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Abstract

International school students face challenges to their well-being that are unique to their context. This Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) aims to support the social-emotional well-being of Third Culture Kids (TCKs) and English Language Learners (ELLs) at a private, for-profit, international school in South East Asia. It is framed around a Problem of Practice (PoP) based on the need to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of a diverse and international student body. Foundational to this OIP are leadership approaches and lenses of servant leadership, shared leadership, and systems thinking. Bolman & Deal’s (2017) four frames are used as a framework for analysis of change drivers, organizational gaps, and factors affecting organizational change readiness. Necessary changes addressed include alterations to policy, curriculum, training and awareness, equitable access to resources, and school culture. The proposed solutions and framework for leading change are based on the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach of Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros (2008) supplemented with elements of Kotter’s (2014) accelerators model. The AI approach is foundational to the change implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and communication plans and processes in order to facilitate alignment with foundational OIP principles, foster broad stakeholder involvement, and to build on existing strengths in the school and community.
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Executive Summary

This Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) centers on a mid-sized, for-profit international school in South East Asia. The Problem of Practice (PoP) addressed focuses on the lack of specific strategically-aligned programming and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of the school’s diverse and international school community. Existing resources and programs are not aligned with the unique needs of the school’s Third Culture Kid (TCK) and English Language Learner (ELL) student demographic and formal policies do not exist to support the school achieving elements of its stated vision, such as developing community, connection, empathy, and social-emotional skills.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the organizational context that This International School (TIS) is situated within as a highly diverse international school situated in the heart of an expatriate community, and outlines the school’s history, mission and vision, and organizational structure. A leadership position and lens statement centered on social constructivism, servant and shared leadership, and systems thinking is provided, and the aforementioned PoP is described and framed with a PESTE analysis and brief review of relevant themes of well-being, challenges to well-being faced by international school students, school community and culture, and school well-being programming and support. Five positively-worded guiding questions that emerge from the PoP are provided as a basis for subsequent Appreciative Inquiry (AI) centered processes in the chapters to follow. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames are enlisted as a lens through which to examine key change drivers in the organization to construct a leadership vision for change and to analyze organizational change readiness.

Chapter 2 describes a process of OIP planning and development centered on Appreciative Inquiry (AI) supplemented by Kotter’s (2014) accelerators as a
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framework for leading the change process that enacts leadership approaches to change grounded in shared leadership, servant leadership, and systems thinking. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames are applied again to frame a critical organizational analysis. This gap analysis is used to determine necessary organizational changes which are subsequently analyzed using Starratt’s (1991) three ethics of critique, justice, and caring to ensure that ethical approaches to leadership and change are undertaken. Finally, four possible solutions centered on AI-based approaches are proposed and evaluated based on the degree to which they address the gaps and necessary changes, and the resources required to implement them. Based on this evaluation, a fifth solution is synthesized to best address the necessary changes most efficiently: a parallel process involving a school-wide AI well-being summit and emergent volunteer change teams alongside AI learning teams comprising members of the Guidance, English as an Additional Language (EAL), and Student Support Departments.

Chapter 3 focuses on describing how the systems thinking and shared and servant leadership practices are articulated through AI approaches and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators in plans that outline how the solution synthesized in Chapter 2 will be implemented, monitored and evaluated, and communicated. A two-year implementation timeline for the parallel solution components, the AI well-being summit and AI learning teams, is provided that leverages multiple existing school-wide processes. A monitoring and evaluation plan is then provided which similarly leverages existing school-wide processes according to a framework of iterative PDSA cycles described by the strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycle (Sheppard et al., 2009). This process is adapted to address the AI 4-D phases and apply affirmative AI evaluation questions aligned with the guiding questions emerging from the PoP outlined in Chapter 1. Finally, a communication plan that leverages existing
communications media, processes and structures emerging from the change implementation and monitoring and evaluation plans, and informal communications to apply a systems thinking approach to change leadership and reinforce the AI principles foundational to the plan is provided.

