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Abstract

The goal of *Canada’s International Education Strategy: Harnessing our Knowledge Advantage to Drive Innovation and Prosperity* (Global Affairs Canada, 2014) is to target the best and brightest international students to study in the country’s higher education institutions, mutually benefiting the student and the country’s economy. However, internationalization has created a new reality, with students graduating ill-equipped for the global society and a demand for approaches that embrace the complexities of diversity and changing environments (Dailey-Hebert & Dennis, 2015). Absent from the internationalization agenda are the considerations of impact on students and what they need in an organization’s culture to be most successful in their “abroad” learning. Evaluation of how internationalization is implemented is a gap and missing from the internationalization discourse is how faculty and staff can be equipped in their roles as implementers of internationalization. Change is needed in higher education institutions, and it requires leadership and an awareness of the organization’s culture and context. The Problem of Practice (POP) in this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) is the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution.

Using the experience of a partnership between a public community college and a private for-profit college, this OIP will outline a proposal for a change plan for the public-private partnership to develop a culturally competent organizational culture. This OIP will also be framed by the distributed leadership approach, the organized anarchy perspective, and the competing values framework to understand the organization and facilitate the change.

*Keywords*: Competing Values Framework, Distributed Leadership, Internationalization, Organized Anarchy, Organizational Culture, Public-private Partnership
Executive Summary

Change is needed in higher education institutions, and it requires leadership and an awareness of the organization’s culture and context. Using the experience of a partnership between a public community college and a private for-profit college, this document will outline a proposal for a change plan for a public-private partnership to develop into a culturally competent organization. The plan will use the distributed leadership approach, the organized anarchy perspective, and the competing values framework, to understand the organization and facilitate the change. Given that the problem this proposal aims to address is the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution, and that faculty and staff have the most contact with students, this plan will be based on a professional development strategy. The proposal is that through the cultural competency professional development of faculty and staff, the learning can change their individual skills, knowledge, and behaviours, which will ultimately change the organization’s culture in the short-term and long-term. A logic model will be used to frame the plan for follow-up monitoring and evaluation.

In the public-private partnership that this proposal will examine, the institute exclusively serves international students. However, absent from the institute’s culture is an organizational awareness of how diversity impacts the organization, and how faculty and staff are adequately prepared to respond to the needs of diverse students. Through an analysis of the organization’s culture, using the competing values framework, readiness for the change plan can be explored as well as understanding the current organizational state. Ultimately, to change a culture, requires an understanding of what the culture currently is.

The change plan is organized into three chapters:
1. Provides a context around the problem, the history and context of the partnership organization, and the leadership position in addressing this problem;

2. Further examines the leadership position supported by framing theories, an examination of the organization, and explores possible solutions to address the problem; and

3. Provides details on the change plan, elements to ensure success, communication, and the evaluation/monitoring component. It also concludes with the limitations to the plan and future considerations.

Additionally, a major consideration in this change plan, is how the three theoretical models through both their strengths and criticisms, can be used as a combined approach. The public-private partnership is a complex organization. Understanding an organization’s culture, and then changing that culture can be challenging. For this reason, this plan proposes that it requires a complex/combined approach.

The distributed leadership approach has been chosen for its rise in popularity in higher education (Leemans, 2017). It is also evident in some of the practices and behaviours of the partnership organization. The organized anarchy description is used to describe the partnership because it is a complex organization: being an entity with roots and relationship accountabilities to the public college that provides the curriculum and brand that it uses, while also being on the property of the private college and sharing a workforce. In additional to its complexity, the partnership has competing systems (Cohen & March, 1983). Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values framework can assess organization’s cultures around their systems. They also argue that organizations have multiple values, to which a dominant culture usually exists but can
change, and ultimately, leadership needs to be adaptable. This circles back to the distributed leadership approach, known for the flexibility and innovation it provides (Leemans, 2017).

This change plan provides a perspective on how internationalization can be implemented but also from a lens of what should be a priority – the students. Making improvements in the implementation of internationalization in a higher education institution through an organizational culture lens should not only be part of the experience of this partnership. Beyond this organizational experience, a framework for implementing and evaluating internationalization is needed. International students come to our institutions to develop skills to function in a globalized society. If we want to provide those skills, our institutions need to be equipped and that starts with an organizational cultural competency commitment.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

The problem of practice (POP) in this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) is influenced by three key elements: (a) internationalization is increasingly part of the landscape of higher education organizations (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2014), (b) culture drives an organization’s values, actions, and identity (Schein, 2010), and (c) the question of “What is the impact of internationalization on international students?” As such, the POP is the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution. This chapter will discuss: (1) internationalization and globalization, (2) the organizational context, (3) the leadership position and lens statement, (4) the leadership problem of practice, (5) framing the problem, (6) guiding questions emerging from the problem of practice, (7) a leadership-focused vision for change, and (8) the organization change readiness.

Internationalization and Globalization

Throughout this OIP, there is a focus on internationalization and identification of the influence and context of globalization. Internationalization while a predecessor of globalization, is often used interchangeably even though there are distinctly different meanings between the two terms, (e.g., international refers to two or more nations, whereas global refers to the whole world) (Chirico, 2014; Gopinath, 2008). Another common view is that internationalization in higher education is a response to globalization (Egron-Polak & Marmolejo, 2017). One of the challenges with the definition of globalization is that there are different perspectives. Is globalization a new phenomenon in our information and technology influenced society, or is it just an expansion of what society has always enacted? Globalization received an explosive energy as a discourse in the early 1990’s (James & Steger, 2014), while internationalization has been discussed since the 1970’s (Gopinath, 2008). Even though technology has certainly
advanced globalization, the sharing or acquiring of resources, knowledge, and territories across regions and societies has been an integral part of our human history (Chirico, 2014; Gopinath, 2008; Robertson & Chirico, 1985). Globalization can be defined as “a set of technologies, institutions and networks operating within, and at the same time transforming, contemporary social, cultural, political and economic spheres of activity” (Schirato & Webb, 2003, p. 21).

Robertson and Chirico (1985) define globalization as circumstances of various forms of connectedness like economic, political, social, and technology activity that creates a single space. This single space idea, assumes that unity is not only possible, but that there is a sense of wholeness in everything coming together. Chirico argues that “ideas, people, products, and money flow through the world connecting people and places” (p. 7), and that these interactions influence how people think, work, and play. Castells (1999) suggests globalization be viewed as a global economy which is historically new; it is only in the last 20 years that we have created the technological infrastructure that enables a planetary-scale functioning of the economy.

However, there is an exclusionary element in this system. This new global economy:

…allows the overall system to link up everything that is valuable according to dominant values and interests, while disconnecting everything that is not valuable, or becomes devalued. It is this simultaneous capacity to include and exclude people, territories and activities that characterizes the new global economy. (Castells, 1999, p. 5)

Egron-Polak and Marmolejo (2017) describe internationalization as an ideological glue that served to solidify linkages “between nations and peoples within the orbit of the Western democratic/capitalist or Eastern communist alliance, respectively, or as a means of structuring and maintaining the power relations within the colonial context” (p. 9). According to de Wit, Hunter, Howard, and Egron-Polak (2015), internationalization is an intentional process involving the integrating of an “international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions
and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society” (p. 29). Although the higher education institution has always had an international commitment, in the last 20 years, the main focus of internationalization has shifted to become economic, with the priorities of attracting and recruiting high yields of international students and competing for “world-class” status in being able to prepare students to perform in the global market and knowledge economy (de Wit, Hunter, Howard, & Egron-Polak, 2015). Even further, Egron-Polak and Hudson (2010) contends that internationalization is critical to the quality improvement strategy for higher education institutions because it allows for the building of understanding, relationships, and collaboration between people and nations, particularly around research partnerships and the societal impact of improving lives. It is this quality improvement intention of internationalization that I build upon in this OIP.

Organizational Context

Statement of Perspective

My OIP analysis is based on information available to me through my professional experiences on the private college/public-private partnership campus. Of note, there are three organizations: the public college, the private college, and the public-private partnership (a college campus developed in partnership between the public and private college), however, the private college and the public-private partnership entity are my points of reference. Because the public-private partnership is a new organization, the availability of formal documents is limited. In addition to my observations and lived-experience in the organization, publicly available material has been used, including marketing tools, the organization’s website, strategic mandate agreements with the province, and personal communication. The resulting proposal that this OIP
outlines, provides a pioneering opportunity for a scholarly analytical perspective on this new higher education partnership model.

**Organization History and Purpose**

The 2011 Ontario budget identified priorities to reduce the province’s deficit while still protecting schools (Ontario Ministry of Finance, 2011). Shortly afterwards, the public-private college partnership model was introduced in Ontario. Also, with reduced provincial funding to public colleges, and declining student enrolment, the entrepreneurial college has emerged (MacKinnon, 2015). This has resulted in several public colleges in small towns selling their curriculum through licencing agreements to private colleges in large cities, and I work in a for-profit private career college that has one of these licences. The owner of the private college purchased the college just before entering into the licencing agreement. The licencing agreement has created a public-private partnership entity which appears to be a satellite site of the public college on the private college’s property, but it is not that simple. This public-private partnership is a complex organization to be in and describe.

The public-private partnership offers business and technology post-graduate programs. The students enrol through the public college’s registrar office, and graduate with the public college’s credentials. Specifically, the students are all international, representing roughly 50 different countries (R. Ross, personal communication, January 16, 2018) (pseudonym). When the public-private partnership started about a few years ago, there were less than 100 students, and now there are several thousand, with waitlists every term (Private College, 2017) (pseudonym). Tuition is collected by the public college and then a percentage is paid to the private college. Sometimes enrolment in the public-private partnership significantly exceeds projected numbers.
but the private college accommodates the over-capacity. Students refer their family and friends, so enrolment is significantly influenced by word of mouth marketing.

Outside of the licencing agreement, neither the private college nor the public-private partnership have written documents that articulate goals or values of the partnership (J. Greyton, personal communication, July 11, 2018) (pseudonym). Public higher education institutions have existed for several decades, and have the planning and strategic documents to represent those years. The newness of the private college/public-private partnership with the pressures of start-up and rapid growth, attention has been concentrated on daily operations. While policies and other formal documents may exist in more established institutions, “they remain secondary to the pursuit of economic competitiveness” (Egron-Polak & Marmolej, 2017, p. 10) In my assessment, there are two goals in the partnership: (1) providing quality education and services, and (2) making a profit. Because there is an increase in the accountability of higher education institutions (Baldridge & Deal, 1983), the public college is diligent in its quality oversight of the partnership’s curriculum (e.g., all programs are audited regularly). Each of the public-private partnership’s programs are also affiliated with a program advisory committee with industry representatives who provide feedback on program design. As a result, the public-private partnership’s performance recently surpassed the public college in some of the province’s key performance indicators (Colleges Ontario, 2017). Regardless, assurances of quality in internationalization requires an awareness of intercultural interactions, using them for learning, and leveraging them to further develop the culture of the institution (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). This cultural level of quality assurance is not addressed in the public-private partnership.

The private college is a for-profit organization; making a profit is an obvious conclusion. Additionally, with insufficient public funding available to support institutions, entrepreneurial
partnerships are an increasing response (Altmann & Ebersberger, 2013). International students are compensating for insufficient public funding (Decock, McCloy, Steffler, & Dicaire, 2016) and the public college has established this partnership to establish a for-profit venture (and thus acquire additional funding for its own operations). In their 2017-2020 Strategic Mandate Agreement (Ontario Government, 2019) the public college states that in their internationalization strategy, the most important goals include increasing the number of attending international students and ensuring that the college is economically viable through the internationalization activities.

**Organizational Structure and Leadership Approaches**

Like the public college, colleges in Canada are typically governed by a board of directors and mandated to also have an advisory council with membership including faculty, staff, and students, to inform the president on institutional issues of importance (The College Centre of Board Excellence, 2014). Nevertheless, this POP is based on the private college’s operations of the public-private partnership. According to Sultana (2012) for-profit higher education institutions tend to use corporate governance structures as a strategy towards business success. As a for-profit, the private college is no different. The governance structure of the public college does not have authority in the public-private partnership or private college, however, it does have direct authority over the curriculum that is used in the partnership, and the student-policies of the public college apply. Both the private college and the public-private partnership do not have the organizational structures of a mission, vision, values, and strategic plans.

Faculty-union concerns have further restricted the public college’s direct involvement with the private college. Specifically, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union (OPSEU) questions the integrity of these public-private partnerships (Colleges Ontario, 2015). In a recent
OPSEU News press release, dated September 24th, 2018, OPSEU President Warren (Smokey) Thomas stated “privatization of public services is the biggest rip-off we’ve ever seen in this province. It’s how public dollars end up in private pockets” (Ontario Public Service Employees Union, 2018, para. 2). OPSEU argues that there needs to be transparency in identifying where the public-private partnerships are occurring, and include: the signed contracts, financial statements, and audit reports on college websites (Colleges Ontario, 2015). Information about public-private college partnerships is limited, which makes this OIP very timely and relevant.

The private college has an owner who is also the president, and the private college also does not have a board or advisory council like the public college. While the public college outlines the qualification requirements for hiring instructors in the public-private partnership, job descriptions do not exist for faculty or staff. The owner/president prefers a generalist model for the workforce, so that any staff can step in when needed to address the organization’s service pressures. Andrew Delbanco, author of the book College: What It Was, Is, and Should Be, argues that higher education institutions are “push(ing) students into preprofessional pursuits” (Rakowsky, 2012, para. 2), rather than teaching them how to think and be adaptable. The public-private partnership models this adaptability in the generalist workforce design, but it is not incorporated into the curriculum design.

The private college does not have an official organization chart. The faculty, staff, and executive in the public-private partnership are either employees or contracted as independent contractors with the private college. Student services and the academic administration departments have reporting relationships to two chief operating officers (COOs) (as shown in Figure 1, which depicts a simplified illustration of the organization’s chart of roles and
relationships). Staff and faculty may be unsure whose directions to follow, creating situations of confusion and questioning of decision-making.

Figure 1

*The Private College’s Organizational Chart*

Note. The relationship line between faculty and the executive leadership is not a solid line which represents the loose accountability.

The faculty reporting relationship is even less defined, especially as an independent contractor workforce. This loose accountability is not uncommon to higher education. The collegial model has been the bedrock of institutions for centuries, in that the “professoriate is granted authority and responsibility as individual professionals and through internal academic bodies” (Austin & James, 2016, p. 124). Additionally, long-standing in higher education is faculty autonomy and academic freedom (Austin & James, 2016; Universities in the Knowledge Economy, 2016).

The organizational theory that best describes this private college is the *organized anarchy*, a concept that was first introduced by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972). The three characteristics in the organized anarchy are problematic preferences (inconsistent ideas), unclear
technology (processes that operate by trial and error), and fluid participation (varied degrees of involvement and commitment) (Cohen et al., 1972). Manning (2018) emphasizes that in this model, there are unclear rules and multiple goals, and they change from one person’s interpretation to another; at times it can feel like chaos. Nonetheless, the private college is recognized for its success, often toured by local and international higher education institution delegates, who want to learn about their experience partnering with the public college.

Another author, Weick (1976), builds on the organized anarchy theory by describing higher education institutions as “loosely coupled systems.” To illustrate, Weick (1976) describes higher education organizations in relation to an unconventional soccer game in which:

...there are several goals scattered haphazardly around the circular field; people can enter and leave the game whenever they want to; they can throw balls in whenever they want; they can say "that's my goal" whenever they want to, as many times as they want to, and for as many goals as they want to… and the game is played as if it makes sense. (p. 1)

The “loosely coupled systems” concept challenges the historical belief that higher education institutions are structured, efficient, have intentional goals, always makes detailed plans, and act using rational procedures (Weick, 1976). Things or people in the system maintain their own identity but can be considered connected to achieve a particular outcome. For example, in the public-private partnership entity, the student services and academic administration departments are loosely coupled, connected in ensuring students complete their academic program. Weick (1976) further argues that although it is easier to adapt to a wider range of changes in the environment in these systems, he contracts this by also saying they are “unspecifiable, unmodifiable, and incapable of being used as means of change.” (p. 9). This is problematic for this OIP because, in addressing the POP, change is required.

In contrast, Teece (2018) argues that the organized anarchy model is not acceptable in higher education today and that structured strategic planning is necessary in responding to the
impacts and demands of a globalized society. And, that this requires a dual mindset, prioritizing an entrepreneurial business perspective and a preservation of the academic history of the institution (Ruscio, 2017; Teece, 2018). However, there is recognition that institutions are “complex system(s) of interdependent parts” (p. 94) and that they have an “endless stream of competing and conflicting demands” (p. 94).

Context Data

There are approximately 200 people working in the private college, of which two-thirds are faculty who work a minimum of two to three terms (Private College, 2017) (pseudonym). The academic administration is a small team of five staff and turnover is high. The public college has full-time, tenured faculty. However, the private college has chosen a predominantly independent contractor faculty model, attracting industry professionals. This precarious workforce has an impact on the stability of the programs and limits opportunities for further development of the curriculum (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

The dominant ideological approach in my workplace, is more like a leader-member exchange model of the “in-group” and the “out-group” relationship with the leadership (Northouse, 2016). The “in-group” members are well known and rewarded in their relationship with the organization’s leadership (Northouse, 2016; Power, 2013). For example, in the private college they would be pursued for their subject-matter expertise. This results in their sense of pride and loyalty to the organization. Contrarily, members from the “out-group” may not be known or recognized by name. They have less of a connection to the organization; they would also generally have poor productivity in the organization. The leader-member exchange theory is not completely negative. Power (2013) says a leader who understands the model, can use it to maximize the number of high quality “in-group” relationships, and thus increase the number of
staff who positively contribute to the organization. In contrast, I function in the organization using a collaborative approach which I have named “the organizational team” and includes all staff, at all levels, and in all departments. The leadership approach that aligns with this is the distributed leadership model. This will be discussed later in this chapter.

**Policy Aspects**

A policy framework would be useful for this partnership in guiding education practices, services, and departments. There is an absence of policy directions on internationalization implementation at the institutional/partnership level, provincially, and nationally. The benefit to society and the economy cannot be ignored. Accordingly, regardless of the money spent in higher education there is a significant financial return-on-investment when we look at international students’ business spending. Their contributions to the Canadian economy was $11.4 billion which translated into 104,000 full-time equivalent jobs in 2014 (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc, 2016). This was determined because the Canadian government commissioned Roslyn Kunin and Associates to study and assess the economic impact of international students studying in Canada (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc, 2016).

