanding of effective PD being well on the way to being shared by more than the author, the need to communicate the mentoring system is the next aspect. With school social networks an important factor for any school leader to consider (Daly et al., 2010; Moolenar et al., 2012), whole-school discussion of the initial pairings would not be advisable. Instead, the third aspect of the midstream communication plan is to first target certain members of faculty via email, then follow-up with meetings to get the mentoring process started. As leading by example is a core component of a successful communication plan (Kotter, 2012), and considering that the change leader is also a teacher, it goes without saying that the author will engage in a mentoring pair themselves. This indirectly communicates both their belief in change and symbolises the change as real and attainable.

Alongside the attitudinal surveys and participation in the PD database informing the PD team, they must ensure that the final organisational vision remains focused on improving learning in the classroom. This is a common value in the faculty, especially among those with the Adhocracy View and Clan View. Communication of the small gains that are made via the early networking of expertise with relevant faculty will help address this value. This will involve the change leader sharing early successes by both posting updates in the online PD portal, congratulating key stakeholders in person, and communicating them at the PLC meetings. This fourth aspect of the midstream communication plan will focus on celebrating progress made, and act as a prototype for the official celebration of change made in the end-of-year PD report.

With the change accelerating, a fifth aspect to the communication effort must be made to those holding the Market View and Hierarchy View at SOME. While this group may not be necessarily be swayed by the educational benefits of the change, the collation of easily analysable data, of great utility during accreditation cycles, and the potential to source more professional learning locally will be more persuasive. As such the change leader will seek a
meeting with both the head of administration and principal at this stage. With the change in culture at SOME being more apparent, and the change leader no longer relying on hypothetical future change for legitimacy, an appeal can be made to both parties for top-level support. Beginning with a meeting request, the author will send a brief overview of the change efforts up to that point. *Realia* like strategy maps will be included too, as they will showcase the breadth of the support for change.

This overview will communicate the change’s level of success and outline how the school may institutionalise the shift through subsequent cycles of change. Another aspect to be showcased is the manner in which the proposed change more closely aligns with the corporate mission, as expressed in the SOE Corporate Vision (2017). Along with the financial benefits of being less reliant on external providers, reputational benefits can accrue too. With the educational community in SOME’s national context being quite interconnected, with teachers moving between schools regularly, the school’s potential for profile raising will be discussed. Finally, if it can be demonstrated that the change is being seen as positive (through the anonymised longitudinal surveys), then the beneficial effect on teacher retention can be discussed (Craig, 2017; Mancuso et al., 2010; Urick, 2016).

**Confirming the change phase**

This final phase of the communication plan is centred on two main aspects. The first is set as being that of the end-of-year PD report, and the second is reliant on the fifth aspect of the midstream stage: communication with the head of administration and principal. Before moving on, it should be noted that the first aspect, the PD report, will be designed collaboratively. Stakeholder feedback on how to design this PD report will be sought, with
the change leader approaching certain members of faculty with experience of writing official reports in previous careers. This may provide insights the PD team does not have.

With the change becoming part of the operational norms of SOME, its success and future direction must be shared with the system. Not only does this mean that an overview of the change will be laid out, it means that the PD team should “create or strengthen systems that will survive them” (Gardner, 2013, p. 26). As discussed in chapter one, teacher turnover in international schools must be considered, so institutionalising the change is essential. This report on the whole change process will be generated containing both quantitative data (new PLC groupings, survey response statistics, etc.) and qualitative data (excerpts from participant interviews, quotes from survey responses, end-of-change questionnaire responses, etc.) to be shared with the whole school.

Fundamentally, the report will highlight the essential capacity building necessary for system improvement (Harris, 2011). The report will be shared via email, as well as having some copies printed for distribution. Of course, it will also be posted in the online professional learning portal. This final stage of communication is geared towards gaining support to finally institutionalise the change. As the “organization needs to be positioned for the next change” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 322), the report will serve as the genesis for the next cycle of change, recording the identified areas to focus on in the future. In fact, the peculiar nature of a school as an organisation should be noted, that for a couple of months over the summer most members stop thinking about it! Upon return at the beginning of an academic year, the report can serve as a touchstone for returning staff and inductees alike.