The OIP concludes with four next steps and future considerations that focus on ensuring the sustainability of the processes and initiatives resulting from the implementation of the OIP. First, the publication of a school-wide student well-being policy and its communication to stakeholders is suggested. Second, the continued monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of appropriate guidance curriculum standards in-line with the school’s existing curriculum review cycles is offered as a means to ensure sustained progress within that department. Third, further application of AI summit and learning team processes to support other pathways to student well-being outlined in an existing TIS Well-being Strategy Proposal (TIS, 2019h) is suggested as a means to further support student well-being. Finally, engaging other schools in the region in conversations and actions to support student well-being through professional learning events or regional AI summits is suggested as a means of changing the broader educational context as an approach to systems thinking in school leadership in support of international student well-being.
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Glossary of Terms

**Appreciative Inquiry (AI):** collaborative organizational inquiry into what makes the organization successful to direct further efforts to create positive change (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008, p. 46)

**Boutique school:** a school offering a more individualized and community-focused approach to a smaller student population (Apple, 2006)

**Community:** the students, parents, faculty, staff, and administrators the school and the relationships they share

**Culture:** a collective social process of interpretation taking place in a “shared frame of reference of beliefs, expressive symbols, and values” (Connolly, James, & Beales, 2011; Alvesson, 2002, p. 5).

**Expatriate (expat):** a person who lives outside of their native country

**International school:** an internationally-oriented school that delivers an English-medium curriculum other than a country’s national curriculum to preschool, primary, or secondary students (ISC, 2015).

**Servant leadership:** leadership approach that seeks to ensure that the most pressing needs of others are served first and results in those served growing to become healthier, wiser, and more likely to lead as servants themselves (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 15)

**Shared leadership:** dynamic interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals (Pearce & Conger, 2003, p. 1)

**Systems School Leadership (SSL):** approach to school leadership grounded in systems thinking and based on leading wholes, adopting a multidimensional view,
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influencing indirectly, and evaluating significance (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b, p. 798)

**Systems thinking:** way of thinking focusing on seeing wholes, relationships between connected elements, and patterns of change (Senge, 2006, p. 68)

**Third Culture Kid (TCK):** students born or living abroad experiencing a mobile, cross-cultural upbringing (Useem, Useem, & Donoghue, 1963, p. 169)

**Well-being:** experiencing positive emotional experiences and healthy responses to difficulty emotions, engagement in activities, healthy relationships, meaning through service to others, and accomplishment of goals (Seligman, 2011, p. 30).
Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem

From university students abroad to ‘Third Culture Kids’ (TCKs) and ‘elite’ locals in private international schools, to refugees and indigenous learners encountering national culture and curricula in public schools and local students learning international curricula in their national schools, the multifaceted nature of international education in the 21st century is undeniable. The myriad realities that international education comprises present students with as many challenges as they do opportunities. Not only must students deal with pressures faced in national contexts, like the rigors of standardized testing and pressure to achieve, they must also deal with issues unique to their international status. Given the pressures students face, how can educators support students’ well-being and success in international schools? Any answer to this question must address the unique context of the individual international school in question and the unique experiences faced by the international students it serves.

Organizational Context

The school of focus in this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) is a privately owned, for-profit international school in South East Asia that has been in operation for over 25 years and serves a predominantly expatriate community. In the context of this OIP, an international school is defined as an internationally-oriented school that provides an English-medium curriculum other than the national curriculum to any combination of students from preschool to secondary (ISC, 2015). To anonymize data and members of the school community, the school will be known as This International School (TIS) for the duration of this OIP. The school offers an American preschool to grade 12 curriculum through the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP), Middle Years Programme (MYP), and
Diploma Programme (DP) instructional frameworks. TIS is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Schools Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACS WASC) and licensed and certified by its host nation’s Ministry of Education (MOE).

A well-being strategy proposal designed to align existing supports within a framework for holistic school community well-being was put forward to the School Head to address recommendations from ACS WASC accreditation reports and is awaiting further review (ACS WASC, 2018; TIS, 2019h). Existing student well-being supports are managed and implemented by the elementary, middle, and high school counselors in the TIS Guidance Department in collaboration with homeroom, learning support, and English as an Additional Language (EAL) teachers. Existing services include walk-in and scheduled one-to-one counseling for academic and social-emotional well-being issues, targeted intervention supports based on parent or teacher recommendations, monthly counselor-led elementary school advisory lessons, and bi-weekly teacher-conducted advisory lessons in middle and high school (TIS, 2019f).