The main focus of higher education boards is strategic and supervisory, with policy decision-making, fiduciary accountabilities, and ultimate oversight in ensuring the integrity of the institution (Austin and Jones, 2016). Whereas, the business model of the private college and the public-private partnership’s operations instead focus on the implementation of the branded curriculum and student enrolment. Austin and Jones (2016) emphasize that in order to improve governance, the human element and organizational culture need to be considered. In other words, relationships matter, people matter, as well as how people think, act, and interact with each other. Faculty are uniquely positioned as the key to the implementation of internationalization through
their direct contact with students and development of the curriculum. However, with respect to
the provision of policy guidelines and how faculty are rewarded for their contributions to
internationalization. “an overwhelming 87% of institutions report having no formal guidelines in
this matter” (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2014, p. 30). This is no
different in the private college and the public-private partnership.

Internationalization and globalization impact higher education through nation-state
requirements with the manifestation of marketization, capitalization, competition, and
commercialization (Sultana, 2012). However, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is a political organization created to promote worldwide peace
through education, sciences, and culture (UNESCO, n.d.b.) and specifically to promote “better
learning outcomes, quality and inclusive education systems” (United Nations Educational,
1-3). Canada is a member of UNESCO since 1946, but this is not evident in the federal and
provincial internationalization strategies to help guide internationalization in our institutions,
particularly around developing inclusive education systems (UNESCO, n.d. a).

Our provincial strategy is Ontario’s International Postsecondary Education Strategy
2018 Educating Global Citizen: Realizing the Benefits of International Postsecondary (Ministry
of Advanced Education and Skills Development, 2018). Our federal strategy is Canada’s
International Education Strategy: Harnessing our Knowledge Advantage to Drive Innovation
and Prosperity (Global Affairs Canada, 2014). Both articulate a goal to provide opportunities for
international students to study in Canada’s higher education institutions with education that
meets the needs of our 21st century global marketplace. Missing from these strategy papers is the
directions on how higher education institutions should enact internationalization in their
organizations and a framework to ensure it is implemented effectively. Instead, the priority focus is in seeing international students as opportunities to contribute to multiple streams of domestic prosperity, with immediate, significant, and long-term investment returns (Global Affairs Canada, 2014). Additionally, the report by the advisory panel on Canada’s internationalization strategy, focused on the predominantly economic benefits in driving the country’s prosperity. Several of the panel members who informed the strategy were presidents of the nation’s universities (Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 2012). However, MacKinnon (2015) argues that Canada needs to focus on the “brain race” for global talent, and that higher education institutions are the conduits for attracting talent and developing talent. He further argues that policy at all levels is needed to guide actions towards achieving the goal in making Canada an education site of choice on the global stage, and the nation with top talent. Implementation of this OIP can play a pivotal role in achieving this goal as well.

**Leadership Position and Lens Statement**

My role is the professional development lead in the academic administration department. Based on several quality audits conducted by the public college this role was created to help improve teaching practice and establish quality standards. Each term, as a condition in the licencing agreement, I report on the number of orientation sessions facilitated and faculty who attended, classroom observations and coaching sessions, and individuals contacted in the recruitment process. Outcomes of these activities are not assessed or evaluated. An overall performance management system has not been created yet.

To address the POP, a cultural component will be added to some of the professional development activities (e.g., classroom observations will include indicators of how culture is addressed in the classroom and incorporated into the curriculum) and with the goal to achieve
cultural competency. The cultural competency goal is further discussed in Chapter 3. I can make this change within the scope of my role. I have the responsibility for developing the professional development framework in the public-private partnership. I have credibility, I am respected, and I am often asked by the executive leadership for my opinion on how we can make improvements.

The distributed leadership will be used to address this POP. In this approach, individuals are actively involved and able to influence decisions (Youngs, 2017). Leemans (2017) also argues that with distributed leadership, organizations are better able to respond to change, adapt, learn, and innovate. Culture in an organization is about a group of individuals and the values that they share (Schein, 2010). To change a culture will require the collective contributions and ownership of the group, like the distributed leadership model.

Educational institutions that have highly positive student outcomes also have great leaders (Eacott, 2013). Arguably, the best leaders are “teachers, mentors, and role models - and they accomplish the vast majority of their work through influence, not authority” (Bacon, 2016, para. 3). Bolden (2011) describes distributed leadership as an evolving theory, often synonymously associated with the idea of co-leadership or leadership that is shared, collective, or collaborative. However, the idea of leadership being distributed, seems to ignore the leader/follower relationship argument that defines leadership (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015).

Youngs (2017) argues that rather than focusing on the idea of “leader” the focus should instead be on the practice of “leading” which includes dialogue, learning, reflecting, and engaging. The distributed leadership model is gaining momentum, promoting collaboration between academic and administration departments (Gronn, 2010). For this type of leadership approach to be fully operational, it requires the support of executive leadership in providing the professional development opportunities, policies, resources, and infrastructure in the institution.
(Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, & Ryland, 2012). However, tensions of authority continue to be challenges experienced when this model is used in higher education (Youngs, 2017). We need to shift our picture of organizations as fixed constructs into spaces of practice, development, and continuous shaping (Leemans, 2017; Youngs, 2017). This is very much aligned with the purpose of professional development in the context of the activities proposed to address the POP, but within the scope of this OIP, the focus will be on faculty and staff.

**Leadership POP**

In response to the realities of today’s global context, the new provincial internationalization strategy states that international education provides spaces to “share experiences, perspectives and ideas that foster inter-cultural understanding and open new doors to discovery” (Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development, 2018, p. 3). Although stated as a provincial policy direction, this is not necessarily felt at the international student level. The learning discourse in the public-private partnership is based on the dominant, mainstream Canadian culture in the organization. The learning does not incorporate an understanding of the breadth of cultures that international students bring to the environment.

Sullivan (2017) argues that the international student’s abroad learning experience includes: adjustment to a new environment, exposure to different cultures, and potentially feelings of isolation. Curriculum and teaching practice in the 21st century need to reflect the diversity of the students and provide the skills required to effectively function in a globalized society (Kezar, 2014). While internationalization does focus on the opportunities for abroad learning, missing from the discourse is the training, preparation, experience, and competencies for faculty to teach in a globalized context (Alfaro, 2008; Merryfield, 1991). A global society suggests there is a seamless transition from one space to another. Instead of learning a “global
culture”, international students take on the dominant cultural environment of their abroad learning experience. Internationalization promotes integration through cultural, social, political, and technological homogeneity (Maringe, Foskett, & Woodfield, 2013).

To address this POP, there is a further need for leadership. In Daft’s (2015) analysis of leadership theories, he argues that leadership today requires a focus on change management, collaboration, and promoting diversity. Manning (2018) concurs, adding that in an organized anarchy, distributed leadership is effective in creating opportunities for divergent views to be shared and discussed. She additionally argues that the organized anarchy supported with distributed leadership can better prepare students to function in the complexities of a globalized community. This focus is also very relevant for this POP and is discussed throughout this OIP (e.g., the distributed leadership model).

**Current Organizational State**

Jessop (2012) asserts that higher education institutions today operate more like economic enterprises with the goal of maximizing revenues. In the context of my POP, this could also be said of the current organizational state of the private college, which is a for-profit institution. According to the Canadian Bureau for International Education (2014), internationalization is the “process of integrating international, intercultural, and global dimensions and perspectives into the purpose, functions and delivery of education. It shapes institutional values, influences external relations and partnerships, and impacts upon the entire educational enterprise” (para. 3). This means the intent of internationalization in higher education is to create and facilitate culturally inclusive learning environments, and this should be expected in the public-private partnership which exclusively serves international students.
The public college’s curriculum has not been revised to reflect the international student’s culture, experience, or different way of learning. The questions of: “Who are our students?”, “What do they need?”, and “How can we facilitate their learning success?” needs to be part of our public-private partnership discourse. Additionally, an assessment of policies, the curriculum, and student supports need to be addressed in the desired organizational state (Nichols, 2013).

Arum & Roksa (2010) advise that academic performance is impacted by the “significant differences in critical thinking, complex reasoning, and writing skills when comparing groups of students from different family backgrounds and racial/ethnic groups” (para. 2). Therefore, international students have different ways of learning and require teaching methods that address these differences (Yeh, 2016). Even with the public-private partnership’s diverse student population, faculty and staff do not practice from a culturally competent lens; it is not part of the organization’s culture. Leadership support and commitment is also needed in the public-private partnership which can be provided through policy directions, resources, and establishing cultural values and practices as the organization’s values (Beck, 2001).

**Desired Organizational State**

The intent of this OIP is to improve the organizational culture through a cultural analysis, change recommendations, an evaluation component, and ultimately an achievement of cultural competency. Prior to implementing the culture change strategies will require an assessment of the organization’s culture through the competing culture/values framework (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This framework will be discussed in the Organizational Change Readiness section of this chapter and in Chapter 2. Additionally, with a primary focus on faculty and staff, professional development activities can be used to reinforce “academic values, student learning, and the education mission of the institution” (Kezar, 2014, p. 114), minimizing resistance to the change.
The desired organizational state would also include three outcomes. Firstly, there would be culturally competent faculty and staff, who are sensitive, aware, and skilled to work with diverse students. According to Nicols (2013) when international students have strong connections to both their home and the abroad cultures, they may experience greater success in the new environment – culturally competent faculty and staff can help to facilitate this. Secondly, internationally-focused student services would better meet the needs of international students, responsive to the context of their experiences, issues, and challenges. Understanding the impact of culture on behaviour will better inform the design of student services (Arthur and Stewart, 2001). Thirdly, a commitment to internationally-focused curriculum would acknowledge the diverse classroom and focus on the global marketplace, where understanding cultures, being able to work with diverse populations and in diverse environments is incorporated into all learning. To achieve this, Lie (2009) argues for creativity in 21st century curriculum design through partnering opportunities between faculty and culturally diverse students.

**Framing the Problem**

**Historical Overview of POP**

Between 2010 to 2017, the enrolment of international students in Canadian institutions increased by about 119 percent (Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2018). I also witnessed a similar increase in the public-private partnership. According to the chief commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, Renu Mandhane "If you want to really serve the population, I think you first need to know who's in your student body. And not just at an eyeballing it sort of way, actually understanding in a much more discrete way" (Mcdonald & Ward, 2017, para. 14). To demonstrate an effort to increase campus diversity and inclusiveness, Canada’s universities have recently committed to collect and make public, their institution’s
demographic data on the diversity of faculty, staff, and students (Chiose, 2017). Humphreys, Russell, Timmons, and Trimbee (2018) share that last year Canada’s institutions adopted a set of principles to champion equity, diversity, and inclusion on campuses, communities, and the country through the development of action plans. These commitments have not transferred to the public-private partnership. Given that the partnership entity is exclusively for international students, this organizational reflection and planning commitment is essential.

The Canadian Bureau for International Education (2016) argues that it must be an obligation of higher education institutions in Canada “to infuse internationalization throughout education to provide truly internationalized learning outcomes that are critical for success in a global context”; it should not be optional (p. 7). The diversity of cultures that international students bring to the institution should be leveraged to facilitate the development of the organization’s culture, that embraces and supports learning from each other’s cultures (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010).

Almost two decades ago, Beck (2001) challenges us to think about the ethics in internationalization. She argued that there is an ethical responsibility for internationalization to focus on the well-being of international students and that with that focus it will result in the well-being of both communities and higher education. Ricketts and Humphries (2015) concur. Beck (2001) also debates that globalization and the economy drives internationalization, instead of the focus on the international student and their learning. Knight (1994) questions whether internationalization in Canada has achieved the intended goals. In Canada’s federal internationalization strategy, internationalization is described as a benefit for both students and the country in creating internationally-focused learning spaces to develop skills for a global
marketplace. These benefits or target priorities cannot be achieved without planning and intentional strategies.

In 1989, through the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, university presidents stated that internationalization of the curriculum would be essential for the survival of Canada (Knight, 1994). They argued this could be achieved through the skills and experience of faculty, students and community members with diverse ethnic backgrounds or experience with other countries (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1989). However, internationalization is not interwoven throughout the curriculum; instead, it is offered as optional activities students can select to participate in (Leask, 2004). According to Begeny (2018) internationalization emphasizes the “importance of collaboration and reciprocity; fostering cultural sensitivity and respect; and synthesizing knowledge generated from practice and scholarship” (p 925). Optional participation does not enable internationalization to be realized in an institution.

Beck (2001) emphasizes that internationalization needs to include a focus on “activity, process, competence and organizational culture” (p. 20). Even further, Knight (1994) argues that there needs to be an organizational focus in internationalization which includes administrative processes, structures, values, and principles. Thus, to achieve success in internationalization and to ensure international students are successful, there needs to be an organizational culture focus.

All these years, decades later, and we still haven’t addressed this.

Organizational Theory Framing of POP and Analytical Review of Literature

As previously discussed, the partnership can be described as an organized anarchy. Loosely coupled systems and garbage can organizations are also terms used to describe the organized anarchy (Lutz, 1982). In this organizational theory, flexibility is permitted in the
organization’s subsystems, the organization is better able to survive and thrive through changes (Cohen et al., 1972; Lutz, 1982; Manning, 2018; Weick, 1976). This model is also associated with organizational chaos, but chaos can be an opportunity for creativity; anything is possible when there are no limits (Cohen et al., 1972). There are contradictions in the argument that the organized anarchy/loose couplings assist institutions with organizational change and improvements (Hautala, Helander, & Korhonen, 2018). In the organized anarchy, multiple goals are allowed, therefore, change initiatives can happen in focused areas without the need for a complete transformation of the whole organization (Manning, 2018). It also means that high performance and mediocrity are tolerated simultaneously in different parts of the organization (Hargreaves, 2011). Even when one part of the organization fails in a loosely coupled organization, it does not cause damage to other parts (Weick, 1976). Additionally, Kezar (2014) argues that even with second order change (which focuses on organizational cultural change) in the organized anarchy, influence and participation are fluid, making it possible for new directions to be achieved in multiple places.

In contrast, Hargreaves (2011) argues that the opposite of loosely coupled systems, which is tightly coupled systems, are best for control and managing change from the top. Weick (1976) also argues that while loosely coupled systems make an organization better able to adapt to change, this model is also problematic in that it cannot be used as a means of change. This suggests that there are limits in how this model can be used in planning for change. However, Hargreaves (2011) further argues that loosely coupled systems and tightly coupled systems are both needed in higher education institutions to enable innovation, competitive advantage, and success in meeting the increased accountability requirements of the state.
The other key characteristic of this model is decision-making. Lomi and Harrison’s (2012) description provides a clear picture of decision-making in this organization type:

…participants carry energy that is needed for organizational choices to be made, and decide where to take it. Problems attach themselves to choices and absorb the energy of the participants. Solutions – the output of problem solving – carry energy out of the system, thereby determining the amount of energy effectively available within the system at any time. (p. 4-5)

This implies that decision-making has a random element, which further implies that planning, thoughtfulness and logic may not be attached to the decision-making process. As a further consideration, there are five characteristics of decision-making in the organized anarchy institution:

(1) most issues have low salience for most people; (2) the organizational system has a high inertia; (3) any decision can become a garbage can for almost any problem; (4) processes of choice are easily subject to overload; and (5) organizations have weak information bases. (Cohen & March, 1986, as cited in, Bowman 1987, p. 74)

Decision-making is also influenced by choices which are constrained by surrounding circumstances, time, and resources (Manning, 2018). This all suggests that decision-making is also complex in this model.

A PEST Analysis

The PEST framework offers a lens to look at a situation from a political, economic, social, and technological perspective (CFI Education Inc., 2019). Politically, the argument forty years ago, was the need for the “Canadianization” of Canadian higher education institutions (Jones, 2009). Expectations for increases in student access, increases in accountability, and decreases in government subsidies to institutions, has made the higher-tuition-paying international student a much-needed commodity in the budget and operational planning of higher education organizations. Even with the unfounded concern that international students displace spaces for domestic students, the reality is that there is a decline in the number of domestic
students enrolling (MacKinnon, 2015; Ricketts & Humphries, 2015). With a decentralized higher education system, the absence of a clear national higher education policy makes it difficult to address the root issues of education needs and access (Jones, 2009; Ricketts & Humphries, 2015). However, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (2014) developed principles it believes should guide internationalization. Ricketts and Humphries (2015) summarizes them as follows:

…internationalization should ideally be incorporated in the core mission of an institution; that it be student-centred, equitable and inclusive; that, while recognizing the importance of fiscal imperatives, they should not dictate the internationalization agenda; that there must be mutual benefit to all parties involved; and that internationalization is a vital means to achieving global-level civic engagement, social justice and social responsibility and, ultimately, the common good. (para. 6)

The economic lens is clear with the focus on “recruiting international students and using that talent towards meeting Canada’s economic needs for the future” (Ricketts & Humphries, 2015, para. 3). An economy-driven agenda of internationalization dominates the discourse. Influenced by the new neoliberalism, the “economization” of political life defines all aspects of the state, higher education, and even what it means to be “human” (Brown, 2015). Similarly, the social perspective draws our attention to the new neoliberalism, where people have become “human capital” as products for themselves, their organizations, and even the state (Brown, 2015). As human capital, people are potentially dispensable elements and “inequality, not equality, is the medium and relation of competing capitals” (Brown, 2015, p. 38). This is contradictory to the idea of a globalized society or community.

The public-private partnership’s programs are primarily technology-focused with hands-on opportunities built into the curriculum. This includes a variety of technology laboratories) Increasing the use of technology on the campuses (e.g., using online textbooks and being completely paperless) is a goal, especially in the public-private partnership (Public College,
Technology and science advancements have brought together many parts of the world, influencing information, communication, financial markets, business transactions, and travel (Olsen & Peters, 2005). Technology has also influenced how long it takes to get things done, and it has contributed to connecting us as a global community. A technology strategy on campus should also include internationalization strategies to improve connectivity for diverse learning.

Targeting the brightest international students to study in Canada, results in the depletion of “human resource potential of less developed countries…with world trade laws designed to enrich developed nations while further impoverishing” (Maringe et al., 2013, p. 12) the latter. Are we producing globally-minded students for a global society? Are we really producing talent to contribute to Canada’s prosperity? According to Ma (2007) internationalization should be to facilitate the development of values and skills to socially transform and sustain a society. The purpose of higher education institutions is to embody social values and ideals as an ethical organization (Baldridge & Deal, 1983). However, the challenge in addressing what an ethical organization means, is constrained because ethics are culturally constructed and do not have a universal meaning (Dion, 2012).