As was mentioned earlier in this OIP, the proposed change does not require a budget to be approved by the administration of the school. Indeed, the triad of approaches rests upon a shift in how professional learning is understood in the organisation, and a realignment of
how time is spent managing its implementation. With the necessary ICT infrastructure firmly in place at SOME, and with all faculty and staff fully competent in its use, no expenditure of financial resources is needed to create, for example, the PD database, the attitudinal surveys, or the end-of-year report. In terms of non-ICT dependent aspects of the change, for the creation and oversight of the mentoring teams, or the even the face-to-face activities of the PD team, no financial budget is necessary. In fact, time and desire for change are the only two resources to be called upon for the change process. With the change in perceptions of what good professional learning is, the school will be more willing to both engage in the new collaborative PD culture, and shift time away from less effective past practices. By highlighting this in the report, those with the Market View will be far more willing to see the benefit of the change plan and support any effort to institutionalise it at SOME.

Another use of the report is that of the potential to communicate the change’s institutionalisation through the PD policy documents. While both the staff handbook and other organisational documents profess an adherence to professional learning far closer to the OIP than the reality at SOME, neither fully capture the planned change. As such, if both the head of administration and principal agree, modification can be made to the staff handbook to accommodate the new approach. This means that an outline of the new collaborative system, its structure and processes would become part of official SOME policy. However, should it become apparent that this would require approval from SOE head office, then this second aspect would be avoided. Perhaps after several successful cycles of change, SOE could be approached regarding this, but the danger of having the change halted early is too great.

Indeed, the danger of factors that may limit the change process is one that this OIP must consider, and as such, the next section will do just that.
PD IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS

**Potential Limitations**

As was made clear at the end of the last section, not to mention in chapter one’s *Organisational Context*, the hierarchical nature of SOE must be considered. Due to its structure, if any change becomes seen as sweeping reform, then approval may be sought from the main office in Europe. As it is unlikely that the change leader will be given the opportunity to engage in face-to-face communication with organisational actors there, this is a potential limitation. A similar issue may arise if the professional learning database, and its management, become problematic. This could occur as the ICT department normally seeks to control access to all organisational information. This reinforces the need to seek formal approval in the SOME context, notably during the prechange phase of the communication plan. As Figure 1 illustrates, the sources of SOME’s operational norms lie far outside the classroom that the change leader frequents. Nationally-sourced oversight may be an issue too. For example, distance learning programmes from the vast majority of universities, including the University of Western Ontario, are not recognised by the MOE. Therefore, should they become interested in the change plan, its lack of borrowed authority (from a locally-recognised academic programme) may damage its credibility.

The inspections mentioned in *Organisational Context* offer no barrier to the proposed change. In terms of the visits of the MOE, their focus is primarily on ensuring adherence to local moral perspectives. This means that the proposed change does not in any way fall under their established purview. If they were to expand their areas of analysis, the change would not conflict with any of the current MOE dictates. The periodic IB and North American accreditation visits include ongoing revision of professional learning, and therefore the proposed change provides a clear and commendable plan for organisational improvement in this regard.
Another potential limitation is that the biases of the author towards what is considered good PD may have affected the proposal. As was made clear in the Possible Solutions to Address the POP section, many perspectives exist on professional learning. While the change leader feels that the Villegas-Reimers (2013) set of characteristics is sound, a personal bias may have set in. In fact, as Northouse (2016) points out, and was pointed out about him in the section entitled Leadership Ethics and Organisational Change Issues, one’s cultural background is pivotal in determining one’s beliefs. So, while the author may not see themselves as demonically championing a Hiberno-Canadian perspective, the Bard himself states that the devil can cite scripture for his own purpose. Yet the change leader feels that once the OIP moves beyond the planning and research this document represents, and into the awakening phase of the Change Path Model, it does indeed assimilate others’ perspectives. It is hoped that the focus on seeking out others at the culturally-diverse SOME to guide the evolution of the change will largely ameliorate the danger of an overriding bias, but the danger remains.

As discussed earlier, faculty turnover at SOME is relatively high, with staff staying on average for three years. The loss of institutional memory as people move to other schools could hinder the institutionalisation of change. To make the change permanent, or at least the core principles of it (as no doubt modifications will be ongoing), formal processes will need to be created to prevent a loss of momentum. If these processes cannot be brought into being, then the potential for lasting change is limited. However, if the new school culture can be shown to improve teacher retention, a major financial boon considering the cost of bringing in new teachers, then the potential for buy-in in future cycles of change could be increased by this. With the estimated monetary cost of teacher turnover being approximately $45,000 for the 2019/2020 academic year, any change that lessens this in subsequent years should be welcomed. Furthermore, as mentioned in the Timeline for Change section, the current vice-
principal is leaving SOME at the end of the current academic year. According to a recent conversation had with the author, they are moving to SOWE. So, while turnover presents a potential limitation in terms of a loss of institutional memory, an interesting future consideration arises.