TIS’s stated vision includes articulated values of community, connection, empathy, positivity, excellence, and diversity. The school’s stated mission involves developing students’ creativity, social and emotional skills, and academic talents. As an IB World School, TIS pursues the IB Learner Profile and strives to develop students who are inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced, and reflective (IBO, 2019). TIS also strives to promote international mindedness within the school community. International mindedness is broadly defined by the IB as a relational and intra-personal process of reflecting on how individuals perceive and interact with others from diverse cultures and understand ourselves in relation to them (Hacking, 2016).
A strong sense of community is maintained and valued by leadership, faculty, and families in the school (ACS WASC, 2018). This sense of TIS being a ‘community’ focused school is strengthened by its central location within a suburban development where the majority of the students enrolled at the school reside within walking distance. There is an active parent association and family involvement in school activities is generally high. Individual classes have a parent representative tasked with communicating information regarding both class-focused and school-wide information and managing a budget for class activities, and groups of parent volunteers organize many holiday and culture-related school functions.

TIS serves a student body of approximately 600 students with just over 90 faculty members for the 2019-2020 school year. The student demographic includes students from over 55 different nations with no single nation comprising more than 20% of the student body, and the teaching and administrative faculty is similarly diverse and broadly representative of the student community with individuals from just under 20 nations (TIS, 2019e). Approximately 10% of the student body are host national students, and almost 90% could be classified as ‘Third Culture Kids’ (TCKs): students born abroad experiencing a mobile, cross-cultural upbringing (Useem, Useem, & Donoghue, 1963). The expatriate students’ parents are typically involved in business, technology, energy, banking, or diplomacy in TIS’s host country. Host national students’ parents are typically successful entrepreneurs or professionals working in government foreign service (TIS, 2019c). Yearly turnover within the TIS student population is high: the average length of student enrollment is just over 3 years before transferring to another school. Since the school’s founding, the student population has been shifting from a majority Western European demographic to
include larger numbers of expatriate students from East Asia and the Middle East, many of whom receive EAL support. (ACS WASC, 2015; ACS WASC, 2018).

The student population at TIS is divided into elementary, middle and high school divisions. One principal oversees the elementary division and another principal oversees the middle and high divisions. Department heads, directors, and coordinators in the areas of learning, information technology (IT), the individual International Baccalaureate (IB) Programmes, and athletics & activities lend administrative support. Additional support staff manage human resources, finances, clerical tasks, technology, maintenance, marketing, communications, and security. A Business Director oversees the non-academic portion of the work done at TIS. Figure 1 summarizes the organizational structure of TIS and formal leadership hierarchies within the school.

![TIS Simplified Organizational Chart](image)

Figure 1. TIS Simplified Organizational Chart

The School Head is the Chief Educational Officer of the school and works directly with the Board of Directors and the Chairman of the Board of Directors who is the owner of the school. Host national law requires that schools have a Board of
Governors, but it is a pro forma committee for independent private schools. The financial base for the school derives primarily from tuition fees, but the owner supplements this to strengthen capital and technology infrastructure. As a result, year to year departmental budgets may fluctuate due to changes in student enrollment and emergent needs resulting in capital expenditures. These factors will need to be accounted for when addressing possible financial resource supports for this OIP.

Recently, school enrollment at TIS decreased due to global changes in commodity prices that affected a number of companies employing expatriate professionals in the region of the school’s host nation. As companies downsized operations, expatriate employees and trailing family members were relocated. Consequently, foreign businesses serving this expatriate population downsized in turn, further reducing the number of expatriate families in the region. These local demographic shifts resulted in a significant drop in enrollment in a number of regional international schools, TIS included. As a result, TIS is seeking to redefine its value proposition and market itself along the lines of a ‘boutique school’ offering a more individualized and community-focused approach to a smaller student population (Apple, 2006). The Board and ownership remain willing to invest significant capital resources to improve TIS facilities and programming despite reduced enrollment. However, all such capital expenditures, including any required to support this OIP, would be expected to provide high-impact and visible improvement to school infrastructure and resources in order to be approved and funded given the economic context of the school.