**Internal and External Data**

As previously stated, internal data in the public-private partnership is lacking which has presented a challenge in articulating details about how it functions, limited to my observations as an employee in the organization. However, a brief analysis can be provided on external data. In 2017 there were close to 500,000 international students in Canada with almost 50% of them in Ontario (Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2018). While 82% of Canadian colleges offer abroad learning activities, only about 1% of the country’s domestic students are participating in these opportunities (Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2018).
Between 2014 to 2016, there was a 37% increase in the financial impact of international students in Canada, and between 2008 and 2018 this percentage doubled (Global Affairs Canada, 2018). Canada prioritized the monitoring and measuring of this impact over the last ten years. These numbers do not address the gap in Canada’s global engagement.

According to Knight-Grofe and Deacon (2016) “Canadians need to be prepared to participate and to lead in the global village, working across borders, cultures, languages, and values to mutual benefit. This preparedness is critical if Canada wishes to maintain the positive place in the world it now enjoys” (para. 18). Knight-Grofe and Deacon (2016) reiterate that Canada’s internationalization strategy has failed in providing directions and measurable targets in its “intention to enhance people-to-people connections, and calls international education a ‘two-way street’” (para. 20). While abroad learning experiences can provide employability skills that include tolerance of ambiguity, curiosity, and confidence (Knight-Grofe & Deacon, 2016), without pre-landing work experience, international students still have less earning potential compared to other immigrants. Cultural awareness for cross-cultural sharing and understanding is missing from the international student learning experience. With a lack of an organizational culture focus, higher education institutions may be providing learning activities, but globalized skills development is not part of the learning discourse.

**Theoretical/Conceptual Framework to Guide the OIP**

Guiding this OIP is a focus on organizational culture. Given the intangible nature and understanding of culture, it was important for this OIP to use a scientifically-tested cultural framework. Accordingly, Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values framework was selected (see Appendix A, for an illustration of the framework’s quadrants). Their framework includes four organizational culture values: (1) clan/collaborate (friendly, teamwork, consensus,
and flexibility focused), (2) adhocracy/create (entrepreneurial, experimentation, and innovation focused), (3) hierarchy/control (formalized, structured, stable, predictable, and efficiency minded), and (4) market/compete (goal-oriented, competitive, and results-oriented). Understanding which of the culture values are present in the organization as well as which one is dominant is helpful in informing how to plan for change.

In addition to classifying types of cultural values, Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) organizational culture assessment instrument (OCAI) reveals cultural aspects that may not be easily identified by the organization’s members. The assessment tool also assists in identifying a possible desired organizational culture/values state (see Appendix B, for an illustration of the OCAI). Also argued is, for an organization to successfully achieve a desired change, there must be an understanding of the organizational culture. Similarly, Schein & Schein (2017) argue that an organizational culture examination must be done to reveal three levels which include: (1) what is at the surface and usually the most visible, (2) where there are underlying assumptions, and (3) what is deep-rooted, requiring more effort and skill to reveal, and therefore address. Achieving successful change requires examining the organizational context, then the change process can be designed accordingly Smith (2015a).

The organized anarchy describes an organization with multiple goals or structures and the competing values framework complements, with an argument that there are more than one set of values in an organization. According to Teferra (2014) higher education institutions have two main structures or groups which are faculty and the administration. With the tensions between these two groups, it is clear that they have different goals and even competing values (MacKinnon, 2015). Teferra (2014) further argues that higher education in the 21st century requires a collaborative leadership approach, involving faculty and administration, to leverage
innovation and order in the higher education institution. This further supports the distributed leadership approach in this combined theoretical approach for this OIP (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

*Distributed Leadership in the Organized Anarchy with the Competing Values Framework*

Note. In the organized anarchy there are multiple goals (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). In this organizational approach, it can also include competing values, which can be analyzed through the competing values framework (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) and supported by distributed leadership (Youngs, 2017).

**Questions Emerging for the POP**

**Potential Inquiry Stemming from the Main Problem**

As previously discussed, many of the partnership’s faculty are self-employed independent contractors, not employees of the organization. Full-time faculty and staff professional development activities can be incorporated into their work hours, but the contracted
faculty’s time is compensated hourly and usually only for teaching time (Basen, 2017). Is there an organizational commitment to the professional development of all faculty? Will the organization be willing to plan for and absorb the costs to train and develop contracted faculty? If contracted faculty are not willing to be trained, is the organization prepared to terminate the contractual relationship or will training be optional? If training is optional, what will that say about the organization’s commitment to changing the organizational culture?

Potential Factors Contributing to the Main Problem

With rising operational costs, institutions require a survival/business focus, competing for a sizeable market share of international students. Interest and demand for abroad learning opportunities is high and rapidly growing, with Canada at the top of the global race as a study destination choice of international students (Atack, 2017). In the partnership, a commitment to student success should be fundamental to the institution’s priorities. It is difficult to assess this commitment, given that there is no mission, values, or partnership-defining documents outside of the curriculum licence (J. Greyton, personal communication, July 11, 2018) (pseudonym). Is there a commitment to student success? If the supply and demand for abroad learning is high, does an organizational focus on the student experience or student success matter?

Challenges Emerging from the Problem

My scope is limited to implementing the professional development activities for my colleagues. The executive leadership (president and COOs) is charged with modeling the way in the organization when innovation or practices need to be introduced and implemented (Schein & Schein, 2017). If they demonstrate personal commitments to their own cultural practice development, it would demonstrate that there is an organizational culture that values and recognizes diverse cultures, and leverages diversity in the development of its students. What
level of commitment can be expected of the executive leadership, if they are not personally involved in the professional development activities of this change plan?

**How the OIP may be Perceived**

Recognizing the need to improve cultural awareness and cultural practices requires ownership of one’s behaviour and thinking, and a commitment to personally change (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989; Quinn, 1988). This OIP is premised on the assumption that all faculty and staff will be ready to participate in their personal-change process so that a resulting organizational culture change may result (Kezar, 2014). Change management will be an important element in the success of this OIP. What change management skills and preparation will be necessary for leadership to support this change process? Is this leadership adequately equipped to manage the change process?

**Leadership-focused Vision for Change**

**Gap Between Present and Envisioned Future State**

Internationalization in higher education has resulted in an increasingly academic-capitalist environment (Kezar, 2014). Like the partnership, education institutions “act more like economic enterprises that aim to maximize revenues, market their education … (and) position themselves competitively” (Jessop, 2012, p. 58). According to the Canadian Bureau for International Education (2014) internationalization is “the process of integrating international, intercultural, and global dimensions and perspectives into the purpose, functions and delivery of education. It shapes institutional values, influences external relations and partnerships, and impacts upon the entire educational enterprise” (para. 3). Implementation of internationalization is an issue because there is a lack of standards, consistent practices, and unclear expectations. There is also a gap between the current and my proposed desired state.
Higher education institutions are essential to the facilitation of our knowledge capacity, social health, and ability to address current and future needs (MacKinnon, 2015). In its current state, even though the partnership is an exclusively international student institution, the support services, curriculum, and teaching practice, do not consider the international student’s experience, different way of learning, or culture. In my position of leadership influence as the professional development lead, my focus is to help improve teaching practice through professional development activities, but these activities are not mandated and compensation for attendance is not provided. To address the POP, and achieve my proposed desired state, I recommend that an organizational culture change strategy be used with a focus on professional development activities. A cultural component would be added to some of the professional development activities, and this change can be made within the scope of my role. I also propose that some of these professional development activities be extended to staff as well. As discussed in the Desired Organizational State section of this chapter, anticipated outcomes of this desired state would include: faculty and staff that are better equipped to work with international students, internationally-focused student services, and internationally-focused curriculum. The cultural element incorporated into the professional development activities will improve the partnership’s organizational culture (Cameron and Quinn, 2011) and demonstrate that the organizational culture has an awareness of and commitment to serving the international students.

**Priorities for Change and Construction of Envisioned Future State**

Foundational to a change process is a leadership vision for change, which requires an understanding of the current organizational context, and a well-developed plan to reach a desired state. Effective leaders prioritize micro and macro level change and recognize that individual transformation efforts impact the success of organization-wide change initiatives (Storberg-
Walker & Torraco, 2004). Time and compensation resources need to be invested for faculty and staff participation. Even though there is some influence in my role, we do not have a designated role with a function to champion/address international students’ success from a student-focus. My proposal focuses on faculty and staff professional development. However, students are the main stakeholders in internationalization and change efforts that affect them should include opportunities to engage them. After the change strategy is implemented and evaluated this may be an area to explore, and this would be beyond the work of this OIP.

In the partnership, I have observed student enrolment numbers continue to exceed faculty and staff capacity. There needs to be a balance between fast-paced growth with program quality efforts with the prioritization of allocated resources to address operations. Beck (2001) argues that senior leadership commitment should include policy statements and engagement of staff and faculty integrated into plans and budgets. Given that the partnership functions like an organized anarchy (as discussed earlier), a collaborative effort in leading this change strategy will be the most appropriate and effective. Additionally, the distributed leadership approach promotes individuals being actively involved and able to influence decisions (Youngs, 2017). According to Leemans (2017), in using this approach, organizations are also better able to adapt, respond to change, learn, and innovate. I believe this leadership approach is appropriate within my scope and solicits an environment of team values. Culture in an organization is about the shared values and beliefs of the group, to change the culture will require the collective contributions of the group (Schein & Schein, 2017).

To construct the desired state the recruitment process will include the exploration of previous experience with diverse populations and demonstration of cultural competencies. Orientation of new faculty and staff will include the organization’s commitment to understanding
how the cultures of its members impact the organization. The training programs will provide
information to improve knowledge, skills, and effect attitude changes. A self-awareness and the
awareness of others lens will be incorporated into coaching sessions. Classroom observation
indicators will assess how culture is acknowledged in the classroom, how cross-cultural
exchange is facilitated and how culture is incorporated into the curriculum. Furthermore, the
effectiveness of these activities would need to be evaluated; this will be discussed in Chapter 3.

**Organization Change Readiness**

**Strategies to Overcome Obstacles and Resistance to Change**

Change efforts in this OIP may fail, so to minimize that risk, it will be important to
understand the potential risks and identify strategies to overcome them. People tend to be
unaware of their organization’s culture until there is a change and the culture is challenged
(Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Major improvements will not be successful if there isn’t a
simultaneous modification to the organization’s culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Using
Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) OCAI will help to assess the organization’s readiness for change
by identifying the current culture, including the parts that people may not be aware of, or take for
granted, and articulating the culture state that is hoped for.

Because higher education institutions have multiple subcultures; it is necessary to
understand these subcultures and align them with the change processes (Storburg-Walker &
Torraco, 2004). However, missing from the private college and the public-private partnership, is
an organizational culture awareness or organizational structure to guide faculty and staff
behaviour. I believe a policy framework will help us overcome this organizational culture gap.
Policy directions can bind the organization to critical actions (Baldridge, 1983). Culture and
structure influence the progression or hindrance of change in an organization and therefore the organization’s culture needs to be aligned with the desired change (Smith, 2015a).

Today’s organizations have to manage environments of turbulence, complexity, and rapid change, so the competing values framework can be used to help develop desired leadership behaviours (Tong & Arvey, 2015). The competing values framework illustrates different types of organizational “values” that a leader can learn and use to “enlarge their repertoire of behaviours” (Tong & Arvey, 2015, p. 667). It can be used to manage the dichotomy of needing to lead with flexibility and creativity and promote order and control, in managing change (Kezar, 2014).

One of the biggest challenges to the change process is getting started. In the partnership, there are strong management, staff, and faculty who hold on to historical practices and block change efforts initiated by the innovators in the organization. It results in slow change. This is what Buller (2015) would call a battle between resistors and innovators/change agents. Busby (2015) argues that stakeholders need to be involved at the various stages of the change process to build ownership, support, and commitment to the implementation. It will be very important to ensure that resistors are engaged throughout the change process.

**Competing Internal and External Forces**

Higher education institutions like the public-private partnership are driven by internal and external change forces. According to Baldridge and Deal (1983) these forces include: accountability requirements, efficiency expectations, innovation opportunities and pressures, impacts of stakeholder relationships, the requirement to contribute to the good of society, and the responsibility of institutions to achieve outcomes of global impact. It will be important for the partnership’s leadership to be aware of the competing external and internal forces that influence change and impact the organization to respond, adapt, and plan for change (Busby, 2015).
While the partnership does not receive government funding, it is dependent on the priorities of the provincial government. In their last two years, the previous provincial government did not support this public-private college model, but the current government supports the entrepreneurial/privatization service model, which is a relief to the partnership’s leadership (J. Greyton, personal communication, June 8, 2018) (pseudonym). Dependent on the standing government and their priorities, this external driver can have both positive and negative impacts. However, the public college is the most influential external change driver with its quality oversight over the partnership’s curriculum, the public college is also very interested in how the private college conducts its operations. The public college conducts program audits of the curriculum delivery and assesses the maintenance of the facilities, staff and faculty hiring, and professional development. Performance concerns identified in the audits can be potential contract breaches, putting a risk on the continuation of the partnership.

The students are also influential internal drivers of change. They have been mobilizing to file complaints about perceived unfair or incompetent teaching practices, in the public-private partnership. The executive and administrative leadership responds almost immediately with corrective actions and plans; and rightfully so. There are other public-private partnerships, and the public college system in Ontario, which are competing for the same pool of international students, making competition an external driver. The students’ satisfaction identified through word-of-mouth and key performance indicators (Colleges Ontario, 2017) are important marketing tools. While soliciting student feedback is internally facilitated, it has an external reach that has a return-on-investment, resulting in driving the interest and enrolment of more potential students.
The partnership’s program advisory committees are both external and internal drivers. These committees are an internal structure in the partnership with (external) industry partners as members, in addition to faculty and administration. The committees provide a pulse on the industry’s changing needs and what the curriculum should include to meet those needs. The program advisory committees also a window into the validation of the investments various industry partners want to make to the public-private partnership. These program advisory committee roles are voluntary, so the time invested to participate also speaks to the credibility of the programs – industry partners are interested and engaged.

**Role of Stakeholders in Change Readiness**

There are several stakeholders of the partnership but the ones with a direct relationship to the POP include: faculty, staff, administration, leadership, and international students. While international students are the subject matter of the POP, I will focus on faculty, staff, and administration/leadership because they are the main players who will participate and contribute to the realization of the proposed solutions. The higher education institution’s faculty culture is prevalent, layered, and tenacious (Manning, 2018). Their buy-in to the change is critical. The distributed model can help to minimize the impact of resistance because the focus of the resistance can shift, and it can be shared among the team (Buller, 2015). There needs to be champions who can sell the change. This can be organized by having a change team with representation from across the different faculty and staff departments. According to Bacon (2016) the best leaders are “teachers, mentors, and role models -- and they accomplish the vast majority of their work through influence, not authority” (par. 3). We need to see more leadership from the team, with ideas and strategies emerging from faculty; in other words, we need champion faculty. Recognized by her peers, Joyce King, a faculty from the University of New
Orleans, builds awareness and challenges higher education power and culture related practices (Merryfield, 2000). She argues for the need to “validate and use the cultural knowledge and lived experiences of diverse people…to transform invisibilizing practices, curriculum, and research methods in education… rethinking the cultural model of being human that prevails in the US, the West and globally” (Merryfield, 2000, p. 435). This is an excellent example of distributed leadership, which would be the type of behaviour welcomed in my proposal to address this POP.

Leadership buy-in is also required because leaders set the tone for what is expected and desired in an organization (Schein & Schein, 2017). Leaders must visibly demonstrate their personal commitments to the culture change with their own personal change, and symbolically bury the past practice with an expressed optimism for the future state (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Leaders need to have the competencies and “capabilities for the future culture as well as for the existing culture” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 114). Personal development plans and efforts may be required. Leadership today, also requires a focus on collaboration, change management, and being able to promote diversity (Daft, 2015), all of which are required in this OIP.

**Conclusion**

This chapter introduced the POP, an organizational context, leadership perspective, and a discussion on change. In analysis, these details suggest that there is a relationship between organizational culture, structure, and leadership. There needs to be a focus on all three to address what is needed in the implementation of internationalization to ensure international students’ (learning) success. The next chapter will be an expansion of this chapter’s discussion on leadership and change. Also, included will be a critical analysis of the partnership organization and an identification of possible solutions to address the POP.
CHAPTER 2: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The first step in ensuring success of a plan is planning. Often missed in planning is how the efforts will be evaluated. This plan will include a logic model which will be discussed in chapter 3. Logic models are planning tools that can be used for monitoring and evaluation (Quality Improvement and Innovation Partnership, 2009). This chapter will discuss: (1) the leadership approaches to change, (2) a framework for change, (3) a critical organizational analysis, (4) possible solutions to address the problem of practice, and (5) leadership ethics and organizational change issues.

**Approaches to Change with Distributed Leadership**

According to Schein and Schein (2017) leadership is entrusted with the responsibility to lead, model, and guide organizational change through the development and maintenance of the organization’s values. The success of organizational change rests heavily on the leader’s ability to deeply understand and define the: proposed change, organization’s capacity to go through the change, the change benefits over the risks, and how the organization’s stakeholders will be supported through the change (Smith, 2015a). With the leadership model that I have selected for this OIP, leadership and all that it encompasses is shared.

While there are layers of decision making in higher education institutions, administrative authority is seen as *the authority* for decisions (Birnbaum, 1991). Siegel (2017) argues that some of the most remarkable things that happen in the academic organization occur by chance and spontaneously. In other words, administrative authority and decision-making sometimes has nothing to do with the innovation and success experienced in the institution. As discussed in Chapter 1, the distributed leadership is an approach that complements organized anarchy.
Leemans (2017) argues that the distributed leadership model is cost effective because controlling employees has financial costs and other associated burdens that cause “counterproductive effects” (p. 15). In distributed leadership, all individuals in an organization are actively engaged and able to influence decisions (Leemans, 2017). This suggests that engagement could lead to being more satisfied in the workplace. In order for this model to work, it requires a shared purpose, challenge and diversity must be welcomed, and mechanisms for collaboration should be part of the system (e.g., communities of practice) (Leemans, 2017).

Alternatively, Youngs (2017) provides a perspective on the distributed leadership model that acknowledges the momentum this leadership approach has been gaining in higher education, particularly in promoting collaboration between academics and administration. Youngs (2017) argues that the problem with this approach is that it falls short in providing what this collaboration should look like and how it would be practiced. Tensions of authority are challenges experienced when this model is used in higher education, however to address this tension, we need to redesign how we cluster and name the opposing groups coming together in “collaboration” (Youngs, 2017). And we need to focus on the practice of “leading”, rather than the role of a leader (Youngs, 2017).