**Future Considerations**

With staff across the SOE organisation all falling under the same corporate umbrella, it should come as no surprise that ten of the author’s colleagues have worked at other SOE schools. This means if a successful cycle of change can happen at SOME, the future movement of staff to other schools may sow the seeds of its implementation across the SOE network. This is a future direction that the change leader would welcome, to say the least.

In relation to future considerations, there are two other main potentialities. The most pressing is that of the subsequent cycles of change. Assuming the success of the initial change cycle, the school, directed by the PD team, could modify the opening of the following academic year. This would put the professional learning survey, the modelling of database use, and a second analysis of the previous year’s end-of-year PD at the beginning of the next academic year. If the new approach to professional learning can “be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel” (Schein, 2010, p. 18) in relation to PD, then the institutionalisation of the change is assured. Furthermore, taking on board the perspective gained in a previous year would help the PD team better chart its future direction.

The final future consideration to be discussed here is in relation to the communication plan. Despite this OIP having discrete phases in its communication plan, one must keep in mind that “a static communication strategy developed at the outset of a major change programme is therefore likely to become increasingly inappropriate over time” (Goodman &
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Truss, 2004, p. 218). This means that while the change leader has outlined a clear plan, the ongoing seeking of feedback during the change path means that the communication plan must itself be open to change. Senge’s (2013) conception of organisations that exhibit systems thinking is one that means they can “continually enhance their capacity to realize their highest aspirations” (p. 6). In other words, the PD team “should seek to learn from parties involved” (Fadzil et al., p. 93). Indeed, this entire OIP is based on the belief that SOME should listen more closely to its staff.

After all, the dialogues that Plato penned almost two-and-a-half thousand years ago all have one thing in common: Socrates listened to those he spoke to. The author simply proposes the same.

**Conclusion**

At the risk of overreaching, this OIP has learnt a lot about schools. While it began by focusing on the unique cultural context of SOME’s host nation, and all of the opportunities and limitations that it entails, it then began to move beyond this in search of an answer to a problem. With the problem examined being how to improve the currently imperfect organisation and delivery of PD at the author’s school, the importance of such an endeavour cannot be overstated. One does not need to rely on academic citations to justify why improving education for a school’s students is a worthy cause, nor should one. As was seen in the first chapter, the very idea of professional learning is quite complex, with people having different motivations concerning it. Yet, as was later discussed in the chapter, the effect of improving PD at a school can move beyond just improving teaching and learning, but can also increase retention rates. The many benefits of this retention were examined, but once again, it is all about the learning at a school.
This ‘at-the-chalkface’ perspective ensures that the proposed change remains focused on what is important, rather than remain a simple exercise in academic writing. It is this aspect of the EdD programme that makes it so relevant. Being able to actually use research to effect change in one’s own context is a unique opportunity. Whether one looks at the assessment of how ready the organisation is to actually engage in the change process, how various groups at the school can be approached to encourage change, or even how each stage of the timeline can reinforce the feedback loop of the implementation plan, the possibility for real change at SOME exists. As the change leader was authoring this OIP, they began to envision the plethora of positive effects the change can bring about.

These effects are not ones relegated to the simple streamlining of administrative protocol, or a vague redrafting of organisational goals. No, these effects are ones called for by the change leader’s lived experiences in classrooms around the world. In the same way that the author has seen how a constructivist approach to pedagogy reaps rich rewards in terms of student learning, the author is convinced that a similar stance can foster real change at SOME. Indeed, the justification of this worldview is interwoven through this OIP, as indeed is the guidance of the OIP’s recurrent companion, Socrates.

For some, including the Athenian sage in a doctoral dissertation on changing professional learning at a school in the Middle East may initially have seemed extraneous. However, it is the contention of the author that Socrates’ meandering around these pages was anything but. The constant exhortation to have others interrogate their own views on topics and potentially develop a deeper understanding is at the core of both day-to-day teaching and leading change in larger systems. If a leader tries to understand the values of those they interact with, they can then guide others to a new perspective. Socrates saw that.

This document has hopefully made the reader see that too.
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