The dominant leadership strategies implemented within the school vary. Within the business and operations side of the school, a traditional management hierarchy exists with executive leadership supervising and goal-setting and functional
leadership distributed to individual department heads. In the academic divisions of the school, the management hierarchy is flatter by comparison, with stakeholder input frequently sought out and considered in decision-making processes. Both the elementary and middle and high school principals engage department heads, grade leaders, and general faculty in decision-making processes related to curriculum implementation and logistics.

Within the elementary division, transformational approaches to leadership are used to create personal connections to change in faculty members to generate buy-in and maintain momentum through multi-year, multi-stage change processes such as IB authorization (Cawsey, Deszca, & Ingols, 2016). A culture of collaborative inquiry has been developed within the faculty and is nurtured by leadership and faculty alike. For example, a number of curriculum-related changes and decisions have previously been initiated as a result of teacher feedback and have been facilitated through teacher involvement in decision-making committees and teacher-led professional development sessions.

Similarly, within the middle and high school divisions inquiry and faculty engagement are also supported. Committees made up of department heads and teacher volunteers are commonly created to address change processes and the implementation of new processes and procedures in the division. The motivation for this approach is pragmatic: small departments and complex scheduling parameters necessitate direct faculty input to ensure that details are not overlooked. Additionally, the desire to retain staff and avoid frequent faculty turnover in difficult-to-fill specialist positions leads to engaging faculty input to ensure their well-being and job satisfaction (Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012; Odland & Ruzicka, 2009).
In both divisions formal middle leadership responsibilities and agency are generally limited to channeling communications between principals and faculty. However, individual middle leaders are encouraged and supported in initiatives should they be proposed to division principals or other school leaders. For example, division-wide professional development on academic honesty and citations software use for middle and high school students was initiated in the 2018-2019 school year as a result of a teacher-initiated proposal.

At the strategic level, heads of various departments providing academic support services such as admissions, curriculum, and communications functions, operate with a great degree of freedom and agency. The School Head meets with both individual academic administrative directors and the entire administrative council on a bi-weekly basis to ensure that initiatives are aligned with TIS’s needs and vision and to provide support and direction as needed. Neoliberal stakeholder desires for “high academic standards” (Tarc, 2009, p. 68) and support for global mobility and transferable credentials are a part of these conversations only insofar as they address legitimate student needs in a globalized world and the organization’s need to market itself to its customer base (Resnik, 2012).

In summary, TIS is a truly international school serving a diverse community of expatriate and host national students. It exists geographically and symbolically in the center of the neighborhood and ‘community’ is central to the school’s vision. As a private, for-profit school, TIS must respond both to the needs and desires of the families it serves and to the expectations of international accrediting and authorizing agencies while ensuring that the organization remains financially sustainable. TIS leadership must balance sometimes conflicting pressures from these stakeholders.
while ensuring that the changes resulting from their influence align with its vision of ensuring the holistic development and well-being of its students.

**Leadership Position and Lens Statement**

How to motivate and sustain positive organizational change depends upon the context in which the leader operates (Cawsey et al., 2016; Fullan, 2006a). I say ‘positive’ change because the idea of a static school is illusory; organizations are collections of individuals whose actions change with every interaction in the processes they enact (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). The challenge that change leaders face is reining in the constant change and directing it towards positive ends (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002).

The Director of Learning (DOL) is a new position in the school as of the 2018-2019 school year and I am the first to fill the role. The position was created to combine the responsibilities of a departed Director of Curriculum and heads of department of the Information Technology and Information Literacy and Student Support Departments as part of organizational restructuring to address budget constraints resulting from decreased student enrollment. The position was also created to ensure support for new and future programs and initiatives across divisions. The position provides agency to engage with administrative directors to collaborate on long term strategy and division principals to direct programming and curriculum articulation school-wide.

According to Creswell (2014), the worldview of an individual will affect the assumptions they bring to their work. A knowledge and understanding of the paradigms and worldviews that drive their actions can benefit scholar-practitioners acting as leaders of organizational change by enhancing innovation and creativity in
their approach, helping in meaning-making, and allowing for creative reflection through change processes (Adams & Buetow, 2014).