Bolden (2011) reviewed the analysis of several theorists to which he found ambiguities in both the definition and use of the distributed leadership approach. He notes that this approach does not view leadership as attached to individuals or roles but at the same time, the literature he reviewed is unclear in explaining how this approach then fits with the ideology of leadership theories. Leadership as a distributed function, seems to ignore the leader/follower relationship that some argue is what defines leadership. Bolden (2011) further argues that even with these
limitations in the definition and description, there is a dominant usage in *school improvement and leadership development*. This usage is in line with the purposes of this OIP.

Twenty-first century higher education has shifted to a culture of individualism, competition, and promoting human commodity and marketable skills, with leadership that sustains this environment (Blackmore, 2013). According to Yuki and Mahsud (2010) it is challenging for leaders to operate within environments of competing values, but being flexible, and adapting behaviours that balance these dichotomies is the pathway towards effective leadership. “Success in adapting to external changes usually requires collective learning and collaboration by many members of the organization” (Yuki, 2009; Yuki & Mahsud, 2010, p. 86). Because senior leadership is usually at a distance from the day-to-day operation and may not readily see emerging threats and opportunities for the organization, bottom-up approaches are essential to fostering innovation and adaptive responses (Yuki, 2009).

In work environments, 80% of the work is done through teams (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015). Formal leaders account for only 20% of the success in organizations, while the other 80% comes from the informal leadership of the team (Schindler, 2015). Interestingly, the same skills and traits required in effective leaders are also required in effective followers (Schindler, 2015). It can be concluded that leadership and followership is a partnership and the distributed leadership approach demonstrates that relationship in its support of a shared leadership role. Additionally, how we define and enact leadership is changing, with a focus on people rather than position and title; anyone in the team can practice leadership behaviours (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015). At all levels throughout an organization, distributed leaders can help to design, develop, and sustain a strong culture of learning, experimentation, and continuous improvement (Yuki, 2009).
Because this organization operates like an organized anarchy (as discussed earlier), a collaborative effort in leading this change strategy will be the most effective. Robert McNeish’s *The Goose Story* (Widemark, 2009), is a poetically described illustration of the brilliant and caring team-leadership behaviours of geese as they travel in a “V” formation, with one goose leading at a time. When the goose that is leading in the front gets tired, she will move and then another goose will take her place (Noyes, 1992). Additionally, if a goose becomes injured and unable to fly, then another goose will stay with her until she heals or dies (Noyes, 1992).

This story is an illustration of my leadership values and my belief that leadership is in all of us. It also speaks to how the distributed leadership model can look. We each have the ability to support the team in its goals. In this goose story metaphor, the flying south goal is a commitment the geese share. The geese also care about each other, sharing the role of leading each other, recognizing when to step into a lead role. When a goose is in crisis, another one will take care of their team member while the journey to reach their goal continues, and then will reconnect with the team later (see Appendix D, for the story). Kouzes and Posner (2002) ask and answer a question that describes the commitment of exemplary leadership, “How do I lead during times of chaos and uncertainty? People first” (p. xviii). Fundamentally, people are at the core of great leadership. If leaders are focused on driving change, the attention needs to equally be directed on people, what their needs are, how they can be engaged, as well as awareness of potential impacts, and how to minimize any possible negative effects of the change.

The public-private partnership displays the leader-member exchange model (Northouse, 2016). While the label of “in-group” or “out-group” (Northouse, 2016) is not openly stated, quite real are the lived effects of these groupings (Bacchi, 2009). There is a high-functioning relationship between the leader and members of the “in-group” (Sonnentag & Pundt, 2016).
Team-leads by nature of their oversight of programs and teams, and their direct access to senior leadership make them part of the “in-group”, and contributors to some of the decision-making. In contrast, my leadership approach values collaboration and caring. I have a philosophy which I have named the organizational team. It includes every staff, at all levels, in each department all being considered as part of the same team. I am interested in who staff are, and what they need to be able to contribute to our organization being the best that it can be. Being a team and collaborating can be our competitive advantage, and our competitive advantage equips us to be better equipped to respond to change.

There is also a downside to the team/collaborative approach. According to Buller (2015) many of the policies in distributed organizations are developed by the staff. When there is a need for change, staff take it personally, believing that the change is a reflection on something they did wrong in the initial design of the guideline procedures. Their self-image and holding on to maintain the status quo, is tied to their identities and their sense of competence (Buller, 2015). The dichotomy of distributed leadership is that it is a “complex, multifaceted process that must focus on the development of individuals as well as the organisational contexts in which they are called to operate” (Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, & Ryland, 2012, p. 68). What this says is that the distributed leadership approach, recognizes that collaborative leadership requires the development of individuals, the group, and an understanding of the organization’s culture. This recognition mitigates the downside of the approach, particularly in this OIP, which focuses on a professional development related change strategy (e.g., offering opportunities for skill development through sensemaking and self-reflection).

Traditional change management approaches, designed for military and corporate environments, do not work in higher education institutions because of the distributed nature of
the organization (Buller, 2015). Distributed leadership is a key element in the change management success of my OIP. In changing culture, it requires the participation and buy-in of the team, which is what the distributed leadership approach embodies (Gronn, 2010). However, I do agree with Buller (2015) in that change management in higher education must be done in a way that is aligned with the organizational culture of the institution. Buller (2015) believes that higher education institutions have distributed organizational cultures and that change processes that are more readily embraced by stakeholders are based on a how relevant the change appears to them. In other words, change managers need to also find the “what’s in it for me” criteria for stakeholders to facilitate their buy-in (Napier, Amborski, & Pesek, 2017). Providing more opportunities for employees’ participation in decision-making will lead to “higher staff satisfaction, but will also lead to increases in productivity and performance” (Sergiu, 2015, p. 42). Certain organizational cultures may also be associated with better workplace performance and higher staff satisfaction (Berrio, 2003).

**Framework for Leading the Change Process**

**Culture and Organizational Change**

Culture as commonly known, is somewhat intangible so the idea of it being the focus of my OIP was met with words of caution from my colleagues and advisors. That inspired me even more to forge ahead in addressing an issue that needs attention, *the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution.* Starting this dialogue requires an understanding of what culture is. Schein (2010) defines it as:

> Culture is an abstraction, yet the forces that are created in social and organizational situations deriving from culture are powerful… Cultural forces are powerful because they operate outside of our awareness. We need to understand them not only because of their power but also because they help to explain many of our puzzling and frustrating experiences in social and organizational life. (p. 7)
As described by Schein and Schein (2017) culture is a powerful force in organizations, but because we are often unaware of this invisible force, we don’t think about it as an important element in the success of change. This lack of awareness make it even more critical for organizational culture to be addressed.

Deep level change is needed in higher education institutions. This is especially relevant in consideration of internationalization and where it is implemented, how it is implemented, the stakeholders involved in the implementation, anyone who may be impacted - as well as understanding who the students are, what they need, and how the institution may be able to respond in addressing student needs. However, even when improvement investments have been made, there has been little success in the altering of entrenched structures, values, and practices of community colleges (Levin, 2017). According to Kezar (2014) deep level change is challenging to achieve and is rarely done. Levin (2017) further argues that organizational members hold on tightly to the organization’s values and practices with the preference of maintaining the status quo.

Assessing Organizational Culture

The emphasis of this OIP is on organizational culture. The competing values framework provides a framework to learn about and reveal an organization’s culture, which can also assist in informing future cultural change (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). A critical element in facilitating the learning of an organization’s culture is leadership. Leaders leverage their role to introduce and provide expectations of new behaviours or to stop what is no longer valued (Schein & Schein, 2017). Also, there are two organizational factors that influence change, and they are culture and structure, which is why organizational culture and the desired change need to be aligned (Smith,
The organizational culture focus of this OIP has two priorities: (1) understanding the organization’s culture and, (2) changing the organization’s culture to be culturally competent.

One of the biggest challenges to the change process is simply just getting started. If some resistant members in the organization hold on to historical practices and block change efforts initiated by the innovators who promote and create change in the organization, the battle between them will result in the slow movement of change (Buller, 2015). Change that is initiated by the governing office or administrative leadership and is resisted by faculty and staff, requires careful planning (Buller, 2015). Stakeholders need to be involved in the various stages of the change process to foster interest, support, and commitment to the implementation (Busby, 2015). It will be very important for leaders to ensure that resistors are engaged throughout the change process. In particular, the collegial culture has been found to be better equipped to enable organizational change because there is great degree of trust (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). This is even more possible with a distributed leadership approach, with the collective input of the group (Bolden, 2011; Gronn, 2010; Leemans, 2017).

According to Schein and Schein (2017) a dangerous assumption in culture-change programs is “to assume that strategy and the external adaptation issues are somehow separate from culture and to focus the desired culture changes just on the internal mechanisms by which a group makes life pleasant for itself” (p. 8). However, while acknowledging the environment of the impacts of globalization and internationalization, the focus of this OIP is also on internal mechanisms in addressing culture change, through the specific areas identified for a desired future state (solutions to address the POP).

Prior to implementing the culture change strategies it will require exploring the organization’s culture. Organizations are ambiguous, complex, and unpredictable, “it is hard to
get the facts and even harder to know what they mean or what to do about them” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 32). Smircich (1983) argues that “we are our own culture” (p. 355) therefore, applying a cultural perspective to organizational analysis can be difficult for the organization’s members. Even though it is difficult to be reflective and critical of one’s assumptions, values, and critique the organizational context, Smircich (1983) suggests that is exactly what a cultural perspective requires. The professional development activities used in this OIP enable faculty and staff development through training and self-reflection.

In addition to that, readiness for culture change may be a challenge. Examination of the organization’s culture may be a delicate issue to explore and confront. It requires an examination of the culture where it is most visible at the artifacts level, where there are espoused beliefs and values, and where there are deep-rooted underlying assumptions - which usually requires more effort and skill to be able to reveal, and therefore address (Schein & Schein, 2017). Even further, Smircich (1983) suggests that to understand an organization requires an understanding of its culture as a critical variable and metaphor. Because higher education institutions have multiple subcultures; it is necessary to understand these subcultures and align them with the change processes (Storburg-Walker & Torraco, 2004).

Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values framework provides a mechanism to understand the many cultures that may exist in an organization. There are four values quadrants in this competing values framework described as follows:

- clan/collaborate (friendly, teamwork, consensus, and flexibility focused);
- adhocracy/create (entrepreneurial, experimentation, and innovation focused);
- hierarchy/control (formalized, structured, stable, predictable, and efficiency minded);

and
market/compete (goal-oriented, competitive, and results-oriented) cultures (Cameron and Quinn, 2011) illustration of the competing values framework quadrants).

Although there is usually only one dominant value at a time, there can still be more than one value present in the organization. Ideally, the values and the leadership style will be aligned but Quinn (1988) argues that the most effect organizations have leaders that have competencies from all four of the values quadrants. Leadership today requires the ability to be culturally adaptable. This ability is congruent with the distributed leadership approach which Youngs (2017) describes as a practice of leading. The ability to be culturally adaptable can suggest a learning journey which is also what the distributed leadership approach stands for, leadership as a developmental process (Bolden, 2011).

This framework also includes an organizational culture assessment instrument (OCAI) that can reveal cultural aspects in the organization that may not be easily identified or acknowledged. The assessment instrument also helps to identify where the organizational culture is currently and a possible desired state (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Although the OCAI is a westernized developed instrument, proposed to be used in an internationalization environment, the cultural context being assessed with this instrument is not about the cultural competency of the organization. Instead, the assessment is looking at the culture of the organization in being able to address the professional development cultural competency goal. Using the OCAI will help to inform how to successfully implement change in the organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). The instrument includes a series of six criteria that the responder answers based on the current experience in the organization, and then rates the organization again based on what would be a desired alternative if it were five years from now. Each criteria offers four options to rate. Since the instrument is dependent on the rating/responses of the responder, it is important to
note that the responder’s bias, emotions, and situational context may contribute to how the ratings are completed. This may be considered a limitation in the instrument’s use. However, much of the research conducted in medicine, which informs many of our health care solutions, comes from data collected through participant self-assessments (Baldwin, 2000).

**The OCAI Experience in a University**

The Ohio State University Extension (OSUE) used the OCAI to assess their culture. In their assessment of the overall organizational culture, they found that the clan culture is preferred by their institution. This is usually the preferred and perceived as the most effective type for higher education organizations (Berrio, 2003). The clan culture is associated with collaboration, teamwork, consensus, friendliness and is flexibility-focused (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This culture type is very similar to the distributed leadership approach as well.

Also revealed in the study was that OSUE’s dominant organizational leadership style was more of a hierarchical type, and this is not aligned with the characteristics of the clan culture (Berrio, 2003). The hierarchy style is associated with control, structure, stability, predictability, and efficiency (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). This style is the oldest and most pervasive organizational approach (Quinn, 1988). Given the decades of history that higher education institutions hold, it is no wonder that this approach is present in this institution. This is also similar to what I discussed earlier in that even when the distributed leadership approach is used in higher education, there is still a tension of authority between faculty and administration (Youngs, 2017). While the clan and hierarchy coexist in the OSUE, the clan is the dominant type currently identified and indicated as the desired cultural state (Berrio, 2003). This illustrates Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) argument that even with more than one cultural value, there is usually just one that is dominant.
In assessing OSUE’s *strategic emphases*, the adhocracy values type was also found in the current culture and the desired state (Berrio, 2003). This values type is characterized as entrepreneurial, experimentation, and innovation focused. This values type is also different to the clan culture type, but, the differences were statistically minimal in the assessment of the OSUE, which is why there was still the dominance of the clan culture in the university. Given the formidable force of the professoriate in higher education, the dominance of the clan culture is not surprising.

**An Understanding of Current and Desired State**

For the purposes of this OIP, understanding the current culture state, using the competing values framework instrument, will be complemented with the solutions that I recommend, to address the POP. The solutions themselves will have an impact on the future culture state.

Heritage, Pollack, and Roberts (2014) studied the OCAI and found limits in its ability to assess current versus ideal cultural state. While effective in identifying the current state, it was not as successful in its validation of the ideal state. However, Cameron and Quinn (2011) argue that their OCAI is able to identify both current and desired future state, based on the ratings completed by the organization’s members in the current (now) state, followed by their completion of the same survey based on their desired (preferred) state. Additionally, Heritage, Pollack, and Roberts (2014) caution that the validity of the instrument’s findings should be tested using multiple data perspectives (i.e., faculty, staff, and leadership). It appears that there may be a tendency to be homogenous in the use of the instrument, testing only one group in a study, for example only faculty.

Using a dialectical view, the creation and shaping of institutional structures are developed by the social constructs of constant encounters and confrontations of people with each other,
forming a social world that is continuously being modified while still maintaining a prevailing social structure (Alvesson, 1985; Benson 1977). However, some parts of the social construction end up beyond rational control and outside of the ability of leaders to control the process (Alvesson, 1985). Recognizing social constructions as “complex interrelated wholes with partially autonomous parts” (Benson, 1977, p. 4) requires an analysis that also looks at divergent, dominant structures and varying levels of structures. It is assumed that there are multiple realities in an organized anarchy, and regardless of the role or position, a full understanding of the many realities cannot be found in any one person or a single group (Manning, 2018). There’s an argument that decision-making is based on irrational and random selection of recycled choices in the organized anarchy (Sherman, 2019). This implies that innovation and intentional assessment of situations would be absent. However, this irrational decision-making means thinking outside the box, and the status quo. Sometimes organizational members “need ways of doing things for which they have no good reason” (Cohen & March, 1983, p. 358). Accordingly, innovation in the higher education institution can benefit from a healthy dose of anarchy (Siegel, 2017).

Amis, Slack, and Hinings (2002) studied how held organizational values contribute to an organization’s ability to move through change. They found that when there is a difference between the dominant group (usually those in power) and the rest of the organization’s values, when change is implemented, it will be resisted or accepted at a superficial level. What this suggests is that the organizational culture/values need to be aligned with the change (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002). An understanding of the organization’s culture is required. Therefore, in examining the culture of this organization, it will assist in revealing what needs to also be considered in implementing the desired changes.
Approach for Leading Change in Relation to the POP

The lens used for this OIP is situated in a leader whose role has influence because of relationships with faculty and staff rather than an authority oversight of them. As such, leadership collaboration will be instrumental in the planning and organizing for this change. Collaboration can build transparency and trust which can also be effective in mobilizing and motivating teams. Faculty and staff development are extremely important to building new competencies and capacities to fulfil change plans - especially, internally designed and facilitated training programs (Kezar & Ecker, 2002). Bottom-up initiatives can be the most effective change efforts in organizations (Kezar, 2014), especially within a distributed leadership environment. As a model, the distributed approach offers emergent, integrated, intuitive, and collaborative group interactions (Bolden, 2011; Gronn, 2010). The distributed leadership approach also enables the environment to be one of trust, creating “the cultural soil for challenge, feedback and therefore creativity and innovation” (Leemans, 2017, p. 15). People also value the learning that they get from their peers (Kezar & Ecker, 2002). Collectively, through their shared learning, they can influence their sensemaking as well (Ericson, 2001). To further enhance the sensemaking, reflective practice will be an important component to the change process. From a distributed leadership approach, everyone’s commitment to reflective practice will be necessary. “You can’t change an organization without being changed yourself” (Buller, 2015, p. 90).

Critical Organizational Analysis

Change is necessary for survival (Smith, 2015a). A new challenge for higher education today is achieving internationalization, but structures in higher education institutions may be impeding internationalization, and the necessary changes. According to Poole (2016), it may not be possible to reform higher education institutions without a transformational change in the
bureaucracy and ideology, administrative systems, and the institution’s identity. The loyal bureaucrat is devoted to the bureaucracy that embodies a system of rules with a strongly held belief that these rules are consistently applied, effective, and ensures efficiency (Poole, 2016). For this reason, Napier et al. (2017) call the loyal bureaucrats “process historians”. In contrast, the reality of higher education institutions as an organized anarchy is an ambiguity of the true power of the organization’s president resulting in “ambiguity of power [that] leads to a parallel ambiguity of responsibility” (Cohen & March, 1983, p. 336). Youngs (2017) challenges us to rethink our understanding of organizations as hierarchies and fixed constructs into spaces of ongoing shaping, continuous development, and practice.

Lacking is the adequate preparation, training, experience and competencies of faculty to teach in a globalized context (Alfaro, 2008; Merryfield, 1991). Furthermore, Kozleski and Waitoller (2010) argue that when faculty are able to reflect on the context of their cultural identities and experiences, it will enable them to be sensitive, aware, and more responsive to a culturally diverse student group. The authors further contend that this reflective practice is a best-evidence solution in addressing cultural competence of faculty. Similarly, Anderson (2015) argues that instructors should continually reflect on their own practices and commit to accessing more effective feedback strategies that include the voice of the students who need to be heard the most. Given the realities of our 21st century global society, faculty training is limited in its focus on how to teach rather than on the context of teaching and learning in a cultural context (Kozleski & Waitoller, 2010).

Why is a globally-diverse intended higher education system lacking the policies on how to teach diverse students? As discussed in Chapter 1, the provincial and federal internationalization strategies lack directions of how to implement internationalization in an
accountable and ethical way. There is no framework for implementation. The strategies also lack the directions on expected outcomes, what to measure, and how to evaluate the effectiveness of achieving internationalization goals. These same absent directions are experienced at the organizational level, so organizational policy directions will also be helpful in guiding internationalization activities.

According to Yeh (2016) remnants of colonialism still pervade our education systems and institutions, driving knowledge and compliance to a dominant culture and ensuring “social order”. Bacchi (2009) describes this dichotomy as “a desire to ‘liberate’ political subjects and an imperative to produce them as well-behaved citizens” (p. 227). This is probably a difficult perspective to apply to the organizational analysis. Being in the 21st century, it is hard to believe that the structures of colonialism could be lived effects today, so, confronting this perspective will be even more important, given the international student context. A cultural competency lens can assist in addressing this.

Is the organization ready for change? This question should be asked, and an assessment should be conducted to help in providing an answer. Cameron and Quinn (2011) argue that their competing values framework can assist in identifying whether the organization is ready for change through an analysis of the current culture. Notably, pitfalls in change processes are often due to cultural misunderstandings (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). Furthermore, Smith (2015a) argues that the more adequately that people in an organization can be prepared, the more likely the success a change effort will be. The values in an organization can be seen and felt in the systems and structures (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002). Which means, any change to a system and structure, requires change to the values and organizational culture. Fundamentally, organizations and change are about people; successful organizational change requires engaging and equipping
people with the motivation for the change to work (Busby, 2015). People need to see that the cost of changing is worth it, particularly for them (Busby, 2015).

Additionally, change and learning are very closely linked together (Smith, 2015b). Learning involves unlearning old ways of thinking and behaving to make way for new learning (Smith, 2015b). Buller (2015) agrees with Schein’s (2010) idea that organizations that adopt a learning culture are more readily able to accept change. Since the desired organization state will require the learning of new behaviours to influence the organizational culture change, preparing for how people learn should also be a consideration in the culture change strategy. Even though external pressures or influences may drive a change, it is the internal context of the organization that will decide how the change will manifest (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002). Higher education institutions rooted in European and Anglo-Saxon models have deeply entrenched collegial traditions that define the processes, policies, and procedures (Austin & James, 2016). Buller (2015) argues that this is even further challenged in that the managed and the management are the same in the distributed leadership organization. For this reason, even simple modifications to the practices can be viewed as an affront to the organizational culture and the values held most dear.

When using the OCAI, Cameron and Quinn (2011) list nine steps that organizations can take to initiate a change which include: (1) agree on identified current culture state, (2) agree on identified desired culture state, (3) decide on the meaning of the change, (4) use storytelling to illustrate the desired culture state, (5) develop a strategic action plan of what things are changing and how, (6) identify immediate/short-term wins (celebrate if possible), (7) identify leadership implications, (8) identify indicators of success, and (9) develop a communication strategy.
According to these authors, these steps should be done collaboratively. The change team can conduct steps 1 and 2 through the assessments of the completed OCAI that the organization’s members complete. Steps 3 and 4 can be done collaboratively with faculty and staff through the professional development activities (e.g., facilitated training sessions discussions). Steps 5, 6, and 8 are outlined in the outcomes listed in the logic model. In Chapter 3, Step 7 is articulated in the leadership development discussion and Step 9 is also acknowledged in the awareness of the need for change. This collaboration emphasis aligns with the distributed leadership approach of this OIP and demonstrates how the theoretical approaches work in tandem.

In comparison, Napier et al. (2017) identify that effective change management includes the following components:

- Assessing the organisation and its leadership’s capability for change;
- Identifying any risks and concerns related to people;
- Ensuring the stakeholders buy-in for the changes;
- Addressing organisational cultural issues that may impact the change success;
- Developing targeted communication strategies;
- Making available the needed training and development opportunities and support; and
- Establishing guidelines and expectations for individual behaviour in response to the current change and future changes.

Testing this OIP’s culture change plan against another change management model would provide credibility for the plan. In demonstrating as such, this OIP’s change plan addresses all of the steps identified in the Napier et al. (2017) recommendations, making it positioned for success (see Appendix F, in how this OIP’s change plan aligns with the Napier et al. (2017)
components). In addition to these steps, organizational contexts and cultures need to be flexible enough to adapt and embrace new ideas and strategies (Kuppler, 2014).

**Possible Solutions to Address POP**

In response to the POP which is the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution, I propose implementing a culture change strategy in the institution. Many higher education organizations in Canada are prioritizing internationalization in their planning, structures, and program offerings (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2014). However, structuring internationalization as an organizational culture strategy may not be a specific goal. The benefits of a relevant organizational culture could potentially create a reputation for the institution as an institute of choice for prospective international students. Organizational culture can be assessed through the policies, practices, curriculum, and student supports (Nichols, 2013). As such, under my proposed culture change strategy, I also recommend three solutions. These include: developing culturally competent faculty and staff, enhancing student services to include an international student focus, and a commitment to enhancing the curriculum to also include an international focus. These solutions have been identified as being within the scope of the distributed leadership approach. They require the engagement of faculty and staff with the support of the executive and administrative leadership in designing enhanced teaching and learning environments which the distributed leadership approach enables (Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, & Ryland, 2012). In Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, and Ryland’s (2012) study, they found that making organizational improvements and building faculty and staff capacity could be done with the distributed leadership approach which utilized professional development through shared learning, reflective practice, and trust and relationships to change values, skills, and behaviours.
Developing Culturally Competent Staff

The first solution, is to develop culturally competent faculty and staff that are aware of self and others, sensitive, knowledgeable, and skilled to work with diverse students. Education is “the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world” Nelson Mandela (Strauss, 2013, para. 1). In internationalization, faculty are mediators of the sociocultural classroom environment, entrusted to facilitate the classroom is a cultural space (Kozleski & Waitoller, 2010). Even further, the practice of teaching needs to be recognized as a “cultural practice” that involves the commitment of faculty, staff, and leadership, working collaboratively to transform teaching and learning for the 21st century (Kozleski & Waitoller, 2010). Culturally competent faculty and staff can help to facilitate international students having strong connections to both their home and the abroad cultures, resulting in a greater experience and success in the new environment (Nicols, 2013). Globalization has already set the stage for a world-community, in which individuals, communities, countries, and institutions operate in cultural coexistence. Beyond just coexisting, there should also be cultural competency enacted in the interactions between the players. Nieto and Booth (2010) argue that globalization has increasingly made it essential for any professional to be culturally competent. For this OIP, this would include the faculty and staff.

However, one of the challenges in cultural competency is in its ambiguous definition, in that it cannot be defined in simple terms (Cai, 2016). However, the description of cultural competency as a continuum of six stages provides a clear understanding of what it is as a journey. The six stages include: (1) cultural destructiveness, (2) cultural incapacity, (3) cultural blindness, (4) cultural pre-competence, (5) basic cultural competence, and (6) cultural proficiency (Cross et al., 1989). With a developmental goal of positive movement through this
continuum, organizations can be in a space of negativity towards others, promoting exclusion and cultural genocide to executing intentional actions to break cultural *incompetency* barriers, embracing differences, and understanding the role of oneself in the cultural discourse (see Appendix E, for the cultural competency continuum details). Cross et al. (1989) when they introduced the cultural competence continuum argued that a culturally competent system would include: (1) a value of diversity, (2) the capacity to conduct cultural self-assessments, (3) a consciousness of the inherent dynamics when cultures interact, (4) have cultural knowledge institutionalized in the organization, and (5) have the capacity to make adaptations to diversity. All of this would also include corresponding attitudes, policies, and practices throughout all levels in the organization. Even more important, is the understanding that achieving cultural competency is a life-long journey of learning (Cai, 2016). This requires a life-long organizational commitment.

**Internationally-focused Student Services**

The second solution is to provide internationally-focused student services, recognizing that mainstream student services can be enhanced to better meet the needs of international students, and responsive to the context of their experiences, issues, and challenges. According to Maringe et al. (2013) there is a discrepancy in the goal for cultural integration in higher education with what may be more of cultural domination. Without an articulated or acknowledged cultural-embracing organizational position, international students risk experiencing acculturation in which their culture becomes silenced to the expectations of conforming to the culture of the dominant society of the institution.

Bacchi (2009) argues that the silencing of one group at the expense of another speaks to a binary relationship for example powerful/disadvantaged, or domestic student/international
student, or mainstream-dominant culture/international. This silencing also perpetuates the power structures that make up our society, which also influence how internationalization is enacted. According to Beck (2012) internationalization has become entrepreneurial and market-oriented focused with student learning success processes absent from the discourse. Higher education personnel need to be conscious of the impacts of acculturation in their interactions with students from diverse cultural groups (Arthur & Stewart, 2001).

Figure 3

*The Cultural Competency Continuum*

![The Cultural Competency Continuum](image)

*Note:* Cross, Bazron, Dennis, and Isaacs (1989) cultural competency continuum was developed for the context of establishing a culturally competent system of care for minority children with mental health. It provides a staged approach with the understanding that achieving cultural competence is a developmental journey which is a good fit with an educational environment – a focus on learning and developing.

Student services can be a potential welcoming centre for international students. Its role is to facilitate, and support students in their transition through their higher education institution experience. However, when student services are mainstream, in an international student environment, it communicates the message that the expectation is that students will adjust to the mainstream culture of the college and the country. Understanding the impact of culture on behaviour and learning will better inform the design of student services and how students are supported (Arthur and Stewart, 2001).
Commitment to an Internationally-focused Curriculum

The third solution is a commitment to having internationally-focused curriculum. A global perspective pedagogy is missing from the internationalization discourse (Alfaro, 2008; Kozleski, & Waitoller, 2010; Merryfield, 1991; Merryfield, 2000;). The curriculum does not acknowledge the cultural diversity of each student nor does it help students to locate themselves in their international education experience in the institution. To address this would mean that the diverse classroom is acknowledged, and the focus is on the global marketplace where understanding cultures and being able to work in diverse environments (or with diverse populations) is incorporated into the subject-matter of what is taught. In that, the courses taught, the way they are taught, and the course content is shaped by cultural competency. Faculty are essential to the implementation of effective internationalization, not only in their teaching practice but also in the material they develop for the classroom (Criswell, 2014). Lie (2009) argues for creativity in 21st century curriculum and that this can be achieved through partnering opportunities between faculty and culturally diverse students in curriculum design.

According to Maringe et al. (2013) globalization “tends to seek cultural, social, political and technological homogeneity as a model for integration” (p. 13). Instead of learning that encompasses a “global culture”, international students take on the new cultural environment of their abroad learning experience. Diversity is lost in this idea of a homogenous global community. Adopting new cultural norms in a new environment is valuable, but in a global community context, it should also mean a sharing of cultures and mutual learning. The priority of learning diversity, understanding diverse communities, and knowing how to function in diversity are critical skills for a global community.
Students are expecting more from their international learning experiences. In Nieto and Booth’s (2010) study, international students perception of what they would learn in their North American learning environments included comments like: “an educator is meant to teach students from a universal viewpoint and not from a limited viewpoint that has not been expanded beyond one country” and “teachers should be trained on different cultures and have a more broad perspective about international students’ cultures” (p. 417). Therefore, this commitment to internationally-focused curriculum is about faculty being willing, skilled, and committed to this solution.

As such, my recommendation is that all three solutions would be implemented to achieve an organizational culture change that would address the POP. Although any of the three recommendations could stand alone. For the deep level impact and organizational culture change, the three should be implemented in tandem. Some of the objectives of the culture change strategy will be that:

- Faculty and staff have an increased awareness of culture (self and of others);
- Faculty and staff have increased knowledge and skills in working with diverse cultures;
- Faculty and staff have an improved attitude towards other cultures (identified through self-reflection);
- Faculty are able to apply their cultural diversity knowledge and skills into the curriculum of the subject-matter that they teach;
- Students feel culturally represented in the design of the curriculum;
- Students feel culturally valued in their experiences in the institution;
• Students have cultural knowledge skills to prepare them for diverse environments; and

• Internationalization is experienced at the faculty, staff, and student levels in the classroom, services, and learning contexts.

To demonstrate the success in achieving these objectives, it will require an evaluation framework. The evaluation design will be discussed in Chapter 3 and framed in a *logic model* (see Appendix C) as a quality improvement effort.

**Outlining Resource Needs**

Additional financial resources may not be required in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the culture change strategy (within the administration of the organizational culture assessment), as these activities will be facilitated within my leadership role, as professional development lead. The major investment required is staff time, of not only my time, but the time of faculty and staff, in the development and implementation of the strategy, and evaluation.

In the actualization of the three proposed solutions it will require financial considerations. Firstly, to develop culturally competent faculty and staff, through the professional development activities, it will require compensation for some of the faculty who are contracted and only paid for their teaching time. Their participation will require executive leadership commitment for the costs, especially if the decision is to make the professional development participation mandatory. Curriculum development also comes with a compensation cost. This is critical because the curriculum would be owned by the institution and not the contracted faculty. This may not need to be considered within the limited six-months timeframe of this OIP, but would beyond.
Because the faculty are predominantly contracted, non-teaching hours will need to be compensated. The least amount of effort, time, and resources extended would ultimately help in decreasing implementation costs for the change. However, since the public-private partnership is a business, enhancing the bottom-line is a priority and a selling point for the buy-in to invest in the training time of the faculty. Organizations that focus on their human capital, prioritizing relationships, valuing their employees, creating cultures that allow people to express themselves, and be creative, know that this all leads to a benefit to their financial bottom line (Lewin and Regine, 2000). A focus on people, and in particular, professionally developing people, is good for business. Given the for-profit nature of the public-private partnership, that focus would undoubtedly help in increasing profits.

Staff will also have access to the professional development. Because I do not work in the student services department, it may be useful for an additional lens on the skills development of the staff. In Chapter 1, I briefly discussed the absence of an international student services structure which could include designated leadership focused on international students’ success. Since this dedicated role does not exist currently, should it be considered, it would also be an additional cost to the organization. Consequently, it would demonstrate a deep commitment to internationalization and student success in the institution.

**Ethical Considerations and Organizational Change Issues**

Internationalization cannot just be about the economic advantages. According to Ricketts and Humphries (2015) an ethical approach to internationalization is needed which involves focusing on student success and increasing awareness and understanding of diversity. How we define student success must also be based on what students identify as meaningful to them. Performance metrics identified in the Maclean’s ranking reports or in the college key
performance indicators (Colleges Ontario, 2017) provide some indication of how the public-private partnership has succeeded in its program delivery (e.g., number of students who completed the program), but missing from this is the objectives of internationalization as described in the federal and provincial strategies (as discussed in Chapter 1).

Canada’s higher education institutions have an ethical responsibility to improve their organizations so that they can be the best that they can be (MacKinnon, 2014). We have a moral responsibility in meeting the internationalization goals of how we are preparing students, what they are being equipped to accomplished, particularly in building new understandings and skills to succeed in 21st century society. Additionally, Ontario’s vision for postsecondary education describes its commitment to students first as follows:

Ontario’s colleges and universities will drive creativity, innovation, knowledge, skills development and community engagement through teaching and learning, applied research and service. Ontario’s colleges and universities will put students first by providing the best possible learning experience for all qualified learners in an affordable and financially sustainable way, ensuring high quality and globally competitive outcomes for students and Ontario’s economy.” (Ontario Government, 2013, p. 7)

Ethical leadership requires a recognition of the unequal structures of power and a commitment to engaging with all, especially informal leaders (Liu, 2015). Leadership is relational in the ways people connect, engage, interact, and cooperate with each other (Liu, 2015). Ethical leadership emerges from the dynamic interplay between leaders and followers in negotiating moral meaning-making (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Liu, 2015). Ethical leadership also exists as a response to the evolving needs and interpretations of situations and behaviours displayed in an organization by its members (Liu, 2015). This means that ethical leadership contributes to the culture of an organization in the same way that it is an output of the cultural environment. The distributed leadership approach will be even more important in this change, facilitating the voice of stakeholders (faculty, staff, and even students).
In the 19th century, education institutions were viewed as a public good, with a symbolic role (Baldridge and Deal, 1983). However, our historical perspective of the education institutions has failed to include an understanding of economic forces and other external factors that contribute to the social and cultural contexts of these establishments (Cohen & Rosenberg, 1983). “The very characteristics that many reformers have tried to change – poorly managed instruction, diffuse goals, and loose controls – are seen as strengths that enable schools to survive in a difficult and ambiguous environment” (Baldridge & Deal, 1983, p. 369). Leadership ethics plays a role. In the organized anarchy, the individual aspirations, interests, and preferences of leaders all contribute to what changes take place in an institution and how those changes progress (Davis & Stackhouse, 1983).

Inherent in the faculty profession is a tradition of having a great deal of autonomy. Faculty generally have independence in how their courses are taught, what is taught, and contribute to the policies and standards that govern their working conditions (Buller, 2015). With the increase in a part-time and contracted faculty workforce, particularly as the main structure in the public-private partnership, there is a decrease in academic participation and decision-making opportunities (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Decreased opportunities for collaboration do not mean the desire is no longer part of the values in the institution.

It is rare to see cultural perspectives applied to higher education change processes and governance (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). This is not surprising. There are inherent risks in deciphering culture that should be assessed before proceeding, and they are often subtle and unknown (Schein & Schein, 2017). Change goals should be clearly defined before a cultural assessment is implemented to determine what role culture will play in progressing or hindering the change process (Schein & Schein, 2017). The impact of intrusion, in examining a culture, is an ethical
consideration. According to Lewin (1947, as cited in, Schein & Schein, 2017) studying a culture “makes explicit two fundamental assumptions: (1) it is not possible to study a human system without intervening in it, and (2) we can fully understand a human system only by trying to change it” (p. 262). The competing values framework, while a culture examination tool, it can be used to minimize these risks. The change process using the competing values framework is discussed in Chapter 3.