Adams and Buetow (2014) describe how theory can act both as a ‘content antecedent’, driving the ideas behind an inquiry, or a ‘method antecedent,’ driving the methods, in research-based action (p. 97). They list a number of theories as examples of ‘methodologies’ within the category of ‘method antecedents’ that correspond to Creswell’s four worldviews: the post-positivist, pragmatist, participatory, and constructivist, in addition to others (pp. 100-102). In some cases, one might argue that some of the methodologies listed could also serve as ‘content antecedents’, especially in the field of educational practice, in determining the ideas that drive organizational change planning. For example, initiatives related to changing pedagogical approaches within an organization might seek to promote constructivist or indigenous pedagogies. Transformative worldviews influence not only the method but also the meaning and goals of change processes (Creswell, 2014, p. 10). Clearly, a change leader’s worldview informs the goals of the change initiatives they plan and the means they use to carry them out.

Reflecting on Creswell’s (2014) descriptions of worldview and Adam & Buetow’s (2014) six layer framework for understanding how theory influences dissertation arguments, I currently position myself in a worldview grounded in social constructivism and drawing upon participatory and advocacy practices and ideals from the transformative worldview. Creswell describes a social constructivist approach as one in which individuals develop understandings and negotiate meanings socially through cultural norms to arrive at context specific results (Creswell, 2014). I enact and embody this worldview through a predisposition towards shared and servant leadership practices in my work as a school leader. By engaging in democratic
leadership practices and leading through service to community goals I seek to create a space in which all stakeholders are provided the agency and capacity to engage in the co-creation of shared change visions. My leadership approach is based on a dedication to strengthening and supporting students, faculty, and families in the school community by aligning systems, structures, policies, and practices towards the achievement of shared school vision. Servant leadership, shared leadership, and systems thinking are the underlying leadership approaches that act as frameworks for the development of this OIP, articulated primarily through application of philosophies, processes, and ideals of the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) change methodology which is grounded in social constructivist theory, participatory and democratic practices, and transformative and generative change outcomes (Bushe, 2013; Bushe & Kassam, 2005) and Kotter’s (2014) accelerator model based on shared visions, volunteerism, and hierarchy transcending networks that engage multiple actors from throughout the organization in synergistic action. Principles of servant leadership act as shared moral commitments that empower and sustain shared leadership as the primary leadership approach enacted in this OIP. Systems thinking strategies are applied throughout the change planning process to best leverage existing systems, drivers, and tools to support the implementation of the change.

**Servant leadership.** Servant leadership was first introduced in an essay by Robert K. Greenleaf (1970) who described the approach as one that seeks to ensure that the most pressing needs of others are served first and results in those served growing to become healthier, wiser, and more likely to lead as servants themselves (p. 15). Sergiovanni (2013) states that servant leadership can be provided best by ensuring that the values and ideals of the school as an organization and community are served as a shared commitment (p. 377). Ideally, if schools are considered
communities of learners, efforts towards school improvement will improve the school’s culture in such a way that stakeholders will eventually be able to continue to sustain their future learning themselves (Barth, 1990). To achieve this goal, leadership practices can be viewed as a developmental process through which initial command and instructional leadership practices might be applied to develop capacity towards a point at which faculty can share burdens of leadership and service to the school (Sergiovanni, 2013, p. 377).

Servant leadership is an approach that resonates at TIS due to the focus on the school as a community. Johnson (1990) and Greenfield (1991) find that practices related to shared ideals rooted in a moral commitment to children become duties that teachers willingly take part in. A significant portion of the TIS teaching faculty and administration have children enrolled in TIS and already feel deeply connected to the organization’s ongoing success on a personal level. As a new member of the school leadership team, it is important that I build trusting relationships with the school’s teaching faculty and staff and gain insight into the school’s culture and needs. Preskill and Broadfield (2009) examine how authentic communication as defined by Habermas facilitates servant leadership when leaders ‘listen first’. Listening and learning can help leaders understand the motivations and perspectives of stakeholders to better solve organizational problems and prevent new problems from arising (Murphy, 2013, p. 35). Principles of servant leadership will be called upon in this OIP to drive and maintain desire for change among stakeholders as a shared moral commitment to support shared leadership as the primary leadership approach enacted in this OIP.