Another ethical consideration for leadership is the calculated risk in undergoing an organizational culture assessment. Is it worth the risk? What happens when the risks materialize? Schein and Schein (2017) caution that organizations can become vulnerable if an assessment is revealed to outsiders. Additionally, an assessment may not be done correctly, and the organization may not be ready for what is revealed about their culture (Schein & Schein, 2017). Organizations may have several subcultures, making it probably impossible to capture the full picture of a culture, but it is having this diversity of cultures that increases the organization’s adaptive capacity (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein & Schein, 2017).

As an innovation commitment, Canada is committed to enhancing its higher education institutions’ systems, practices, and abilities to meet the needs of its constituents (MacKinnon, 2015). If our country is prioritizing internationalization, then our innovation should also include developing educational environments that foster learning synergies between international and domestic students. This extends beyond innovation to an ethical commitment. It requires efforts to elevate the human capital potential of international students beyond just studying on our local soil, but to enhance international students experience and learning so that we can positively contribute to the construct of our social values and ideals in a globalized society.
Conclusion

This chapter provided an argument that higher education institutions are complex, and particularly in the example of this new public-private partnership model, requiring flexibility in organizational approaches and leadership. The organized anarchy theory and distributed leadership model complement each other in their similar abilities to foster fluid structures that empower voices throughout the organization. The goals of this OIP are to achieve internationalization and student success, which may be possible through the recommendations of having the right combination of leadership, change framework, and organizational culture. As illustrated in this chapter, there is an opportunity to plan for making improvements to the implementation of internationalization in a higher education institution, modelling an approach of collective leadership, and implementing solutions in a cultural change strategy, through an organizational analysis and an ethical lens.
CHAPTER 3: IMPLEMENTATION, EVALUATION, AND COMMUNICATION

The Change Implementation Plan

The recommendation regarding the organization in this OIP is for it to undergo a change plan with the goal that the organization develop a cultural competency culture. Cross et al. (1989) describe their cultural competence continuum which can be a goal for professionals, organizations, and systems to strive towards (see Appendix E, illustrating the continuum). Cross et al (1989) describe the characteristics of organizations that are culturally competent in this continuum as:

- Accepting and respecting differences by continually assessing their organization’s culture, continually adapting and making improvements, and expanding their knowledge and resources to better meet the needs of communities;
- Seeing minority groups as distinctly different and recognizing that communities are the experts of what they need and how they define themselves; and
- Helping staff to develop skills to work cross-culturally.

Based on the continuum, this OIP is striving for the cultural competence achievement, it will be demonstrated through short-term and long-term outcomes. The strength of the Cross et al. (1989) definition is that it acknowledges what it is, what it should look like, the responsibility of the organization, and how it would be experienced by stakeholders. The definition is wholistic, just like the expectations in how it should be lived. Furthermore, developing cultural competency requires training, practice, self-evaluation, guidance shaped by policy, and experience (Cross et al., 1989). Fundamentally, it requires an investment of time and a commitment to learning and changing.
In this final chapter of the OIP, I intend on providing further details on the change plan, how it will be communicated, and the evaluation/monitoring component. This OIP has been structured around three theoretical approaches. Firstly, distributed leadership being the model describing some higher education environments today in the faculty domain (Austin & Jones, 2016; Bolden, 2011; Buller, 2015; Leemans, 2017) and the model I propose for the public-private partnership. Organizational behaviours in the partnership already appear to reflect this leadership approach and through my OIP, I propose further enhancing it. This POP interfaces with faculty and staff who predominantly have direct interactions with international students. As such, for the success of this change plan a bottom-up approach is required (Yuki, 2009). This does not require a change in the organization’s hierarchy structure; the current hierarchy is lean. Secondly, I describe the partnership organization as an organized anarchy with its many systems (Manning, 2018). The systems include: (1) being a public college by which the international students are registered and maintain legitimacy for the credential received, (2) being a private college that has the flexibility of a lean organizational structure, making it nimble to adapt programming and services to attract a sizeable market-share of international students to the city, and (3) being a partnership entity by which the public and private institution combine resources to produce a separate organization – like a hybrid of the two coming together. Lastly, the competing values framework has been selected for its organizational culture perspective and three-prong framework: (1) organizational culture through identification of the organization’s current and desired values, (2) assessment of leadership values current and possibly to be developed, and (3) insight into making a change strategy (Cameron, Quinn, Degraff, & Thakor, 2014). When change leaders understand how culture has shaped their organization and how their
organization interfaces with other cultures, they will be better equipped to develop strategies to minimize cross-cultural barriers (Cross et al., 1989).

**Change Plan Priorities**

To change culture requires a pre-examination of what it is and an understanding of a number of aspects including, how it is: defined, understood, enacted/lived, developed/created, reinforced, challenged, maintained, implemented, and evaluated. Armenakis and Harris (2009) propose that without a thoroughly conducted organizational assessment and diagnosis, change agents will be ill equipped to know what changes or change processes will work in their organization. This is also why the competing values framework is being applied to this organizational culture change plan. Change is necessary for survival but that doesn’t mean that it is easy to do (Smith, 2015a). In fact, many change efforts fail, regardless of the planning efforts (Lewis, 2011b: Smith, 2015a). Honig (2009) asserts that change implementation would be more successful if the decision on what methodology to apply is framed around the questions of “what works, for whom, where, when, and why?” (p. 333). This suggests that a full contextual picture should be applied. This questions-framing also suggests that a deep assessment and analysis is required when planning for change. She further claims that the interactions between people, places, and policy come together to influence how a change is implemented. Another way of looking at this, is a cultural perspective, identifying change implementation in relation to the organization’s culture. In this view, the three dimensions of implementation (people, places, and policy) are interdependent and any one of the three cannot be understood in isolation of the other two (Honig, 2009).

The distributed leadership model can help to minimize the focus and impact of resistance so that it is shared among the team (Kezar, 2014). However, Cohen and March (1983) argue that
an “ambiguity of power leads to a parallel ambiguity of responsibility” (p. 336). Because distributed leadership doesn’t focus on “the position of leaders”, but rather the functions of leadership, an assumption in this shared leadership approach is that everyone in the team has the needed leadership skills (Northouse, 2016). All leaders have a toolkit of leadership experiences, qualities, competencies, and the knowledge in being able to readily assess what intervention tool to draw on when needed. Since the roles of leaders and followers can be interchangeable in the distributed leadership approach, it also assumes that everyone has team-oriented skills (Northouse, 2016).

In the distributed leadership environment, it can be risky for the team member who steps forward to provide overall leadership of the team (e.g., the risk of failure if their strategy doesn’t work well for the team) (Amos & Klimoski, 2014). To take risks would suggest that there would need to be courage in the team member. Additionally, Amos and Klimoski (2014) suggest that stepping up into the designated leader position is a choice, and that it cannot be assumed that anyone in the team would be inclined to respond to the need to take charge in the group. In fact, what Amos and Klimoski (2014) infer, is that stepping forward in a distributed leadership environment requires a values base of moral awareness and therefore a willingness to act based on moral principles.

**Change Process**

As professional development lead, I work in administration with the responsibility to facilitate the rules and requirements of the executive leadership. I am further tasked with improving teaching practice and performance, and establishing quality standards. I facilitate training, classroom observations, individual and team coaching meetings, orientation sessions, and the recruitment of all faculty and some staff positions. To address the POP, a cultural
component will be added to professional development activities – it is possible for me to make this change within the scope of my role. Firstly, timelines for the development of the revised professional development material and processes would require at least three to four months. Secondly, working with a change team would be established in advance of the change to work out the implementation timelines and an identification of required resources. I propose that since the institution functions on a semester schedule and the faculty workforce is transient, then maximizing a semester for implementation would be ideal. However, it may be more realistic to function across two semesters since there is only one professional development lead and a lot of the change activities rely on this role. This would mean an overall timeline of ten months including pre-planning and implementation. The implementation activities will occur simultaneously (e.g., classroom observations need to be done individually, but other training sessions can also be scheduled within the same timeframe).

Recruitment will be designed with the cultural criteria of previous experience working with diverse populations and demonstrated cultural competencies. New faculty and staff will be oriented to the organization with information about the organization’s values e.g. a commitment to understanding how the cultures of its members impact the organization. A training program will address knowledge, skills, and attitude changes. Faculty training will be focused on teaching and the classroom setting, whereas, staff training will focus on student support interactions. To further support the learning from the training sessions, faculty and staff will complete a self-assessment instrument which will encourage a reflective practice approach – reflective practice will be a new activity in their professional development. For faculty, the questions will be related to the context of the classroom and for staff, it will be based on the context of their customer service support interactions with students. Coaching sessions will include a cultural awareness
lens, looking at self-awareness and the awareness of others. Classroom observations will include indicators of how culture is addressed in the classroom and incorporated into the curriculum. Lastly, documented reflections will be completed by the change team facilitating the change strategies. These can be used in the evaluation process to review lessons learned.

While important for administration and executive leadership to also participate in the training and evaluation, within my scope, I may not be able to influence that level in the organization. It would certainly be an area for future exploration, but the initial priority would be for their commitment to pay contracted faculty for their participation in the professional development activities (contracted faculty are independent contractors who are self-employed in their teaching relationship with the organization; they are not employees and are only paid when they invoice for the teaching-hours worked). I am confident in obtaining that support because the organization’s administration/leadership is committed to quality teaching. The president/owner’s investment in my new role as professional development lead, is a strong indicator of this commitment. Additionally, because the change plan requires minimal effort to implement, as the planning and preparation would rest primarily within the professional development lead’s responsibilities, the potential concern regarding a pull on the limited administration and management resources would be alleviated.

Current international students could be asked about their experience in the college. The current student perception of learning survey, which uses a Likert scale, would be an effective tool to enhance with culture related questions (e.g., “The curriculum in this course reflected an understanding of different cultures,” or, “I felt that my instructor acknowledged the different cultures represented in the class”). Additionally, an improved organizational culture could potentially create a reputation for the college as an institute of choice for prospective
international students. While I do not have oversight of the student perception of learning assessments, these surveys are a primary element in faculty professional development and performance feedback. As such, I would make a case for an enhancement of the indicators to include the cultural aspects as well. Should it not be possible to make any changes to the student perception of learning indicators, we can still obtain students’ feedback on the cultural aspects of their experience in the organization. Faculty will be coached to encourage students to write comments about how they feel in the classroom with regards to their culture and the culture of other students.

Assessments will be mainly focused on the competing values framework and cultural assessment tool. However, components of the professional development activities will be indicators of feedback and success (e.g., project diaries would be reviewed in lessons learned debriefing sessions). There will also be an evaluation based on the achievement of the plan as detailed in the logic model, and especially the outputs. The logic model’s outlining of the change plan components will be a useful tool to monitor progress on the change implementation. Details of the evaluation will be further discussed in the Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation section of this chapter.

**Challenges with Culture and Assessments**

Organizational culture is a paradox. It creates organizational stability, reinforcing continuity and consistency and on the other hand, adaptability for organizations through clear principles and guidelines to draw on to manage new conditions (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). There are also controversies in assessing organizational culture include how to precisely define culture and how to measure culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). In the early onset of the competing values framework, Cameron and Rohrbaugh (1983) argued that the need to create the
model was driven by the problem with the way organizations were being assessed and evaluated, and that “personal values that motivate the choice of particular criteria ultimately underlie the resulting effectiveness dimensions "uncovered" by (but actually antecedent to) factor analytic studies” (p. 365). There is also the data validity issue of factual accuracy and interpretative accuracy considerations (Schein & Schein, 2017). Lindquist and Marcy (2016) acknowledge that the competing values framework is a self-diagnosis tool that should be intended for the data obtained to be used for “insight as basis for fostering dialog about differing perceptions of the organization and its performance, and strategies moving forward” (p. 179). They also recognize that the static nature of the competing values quadrants is based on general classifications of leadership styles, values, and organizational culture, which can limit the moving-forward ideal.

Schein and Schein (2017) caution that the typologies that generalize culture and value types in organizations may fall short of being able to get at the DNA of a culture. For this reason, they further suggest that the change leader thoughtfully consider the use of culture assessment tools and that a qualitative approach may be more appropriate. They describe this qualitative approach as not having a formula because “it depends on the nature of the problem, the macro-cultural context, and the kind of relationship that is built up between client and helper (an outsider, facilitating the qualitative culture diagnosis process)” (p. 298). Questions that can be asked of the organization’s members can include: “What does it feel like entering this organization?”, “What are the values we live by here?”, “What are the underlying assumptions that drive us?”, “What is the change goal we are trying to make?”, and “What do we need to do to get there?”, “How will our current culture move us towards that change or hinder it?” (Schein & Schein, 2017). While important to note these questions, interview-type data collection would not be permitted in the fulfillment of completing this OIP.
However, even with Schein and Schein’s (2017) promotion of a qualitative design to understanding an organization’s culture, they also acknowledge that the act of studying the culture, intervenes into the life of the organization in unknown ways. It is also difficult to obtain valid cultural data because human subjects have a tendency to conceal information that they feel defensive about or may exaggerate details if they want to impress the helper/researcher. As a solution, Schein and Schein (2017) propose having the helper enter the organization in a role like a volunteer or intern, to leverage that position in the organization to help the organization’s members and not just be there to gather information. This would seem that this could only be effective if the data collection were to be concealed. Whether or not the helper is just there to collect data or to additionally serve in another capacity, the information seeking aspect still exists and therefore so does the human subject interface. If data collection intentions are concealed then the study would be unethical. Human subjects should always be given the opportunity to provide consent to participate in a study about them (Bersoff & Bersoff, 2000).

Schein and Schein (2017) encourage exploring and identifying the approach or methods that are the best fit with the organization and situation. For example, conducting content analysis of organizational documents rather than direct engagement with the organization’s members. It is probably unavoidable to have bias in the rating of performance scales. The culture of the nation, family backgrounds and traditions, social experiences, and generational differences can impact how people rank values (Daft, 2015). This is further confounded with what defines organizational effectiveness, because as Cameron and Rohrbaugh (1983) assert, organizational effectiveness is socially constructed. There may be tendencies to rate very high or very low as part of the individual preferences or practice of the people doing the ratings or based on the culture in the organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).
Schein and Schein (2017) argue that in addition to ensuring validity, through predictability and replication in data analysis and interpretation, there should also be confidence in the organization’s members that the depicted results make sense and can help them to understand themselves. In other words, there should be confidence that the organization’s members have been able to accurately identify and assess their organizational culture experience and understanding. To ensure that individuals respond to the assessment questions based on the overarching culture, including underlying values and assumptions, the competing values framework uses scenarios as cues to rate the extent to which the scenarios represent their organization’s culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Moreover, assessing culture requires a content and pattern perspective. The competing values framework uses six content dimensions that represent what individuals naturally interpret as the contextual basis associated with their organization’s culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). These dimensions are:

- The dominant characteristic of the organization;
- The dominant leadership style;
- The dominant style of the working environment;
- The dominant mechanism that holds the organization together;
- What drives the organization’s strategy; and
- What defines the organization’s success.

By articulating these dimensions, the authors are exerting that there are implicit theoretical framework(s) that have criteria of organizational effectiveness that can be grouped into specific domains (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). That is, there is a common understanding of organizational effectiveness, summed up in these dimensions.
If a proposed change is not compatible with an organization’s value system, it will result in tensions that will make the change impossible to implement (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002, p. 440). For this reason, organizations that operate with a balanced-culture frame, are better equipped to deal with organizational shifts brought on by environmental drivers (Malbašić, Rey, & Potočan, 2015). Amis, Slack, and Hinnings (2002) discuss the role an organization’s values have in its members acceptance and ability to successfully move through a change. Missing from their discussion is how an organization can change its values to address an organizational culture change. In other words, “What values does an organization need to be able to embrace changing its values?” The competing values framework not only assesses culture, but it also provides insights into what cultures may be best suited for certain situations (Cameron, Quinn, Degrass, and Thakor, 2014). It also promotes developing versatile values and cultures, to be adaptable to change (Malbašić, Rey, & Potočan, 2015). Because the higher education environment of this OIP operates like a distributed leadership and organized anarchy, the competing values framework’s leadership development perspective can be applied. The competing values framework was developed for the private sector (Cameron, Quinn, Degrass, & Thakor, 2014) and has relevance in this OIP because the partnership organization is located in a private institution.

**Plan to Communicate**

**Awareness of the Need for Change**

Because this change plan aims to improve the organizational culture through faculty and staff professional development to develop a culturally competent organizational culture to address international students’ success, faculty and staff need to understand the need for the change. Higher education institutions are increasing the use of contract faculty, increasing management expectations and accountabilities to external regulations and a growing acceptance
of uncertainty in the internal environment (Casey, 2002). We are seeing a shift in the faculty experience as “autonomous professionals” to being more restricted and accountable under the umbrella of being an employee in the college, with the college operating more like a business (Levin, 2017). This shift in the faculty experience has made it even more important to engage faculty in any change process. Education institutions cannot exist without faculty teaching, but in the global society that internationalization has created, students are depending on faculty to be competent conduits that will equip them with the skills they need to function in a global market.

The default or preference of organizations is to stay in the status quo. Organizational members hold on tightly to current and legacy values and practices (Levin, 2017). Structures in organizations are often deeply embedded, the organization’s members can be so accustomed to them that they become maintained (Lewis, 2011b). This tightly held position creates a tension of resistance. However, Lewis (2011b) asserts that resistance may be healthy for an organization, in that tensions can create opportunities to examine a situation more closely and potentially this may enable more appropriate steps and processes to emerge in the change design, through individuals’ self-reflection.

Armenakis and Harris (2009) also believe that it is the change leader’s responsibility to adequately prepare a plan for the change and to sell the merits of the change to the organization’s members. The intersection between intended strategies and those that are emergent, is where realized strategies are created, and the way organizational members create meaning and make sense of the change (Ericson, 2001). We are seeing a social and cultural shift in higher education institutions, with postmodern cultural constructs and interests. There are new demands for value in how the members of higher education institutions express meaning, self-identify, and locate themselves in the context of the institution (Casey, 2002). Hultman and Hultman (2018) argue
that one of the main reasons why change efforts fail is because of the role of self and identity. People may associate themselves with the functions of their jobs, so that any change to their work environment may be perceived as being done because something is wrong with the person, rather than something needing to be different about the work activity, environment, or culture (Buller, 2015). Similarly, Edwards and Cable (2009) argue that organizations don’t have values themselves, but the organizational members do. They use their values along with the systems and norms in the organization that direct behaviours, practices, and how resources are used (Edwards & Cable, 2009). These nuances must be considered in the organizational change plan.

Kezar (2014) petitions that it is important for organizations to create opportunities for sensemaking in the change process. Stakeholders use sensemaking to understand the meaning of the change and observing their processing of what it all means can be revealing for the leader. This means enabling communication processes about the change that people can connect with, make sense of, re-examine assumptions, and better understand what is being proposed. Distributed leadership creates sensemaking opportunities by involving a broad collection of stakeholders in ongoing conversations, questioning the meaning of the change as it pertains to themselves as individuals, as well as the organization as a whole (Kezar, 2014). In other words, sensemaking allows stakeholders to reflect on their identity in relation to the change, as active participants in the change process (Kezar, 2014). Sensemaking can be achieved through professional development.

Institutionally supported faculty and staff professional development opportunities can be used to facilitate changing mindsets and reconstructing human identity in the context of the organization (Kezar, 2014). Cognitive schemes are constructed over time through an individual’s life experiences, and these cognitive schemes influence how a person makes sense of a situation.
or issue (Ericson, 2001). In sensemaking, Tong and Arvey (2015) contend that “By linking the past to future vision and goals, the organizational life story becomes a sensemaking device for interpreting situations not yet encountered” (p. 664). The leader’s sensemaking communication and actions enable the organization’s members to understand and embrace the change and in turn their understanding can be leveraged to bring about future change goals. The collective buy-in creates a shared ownership, which like distributed leadership, facilitates shared leadership (Bolden, 2011). In complex and changing environments, the wealth of knowledge that can come from the team can be invaluable in directing possible courses of action and problem-solving (Tong & Arvey, 2015).

Being named a top employer is an attractive designation, particularly in the corporate world but different types of organizations are also making the list. Increasing in popularity are organizations striving to create environments that their employees will rate as a great place to work with the label of “employer of choice” being a goal. The Forbes 2019 list of Canada’s Best Employers, identified a higher education institution at the number two spot; this institution moved up 61 spots on the list since the year before (Ng, 2019). These institutions make a lifetime commitment to their workforce through “intentionally inclusive, diverse and equitable initiatives that support employees over various (personal) life and career stages” (Ng, 2019, para. 5). The institutions hold the title of one of the top employers, and their turnover rate is only 2%, whereas other higher education institutions are around 7% (Valet, 2019). Inclusive initiatives are a priority with recruitment targeted around the surrounding communities of the campuses and commitments to hire faculty and administrative staff representing African-American and Indigenous cultures to address employment equity (Valet, 2019). This institution demonstrates its commitment to and value of its employees as whole persons. The for-profit aspect of the
public-private partnership means that there is a continuous effort to compete in the market. Being an employer of choice would attract great faculty and staff, and ultimately this could translate into a reputation that then attracts more students.

Aguirre, Alpern, von Post, and Butler (2014) of Booz and Company discuss the findings of a survey conducted through their organization which highlighted that “86% of C-suite executives and 84% of all managers and employees say culture is critical to their organisations’ success, and 60% see it as a bigger success factor than either their strategy or their operating model” (p. 30), but culture was still not a priority when the organizations were orchestrating change plans. Notably, “70% of respondents who said change efforts at their companies were adopted and sustained also said their companies leveraged employees’ pride in the organisation and their emotional commitment” (p. 30). Strong value systems in an organization establish conformity which most often contributes to the organization’s survival and effectiveness (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002). In this change plan, the value of the public-private partnership’s members will be part of how the change plan is communicated. Their involvement, through the professional development activities will play a role in enhancing not only their development but as participants in the organization, their development enhances the organization in the immediate and long-term.

**Role of Leadership Development in the Communication**

Individual change is key to organizational culture change. “You can’t change an organization without being changed yourself” (Buller, 2015, p. 90). According to Cameron and Quinn (2011) the change process must be personalized by the organization’s members, with a shift in management’s *leadership competencies* in response, and individuals being willing to enact the desired new behaviours. In order for leaders to be effective, they can clarify their own
values and understand how those values impact their leadership behaviours and the organizational culture (Daft, 2015). Even further, those values that a leader holds, determines the attitudes that they have in relation to who they are and how they view their followers (Daft, 2015). The values of individuals in top positions also largely influence the values, structures, and systems in an organization (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002). In the context of this partnership, and a distributed leadership frame, the collective leadership’s values matter.

Similarly, Tong and Arvey (2015) assert that in addition to being used to help organizations assess their current culture and gain insight into changing their values to achieve a desired culture, the competing values framework can also be used to enhance leadership behaviours to be more effective in complex, changing environments (Linquist & Marcy, 2016; Tong & Arvey, 2015). Through their research, they have identified that there are three critical leadership qualities for these environments which include enabling, sensemaking, and facilitating shared leadership. All of these qualities support the distributed leadership and organizational anarchy descriptions of my organization and what is needed for their success.

In enabling, leaders would be balancing order and disorder and ensuring that structures are flexible enough to function effectively at the “edge of chaos” (Tong & Arvey, 2015). This is like the organized anarchy, where rules are unclear and there are multiple goals, and they change from one person’s interpretation to another, but organizations are still able to function (Cohen et al., 1972). Stakeholders use sensemaking to understand the meaning of the change and observing their processing of what it all means can be revealing for the leader. This means enabling communication processes about the change that people can connect with, make sense of, re-examine assumptions, and better understand what is being proposed. Collaborative leadership can be used to create sensemaking by involving a broad collection of stakeholders in ongoing
conversations, questioning the meaning of the change as it pertains to themselves as individuals, as well as the organization as a whole (Kezar, 2014). In facilitating shared leadership, for the enhancement of leadership skills and behaviours, Tong and Arvey (2015) created a workshop that uses the competing values framework. The workshop has three phases, starting with an open discussion of sharing experiences and in particular related to handling complexity, then a review of each person’s leadership profile (completed prior to the workshop) and used to discuss enabling, sensemaking, and facilitating shared leadership. The last phase is for goal-setting to explore ways to increase a diversity/balance of skills across the skills quadrants. This type of workshop could also be facilitated in this change plan.

Lindquist and Marcy (2016) also discuss how the competing values framework is relevant for leadership development through various workshop activities. Their suggested workshop activities include having leaders complete a leadership profile as well, and then having participants grouped with others who have similar values to work on a strategic issue for presentation to the rest of the participants. Then everyone would be reassigned to groups with people who have different values and work on the same strategic issue. The discussions afterwards would be about which groups were the most effective in addressing the strategic issue and ideally, it would be the group where there was a mix of values.

As part of the competing values framework, personal management skills profiles are conducted through a 360-degree feedback rating involving direct reports, peers, supervisors, and self-ratings that assess the leader’s performance in demonstrating critical managerial leadership competencies (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). In his original construct of the competing values framework Quinn (1988) introduced the concept of competing values as an opportunity to rethink management effectiveness, as well as an opportunity to redefine organizational change. It
was also constructed to help managers in their self-improvement quests, and a way to better understand the values they hold, and how those impact their management behaviours. Quinn (1988) describes *an agenda for self-improvement* which entails learning about yourself through completing the competing values framework tool, reflecting on and analyzing the results, then making a personal change strategy plan, while maintaining a journal or diary of the process. Since the scope of this OIP is using the distributed leadership approach with a professional development focus on faculty and staff, the leadership development would be within the distributed leadership of the faculty and staff compliment. There is a sort of symbiotic relationship between distributed leadership and the professional development of faculty and staff. Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, and Rylan (2012) state that in order for distributed leadership to be successful in an organization, it requires upper management’s support, demonstrated through resources, infrastructures, professional development, and the facilitation of collaborative approaches and opportunities.

**Strategy for Communication**

Communication plays a critical role in change processes and as such it needs to be properly planned and executed (Lewis, 2011b). Leadership plays an important role in communicating the message and modeling the expected response (Schein & Schein, 2017). Sidhu (2015) suggests that people need to understand why there is a need for the change, what will the change involve, how will they be impacted, and where they can contribute to the change process. Part of communicating the change should include indications that there is a communication plan; people want to know that there will be updates and transparency in the progress of the change (see Appendix G, template for the communication strategy). Accordingly,
Buller (2015) says the question of whether there is a need for change, needs to be reframed to ask, “Since change is here, how do we do it?”

Lewis (2011a) asserts that all stakeholders are not necessarily interested in being part of the change design process. Strategic communication opportunities to engage stakeholders, can solicit buy-in to the change and decrease resistance, but that part of effective strategic communication is also in how change messages are designed (Lewis, 2011a). Messages that include a balanced perspective of the change, including the negatives, potential threats, and opposing arguments are more persuasive in achieving stakeholder buy-in than communication that just states what the change is (Chebat, Filiatrault, Larache, & Watson, 1988; Lewis, 2011a). The need for change requires a recognition that something must be different, triggered by stakeholders identifying what is happening in the environment, and expressing the need for a response (Lewis, 2011b). This need for a response, must include compelling reasons for what will be changed, how it will be achieved, and how stakeholders will benefit. Much like the distributed leadership approach, bringing stakeholders together socially, to participate in working groups provides opportunities to plant cues (seeds of sensemaking) which can be distributed widely across the span of different people working together (Kezar, 2014). In this regard, connecting to the identity and the sense of self of stakeholders, and providing opportunities for sensemaking communication and social interactions further enhances strategic communication, and ultimately the effectiveness of change.

Manning (2018) argues that because higher education institutions have highly professional employees with professional authority (and autonomy), more inclusive approaches, like distributed leadership, are needed to foster new approaches, increased skill levels and competencies to meet the complexities of today’s higher education demands. Moving forward
with change in the higher education institute, requires the buy-in and collaboration of this group, which, much like in the public-private partnership is the largest stakeholder group. As identified earlier, a change team, with representation from across the faculty and staff departments will serve as a medium to help champion the change and cheerlead the change process. As leaders of the change, they will be modelling their buy-in, which is a message of action that is stronger than words. People are more comfortable with change coming from their peers, whom they trust and believe understands their needs and concerns (Kezar & Ecker, 2002).

**Communication Context**

Culturally competent communication needs to be a priority in the public-private partnership. There needs to be an understanding of how different cultures communicate, and how to plan for change in environments, given the diversity of communication in the public-private partnership’s student population. The need for culturally competent communication between high-context and low-context cultures also increases within the context of a global society (Henson, 2013). When dealing with people from different countries, an awareness of the differences between high-context and low-context cultures will help in ensuring effective interpersonal interactions and communication (Smyth, 2015) (See Figure 4). Trust can be impeded when the differences in expressions is not understood between high-context and low-context cultures (Manrai, Manrai, Lascu, & Friedeborn, 2019). For example, how authority, disagreement, and conflict is dealt with would require different approaches (Henson, 2013). As a low-context culture, in North America, individualism, responsibility, and authority are values we take pride in, whereas, in high-context cultures found in Spain, India, and Japan, relationships, time invested in processes, and group participation are highly valued (Smyth, 2015).
Communication relies on words to clarify meaning in the low-context culture versus the implicit understandings based on relationships, contexts, and traditions in the high-context culture which goes beyond words (Henson, 2013; Smyth, 2015). An individual’s identity is defined and deeply rooted in groups like the family and community in the high-context culture (Pai, Adler, & Shadiow, 2006). High-context and low-context culture understanding has been linked with being important for successful business across countries (Henson, 2013), but it is also relevant in the internationalization discourse when the classroom is diverse, and the purpose of the learning environment is to equip students for a global marketplace. With North America predicted to become a minority-majority by 2030, high-context cultures will be the dominant communication context of the population (Henson, 2013). Moreover, students that come from cultural contexts that value respect for authority and conformity may find it challenging to learn in loosely structured learning environments (Pai et al., 2006). This is why there needs to be an organizational culture focus to internationalization. The learning environment of the institution, has an impact on students’ learning. The organized anarchy, with it loosely coupled systems and its appearance and feeling at times as being unorganized (Cohen & March, 1983) would be felt by international students coming from high-context cultures and have an impact on how well they function in the environment.

While this communication context highlights the considerations required for faculty and staff in their engagement with students, if they can apply this awareness to themselves, it will also contribute to the organization’s communication culture towards cultural competency (Cross et. al., 1989). And deeper yet, “If we are to avoid being ethnocentric, we must understand both the strengths and weaknesses of our own culture” (Pai et al., 2006, p. 206). Additionally, “as geographical and social boundaries are diminishing, many cultures are adopting various cultural
elements from each other, resulting in blended cultures” (Manrai, Manrai, Lascu, & Friedeborn, 2019, p. 68). Therefore, cultural learning is imperative, recognizing that as cultures develop and emerge through global influences, cultural competency achievement is an ongoing commitment. The public-private partnership has attracted a diverse faculty and staff workforce so planning for the communication of this change should also include these cultural communication context considerations.

Figure 4

**Effects of Cultural Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Effects</th>
<th>Versus</th>
<th>High Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal-making</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreground Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Background Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Manrai, Manrai, Lascu, and Friedeborn (2019) describe the focus of cultural context as a comparison between low-context effects and high-context effects.*

**Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation**

Evaluation of the change process begins with the planning of the change process. A tool that can be used for this combined planning and evaluation role is the logic model (Abdi & Mensah, 2016). In addition to the use of evaluation/monitoring tools, there needs to be a plan for monitoring and evaluation. The plan or roadmap for implementation and evaluation is essentially one plan – evaluation is interwoven as the goals, outcomes, implementation etc. The logic model is a tool that provides this type of integrated planning. Ideally, the logic model is developed with the input of stakeholders (Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, n.d.). One drawback is that logic models take a long time to develop, especially because they are created through the contributions of a group of people with their various stakes. It is unlikely that it would be created in one session as there needs to be reflection and agreement on the details of
the plan. As per the design of the logic model, it is intended to enable stakeholder participation in the questioning and challenging of the logic of the project (Evaluation Toolbox, 2010). Another consideration is that stakeholders need to be clear in their understanding of the project and what they hope the project will achieve. Without this clarity, there will be a lack of logic in the logic model design and impact evaluation.

Sweeney and Pritchard (2010a) also caution that the logic model needs to be updated and if it is not, there is the risk that it will restrict flexibility and continuous improvement efforts. It is being used in this OIP because it is a clearly organized tool that serves as a planning, evaluation, and monitoring resource. To help reduce the rigidity of its use, the logic model components should include timelines or check-in points, which are often not part of the design and identify where components are critical (Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, (n.d.).

In contrast to the logic model approach of evaluation being a design component and consideration in how the change is planned, Browne and Wildavsky (1983) argue that evaluation and implementation need to be in tandem because everything that would be asked and considered in an evaluation occurs during implementation. Additionally, these authors argue that implementation is planned with a rigid belief that preconditions will result in the anticipated outcomes that are desired. Instead, the act of the implementation should be dynamic and adaptable, with the resiliency to overcome unexpected obstacles and unintended consequences (Browne & Wildavsky, 1983). Using a logic model framework, this evaluation/plan will incorporate the following components: goal, inputs, activities, audience, outputs, and outcomes (Abdi & Mensah, 2016) as illustrated in Appendix C.

Additionally, since this OIP is about an organizational culture change effort, the competing values framework’s cultural assessment tool will be used as a pre-intervention and
post-intervention strategy. In Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) writings, it does not discuss administering the assessment tool as a pre and post strategy. However, since this OIP aims to demonstrate that a cultural focus to professional development activities will change the organization’s culture, it seems appropriate to therefore confirm the culture change through a pre and post implementation approach.

The professional development activities of this OIP includes reflective practice. The project diary coupled with team meetings to discuss the reflections on progress to date, areas for improvement etc. will be part of the evaluation process (Sweeney & Pritchard, 2010b). The project diary uses a reflective practice element, with its accurate, time-stamped documentation of the project journey (Sweeney & Pritchard, 2010b). That the project diary will be effective in this OIP is based on the assumption that by virtue of being in a higher education environment, the organization’s members are committed to learning and being reflective. The project diary will be completed by the change team, which will include: the professional development lead, administration/leader, and representation from faculty and staff to champion the change. The project diary may be very effective for the change team in assessing how they are functioning in their leadership of the change as a reflection of lessons learned, and for further debriefing in the lessons learned workshop.

Complimentary to the project diary is the lessons learned workshop. It also includes a reflection component but as a workshop it is planned for particular points of time. As a monitoring focus tool, the lessons learnt workshop can happen at different milestones in the project, and as an evaluation tool, it can occur at the end of the project (Sweeney & Pritchard, 2010b). In order for the lessons learnt workshop to be effective, it would entail a structured approach to obtaining data for review and a structure for how the information will be reviewed.
It would also require stakeholders’ participation without reservations, because there needs to be reflection and analysis in the sharing of what has worked, what needs to improve, and essentially what lessons have been learnt.

Logic models provide an outline for how change will occur in the program. The following logic model components will be discussed as they relate to this OIP: goal, inputs, activities, audience, outputs, and short and long-term outcomes (Quality Improvement and Innovation Partnership, 2009).

Goal

In addressing the lack of an organizational culture focus in supporting international students in an Ontario higher education institution, the goal of this change initiative is to understand and change the organizational culture. This can be achieved through faculty and staff professional development to develop a cultural competency organizational culture to address international students’ success.

Inputs

Invested into this OIP will be several resources which include:

- Staffing - professional development lead, change team, faculty, staff (Student Services), and administration/leadership;
- Training and training material (e.g., self-reflection tools/diaries); and
- Finances - compensation for contracted faculty to participate in professional development.

Important to note is that this OIP is framed around professional development of the faculty and staff. The predominantly contracted faculty in this public-private partnership are independent contractors, paid only for their teaching hours. Their participation in professional development
will require additional compensation costs that the executive leadership will need to support. Additional compensation resources would not be required for fulltime faculty and staff because they are salaried employees.

Additional financial resources may not be required as the development and implementation of the culture change strategy, and the facilitation of the evaluation activities will be conducted through the professional development lead. The professional development lead will be supported by the change team which include representation from fulltime faculty, and student services staff, and an administration/leader to sponsor/support. The change team’s time in the development and implementation of the strategy and evaluation will be required. And the investment of time to participate in the professional development activities will be required by the faculty and staff.

Activities

The activities that will take place in this OIP include the interventions that will be used to provide the change (Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, Abdi & Mensah, 2016). These include: classroom observations, training sessions, lessons learned debrief sessions, completion of the organizational culture assessment, recruitment, orientation, coaching sessions, self-assessments, and completing project diaries. Also see description in the Process section of the Change Implementation Plan at the beginning of this chapter.

Audience

The audience or stakeholders refers to whom the change interventions are targeting, and this can include primary and secondary targets (Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, Abdi & Mensah, 2016). Primary targets are the main focus and the secondary would include individuals who may not be the direct focus but may be impacted nonetheless (Ontario
Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, Abdi & Mensah, 2016). Through the professional development activities, the primary targets in this change initiative are the faculty and staff.

Students will be impacted by this change initiative, but will not participate in the change activities. The intent is that they will benefit as a result of the organizational change that will shift the organization’s culture to be more responsive to their learning needs. International students may be engaged as a feedback resource after the professional development activities have been conducted. Their perspective will help to inform the effectiveness of the professional development on their resulting experience in the organization with the faculty and staff.

The organization’s administration and executive leadership will influence this change initiative. They will not participate in the change activities, but their support is required. For example, there must be a commitment to paying the contracted staff for their participation in the professional development activities. Ultimately, the administration and executive leadership support is required to enable the design of the improved professional development activities.

While this OIP focuses on a bottom-up approach to leadership, through a distributed leadership emphasis, the organization’s administration and executive leadership still have the decision-making authority. This authority also comes with access to resources and supports if needed, which can be requested and negotiated.

**Outputs**

The activities in this OIP will produce quantified products (Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, Abdi & Mensah, 2016). These outputs will include: classroom observations, training sessions for faculty and staff, a lessons learned debriefing session, redesigned recruitment, coaching sessions to support the training, self-assessments completed by faculty and
staff, and project diaries completed by the change team (professional development lead, administration/leader, and representation from faculty and staff to champion the change).

**Outcomes**

The results of the culture change strategy/professional development activities will include both short-term and long-term outcomes associated with changes in awareness, knowledge, skills, and behaviours (Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion, Abdi & Mensah, 2016).

**Short-term outcomes.** Fairly soon after the completion of the professional development activities, we should see some indicators of success. They would be short-term outcomes as follows:

- Faculty/staff have an increased awareness of culture (self and of others);
- Faculty/staff have increased knowledge and skills in working with diverse cultures;
- Faculty/staff have an improved attitude towards other cultures (identified through self-reflection); and
- Faculty are able to apply their culture diversity knowledge and skills into the curriculum and learning environments of the subject-matter that they teach.

**Long-term outcomes.** This OIP provides an opportunity to implement an organizational culture change strategy. As we know, deep rooted change requires more time, effort, and skill from the leader (Kezar, 2014). The following outcomes are anticipated in the long-term:

- Culturally competent faculty and staff that are sensitive, aware, knowledgeable, and skilled to work with diverse students;
• Internationally-focused student services – recognition that mainstream student services can be enhanced to better meet the needs of international students, responsive to the context of their experiences, issues, and challenges; and

• A commitment to internationally-focused curriculum – the diverse classroom is acknowledged, and the focus is on the global marketplace where understanding cultures and being able to work in diverse environments is incorporated into the subject-matter of what is taught;

• Students have cultural knowledge skills to equip them for diverse environments; and

• Students feel culturally represented in the design of the curriculum.

**Evaluation Model and Justification**

I have selected to implement change in this organization through making improvements and building capacity, with an interest in the participant perspective through self-evaluation and accountability. The goal is to empower faculty and staff in their skills development ownership through the professional development activities (Fetterman, 2002). According to Youngs (2017) distributed leadership provides an opportunity for collaboration, diverse thinking, reflective spaces, and learning. I am not in a formal leadership role, which limits my ability to make change in my organization. However, this leadership approach gives me legitimacy/empowering me in addressing my POP, and the empowerment of the faculty and staff builds on the skills of participants making change possible from the bottom up.

The logic model used in this change plan (see Appendix C), enables the plan to be articulated in clear steps with a snapshot view of what to do and what is expected. It also ensures that evaluation is considered from the planning stage (Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, n.d.). The plan can be monitored based on what has been planned against what is taking
place. For example, in looking at the planned activities, it can be assessed whether all activities have successfully been implemented. The organizing of the plan components in the logic model also allow for reflection and refinement of the plan if required (Quality Improvement and Innovation Partnership, 2009).

Key to the change plan is the successful accomplishment of the desired outcomes, as outlined as short-term and long-term achievements. A step towards the cultural competency goal can be demonstrated through the short-term (learning) outcomes. Individuals change in their behaviour, thinking, and skills through the learning, which will have a longer-term impact on the organization’s culture (Kezar, 2014). Every plan should also be prepared for things to not always go as planned. As an addition to the traditional logic model, I am including another category for 
unintended outcomes. Using a learning lens, unintended outcomes can be documented, and strategies put in place to respond as necessary.

Limitations

Although this OIP is not a research study, there are still limitations to the plan that should be identified. Firstly, the change implementation centres around the professional development activities. The limit with this is that the professional development activities rely on self-reflection. We make assumptions that a self-report/reflection will be accurate and forthcoming. There is an inherent risk of conscious bias, “a desire to look good could distort data either intentionally or unintentionally” (Baldwin, 2000, p. 8). What also needs to be considered are whether or not there are incentives in the organizations culture to report inaccurately/distorted from the truth. There was no way to assess this aspect in the culture in advance of proposing the change plan, and the change plan itself includes an assessment of the culture as part of the design.
An additional limitation to consider, is the role of motivation in the professional development activities. This OIP assumes that faculty and staff will be motivated to participate in their professional development. This was not identified as an area to address in advance, as a criteria for participation. It may require additional assessments to address or assess the role that motivation can play in the professional development activities and how this would influence the overall change implementation. This can potentially be a consideration to explore in a future iteration of this OIP.

**Future Considerations and Conclusion**

The investments in improvement initiatives made to community college have had little success in altering the deep structures, values, and practices of the institutions (Levin, 2017). This is problematic when we consider what education needs are for the 21st century and the impacts of internationalization on higher education institutions. If we agree that globalization and neoliberalism have greatly impacted the context of higher education, then we have no choice but to be responsive in making changes. However, what we have learned is that when content transformation initiatives have been unsuccessful, it “usually appears that corporate culture was an afterthought” (Aguirre et al., 2014, p. 30). This means there must be an understanding of and leveraging of values and culture to bring about organizational change; and this makes the focus of this OIP even more pertinent as a scholarly informed contribution to the discourse on organizational culture and change.

Increasingly, organizations are experiencing the merging and molding of their cultures as integrations, downsizing, divestments, and amalgamations become more popular (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). For this reason, identifying, assessing, and managing organizational culture is essential to the understanding of how organizations operate. Even further, Cameron, Quinn,
Degraff, and Thakor (2014) assert that competing tensions exist in organizations and personal tensions are battled by leaders. They argue that awareness of and being able to manage those tensions will help to create effective organizations. To address those tensions, according to Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, and Ryland (2012), all levels in an organization need to be working collaboratively in planning and decision-making, as well as prioritizing their individual development, and the enhancement of the organization.

In response to environmental conditions and social, political, financial etc. goals, organizations adopt different values (Malbašić, Rey, & Potočan, 2015). Given that internationalization in higher education institutions strives to achieve equipping students with the skills they need to function in a global society, values that reflect culture and diversity must be part of the higher education and internationalization discourse. Cultural competency can no longer be a nice to have or optional. The increasingly changing and diverse environments of Canada make it imperative for cross-cultural understandings. Internationalization has opened the doors to the learning possibilities, we just need to make sure that learning is optimized, and that skills to function in a global community are indeed provided.

In recognition that cultural competence achievement takes time, the professional development focus of this OIP will not be sufficient on its own to develop a culturally competent organization. Although the longer-term outcomes may begin to surface at the end of the change plan, it may be more realistic to expect them to be demonstrated beyond the life of the OIP. Also, briefly mentioned in this OIP is the missing policy directions in the implementation of internationalization at the national and institutional level. In addition to being informed by research, to effectively develop relevant policies to guide the organization’s cultural competency, a range of stakeholders, including minority groups should be consulted (Cross et al., 1989).
While the students are the main stakeholders in the internationalization arena, and even though the focus of this POP is intended for student success, this OIP was mainly focused on faculty and staff. A future consideration, beyond the walls of my institution, would be to enhance the student voice through the Key Performance Indicators Student Satisfaction and Engagement Feedback Survey. Even with internationalization being a significant part of the education system in Ontario, the surveys do not include questions related to diversity, cultural experiences, or feeling prepared to function in a global community (see Appendix H, for a sample of KPI questions). As mentioned earlier in this OIP, a policy direction is needed for internationalization, that would include things like these provincially-mandated and collected KPI surveys (Colleges Ontario, 2017).

The potential challenge of the public college union was briefly raised to provide context on the timely need for this OIP as there is little transparency into the operations of these new public-private partnerships, and concern that standards of practice are not monitored. In particular, there is the concern that the curricula developed by the faculty in public colleges are being sold to private colleges and delivered by faculty that are not considered their peers. The nature of this OIP is about changing the organizational culture of the public-private partnership through professional development – this quality improvement focus is anticipated as an accountability effort that would be welcomed by the public college union. It may also provide an opportunity for a standard of cultural competency that should also be practiced in the public college system. Nonetheless, a framework for evaluating internationalization is needed. However, through the exploration of this OIP, there is an opportunity to plan for making improvements to the implementation of internationalization in a higher education institution through an organizational culture lens. This is further enhanced by modelling an approach of
collective leadership, change management and promoting diversity through professional development, and using a planning and evaluation model that is also in alignment.

This OIP provided me, as the writer, with an opportunity to reflect on my understanding of my organizational experience from an assessment and analysis lens. In planning for the assessment of the organization’s culture, it reminded me that by being in an organization, I am influenced by the organization’s culture and I too, have an impact on it as well. With a goal for cultural competency in an organization, it requires an ongoing commitment of learning. My personal development commitment is the same - an ongoing commitment of learning to improve myself, and my organization to be effective in achieving its objectives, being able to respond to changing environments, and leveraging its values in the journey.
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Appendix A

Competing Values Framework Quadrants

Flexibility and Discretion

Clan

Adhocracy

Hierarchy

Market

Internal Focus and Integration

External Focus and Differentiation

Stability and Control


After the organization’s members complete the OCAI (see Appendix B), the change team, with representation from across the organization, can review the completed assessments and average the scores completed for the now (current) and preferred (desired) culture state. Those averaged numbers are then plotted on the competing values framework quadrant to identify the current and desired culture values.
# Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

## 1. Dominant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization is a dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization is very results oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People are very competitive and achievement oriented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The organization is a very controlled and structured place. Formal procedures generally govern what people do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Organizational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovating, or risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify a no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify coordinating, organizing, or smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Management of Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by hard-driving competitiveness, high demands, and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability in relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Organization Glue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. Strategic Emphases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes acquiring new resources and creating new challenges. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficiency, control and smooth operations are important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterial of Success</td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of having the most unique or newest products. It is a product leaders and innovator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of winning in the marketplace and outpacing the competition. Competitive market leadership is key.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling and low-cost production and critical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix C

### Change Implementation Plan Logic Model

**Goal:** Improve the organizational culture through faculty and staff professional development to develop a cultural competency organizational culture to address international students’ success.

**Timeline:** Preparation for the plan, to develop the cultural competency infused training and material with require 3-4 months prior to implementation. Then the professional development activities will occur across two terms (6-7 months). Short-term outcomes can be demonstrated shortly after the learning activities have occurred. Long-term outcomes may begin to surface at the end of the change plan but may more realistically be evident beyond the life of the OIP and assessed as a future consideration.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** This logic model serves as a planning resource and a monitoring/evaluation tool. Progress on the anticipated components of the plan can be regularly reviewed and assessed for successful achievement. The indicators of the outputs in the plan are specific measurable targets for evaluation as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>(Professional Development) Activities</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Unintended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Lead</td>
<td>Conduct classroom observations</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Conduct classroom observations</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change team</td>
<td>Facilitate training sessions (including leadership development)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3 training sessions</td>
<td>Culturally competent faculty and staff</td>
<td>Internally-focused student services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Host lessons learned debrief session</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 lessons learned debrief session</td>
<td>Internationally-focused curriculum</td>
<td>Internationally-focused curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (Student Services)</td>
<td>Complete the organizational culture assessment (pre and post)</td>
<td>International students</td>
<td>Complete a pre and a post organizational culture assessment</td>
<td>Students have cultural knowledge skills to equip them for diverse environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/leadership</td>
<td>Develop recruitment processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target 5% increase in recruitment</td>
<td>Students feel culturally represented in the design of the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students (current and prospective)</td>
<td>Conduct orientation, Deliver coaching sessions, Complete self-assessments Complete project diaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching sessions provided as requested</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% of faculty and 100% of staff complete self-assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection tools (e.g., diaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 project diaries (change team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competing values framework – culture assessment tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for contracted faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Be Determined – These outcomes would be documented if and as they occur. Strategies may be necessary to address them and would be developed as required.
Appendix D

The Goose Story

When you see geese flying along in ‘V’ formation, you might consider what science has discovered as to why they fly in that way. As each bird flaps its wings, it creates uplift for the bird immediately following.

By flying in the ‘V’ formation, the whole flock adds at least 71 percent greater flying range than if the bird in front flew on its own.

Lesson: People who share a common direction and sense of community can get where they are going more quickly and easily because they’re travelling on the thrust of another.

Whenever a goose falls out of formation, it suddenly feels the drag and resistance of trying to fly alone, and quickly gets back in formation to take advantage of the “lifting power” of the bird immediately in front.

Lesson: If we have as much sense as a goose, we will stay in formation with those who are headed where we want to go, and be willing to accept their help as well as give ours to others.

When the lead goose gets tired, it rotates back into formation and another goose flies at the point position.

Lesson: It pays to take turns doing the tasks and sharing leadership.

The geese in formation honk from behind to encourage those up front to keep up their speed.

Lesson: We need to make sure our honking from behind is encouraging and not something else.

When a goose gets sick or wounded, two geese drop out of formation and follow it down to protect it. They stay with it until it is able to fly again or dies. Then they launch out on their own starting another formation, or catch up with the flock.

Lesson: If we have as much sense as geese, we will stand by each other in difficult times as well as when we are strong

Appendix E

Cultural Competence Continuum

An organization’s progression through the competence continuum include the following six stages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Dehumanizes or classifies as subhuman, with and intention of cultural genocide of minority communities, reinforced through attitudes, behaviours, policies, systems, and practices.</td>
<td>● Cultural destruction still happens but it is not intentional because systems and organizations lack the resources, knowledge, and skills to operate</td>
<td>● Believe that all people are the same – race, culture, or country of origin does not matter. And therefore, all service approaches should be universally designed and applied, and would be equally effective</td>
<td>● Recognizes their weaknesses in serving minority communities and strives to make improvements. However, they risk being overly confident in the success of one improvement and then not continuing in their competence journey.</td>
<td>● Accepts and respect differences, continually assess their organization’s culture, continually adapt and make improvements and expand their knowledge and resources to better meet the needs of communities.</td>
<td>● Holds culture in high esteem and advocates for cultural competence system-wide and throughout society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Given the activities of professional development, within the timelines of the change implementation of this OIP, the fifth level, cultural competence is more realistic to strive for.
Appendix F

Demonstration of an Effective Change Management Plan

|---|---|
| An assessment of the organisation and its leadership’s capability for change. | • Identification of the organization’s structure as an organized anarchy and how this model enables change  
• Using Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values framework to assess the organization’s culture  
• Using the distributed leadership approach which is identified as helping organizations to be better able to respond to change, adapt, and be innovative (Leemans, 2017)  
• The professional development activities achieve short-term and long-term change outcomes |
| Identification of any risks and concerns related to people. | • Risk of faculty and staff resistance is minimized by engagement through:  
  o enlisting champions for the change team (Bacon, 2016),  
  o using the distributed leadership approach (Buller, 2015),  
  o structuring the change through peer/professional development lead support and their self-reflection to facilitate sensemaking (Ericson, 2001) |
| Ensuring the stakeholder buy-in for the changes. | • Prioritizing a communication strategy with an initial need for the change communication and ensuring ongoing transparency (Sidhu, 2015)  
• Using the distributed leadership approach in which organization members are engaged, actively involved, and able to influence decisions (Youngs, 2017)  
• The professional development change plan fits with the distributed leadership approach because people value the learning they get from their peers (Kezar & Ecker, 2002) and enables the fostering of a culture of “challenge, feedback and therefore creativity and innovation” (Leemans, 2017, p. 15) |
| Addressing organisational cultural issues that may impact the change success. | • Using Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) competing values framework to assess the current organizational culture and the desired state  
• Recognizing that the desired state will include short-term effects (almost immediately after implementation of the professional development |
| Developing targeted communication strategies. | • Having a communications strategy and ensuring that this is communicated during the need for change communication (Sidhu, 2015)
• Recognition of the communication context and using that in the strategy with faculty and staff, as well as considering in the cultural competency development (Henson, 2013; Smyth, 2015)
• Establishing a change team with representation from across faculty and staff departments, as a medium to champion the change – their participation conveys the message of buy-in to the change (with the idea that actions speak louder than words) |
| Making available the needed training and development opportunities and support. | • The change plan is a professional development intervention supported by the professional development lead
• Executive leadership support enables participation of contracted faculty through compensation for participating and the time for the professional development lead to develop the activities and materials |
| Establishing guidelines and expectations for individual behaviour in response to the current change and future changes. | • Stage five on the cultural competency continuum identified as the desired goal for this OIP
• Short-term (directly linked to the professional development learning in the immediate) and long-term outcomes identified as a result of individual knowledge, skills and behaviour changes over time
• Measurable outputs identified in the plan for achievement |
Appendix G

Communication Strategy Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey
Sample questions

The Likert Scale range of feedback choices for each question include:
■ Not Applicable
■ Not Important
■ Important
■ Very Dissatisfied
■ Dissatisfied
■ Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied
■ Satisfied
■ Very Satisfied

The instructions for completing the survey ask students to:
*Think about how the learning experiences in this program relate to your future, and then rate the importance of, and your satisfaction with the following:*

This program…
■ Provides you with skills and abilities specific to your chosen career.
■ Provides you with skills and abilities helpful for your future life outside of work.
■ Develops your ability to work with others.
■ Teachers are up-to-date/current in their fields.
■ Quality of the learning experiences related to the background theory and concepts of your program.
■ Usefulness of assigned course materials.
■ Usefulness of library/Resource Centre services.
■ Usefulness of academic advising services.
■ Provides an International Office and other international student services.
■ Usefulness of Food Services.
■ Provides Campus Safety and Security services.
■ Provides internet connectivity.
■ Provides recreation and athletics facilities.
■ Ensures cleanliness of buildings and rooms.

This college:
■ Encourages you to spend time on your coursework.
■ Provides support to deal with coursework.
■ Provides information on social opportunities.
■ Provides information on student financial services.