**Shared leadership.** Shared leadership is the natural extension of servant leadership and another leadership approach underlying this OIP (Sergiovanni, 2013).
In the context of this OIP, shared leadership will be defined as “a dynamic interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals” (Pearce & Conger, 2003, p. 1). Shared leadership seeks to promote democratic participation of all members of the school community through advisory councils and other groups (Gordon & Louis, 2013; Ospina, Foldy, Fairhurst, & Jackson, 2020). One way of viewing the relationship between schools and communities, especially in private international schools, is that of client-customer accountability (Riley & Louis, 2004). Further support for the approach is a professional model in which expert practitioners require cooperation from clients to carry out prescribed actions (Gordon & Louis, 2013). However, moving beyond the view of parents as ‘clients’ to one that sees them as ‘partners’ can lead to more meaningful engagement (p. 361). Shared leadership practices have been shown to lead to more meaningful community, parent, and youth engagement and collaboration between traditionally competing groups (Mediratta, Fruchter, and Lewis, 2002; Mediratta, Shah, & McAlister, 2008). Parents, teachers, and other stakeholders selected for involvement may lack the language and expertise to be participative, so school leaders should determine training needs and provide instruction on shared governance and other topics as required (Gordon & Louis, 2013; Hambright & Diamantes, 2004).

The active parent community that supports TIS is a resource that it would be remiss to exclude from school improvement initiatives. As a private, international school, viewing community members as clients to whom the school is accountable is not only an apt metaphor: it is a fact. Engaging the parent community in an initiative to support student well-being will allow parents to support the organization in addressing students’ emotional needs holistically. Furthermore, efforts to educate
parents as stakeholders in their children’s well-being may support their own well-being as well: many of our students are second-generation TCKs with parents who may have encountered similar challenges to their children and the school’s many first generation expatriate parents share common challenges of adapting and transitioning to life abroad (Bridglall, 2015). This is another opportunity for TIS to serve the broader school community.

**Systems thinking.** Systems thinking is described by Peter Senge (2006) as “a discipline for seeing wholes” and “a framework for seeing interrelationships [and] . . . patterns of change” (p. 68). Sterman (2000, p. 4) writes that systems thinking involves the understanding that the world is complex and made up of connected elements. Systems thinking can be a useful tool for school leaders to use in managing schools as organizations (Benoliel, Shaked, Nadav, & Schechter, 2019; Shaked & Schechter, 2013a; Shaked & Schechter, 2019). Systems thinking and the holistic view have been used to support the inclusion of parents as an integral part in school learning communities to support innovation (Price-Mitchell, 2009; Shaked & Schechter, 2013a). Shaked and Schechter’s (2013b) Systems School Leadership (SSL) approach presents four characteristics of how to apply systems thinking to school leadership: leading wholes (considering how individual parts influence one another), a multidimensional view (considering multiple consequences and options for any issue), influencing indirectly (applying indirect action aware of connections between elements), and evaluating significance (determining the importance of different issues) (p. 806).

As a PreK-12 school, TIS is a complex organization with many systems interacting to support the functioning of the entire school. Systems thinking offers a framework for engaging with the complexity of the organization and bringing
together the numerous systems, structures, and stakeholders within the school as an organization to affect positive institutional change. It aligns and provides a framework for enacting shared leadership approaches by valuing multiple perspectives and the influence of multiple stakeholders in addressing issues and determining their significance (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). Systems thinking further reinforces the value of servant leadership approaches by supporting inclusive practices that find value in the input of all stakeholders in the organization irrespective of hierarchies (Price-Mitchell, 2009; Shaked & Schechter, 2013a). Given the situational factors affecting student well-being, any approach should focus, at least in part, on systemic whole-school and community well-being. Committees of school and community stakeholders should be formed to address local issues affecting well-being, and policy directives should systemically address well-being in all stakeholders, not only students (Ott, Hibbert, Rodger, & Lescheid, 2017, p. 13).

In summary, the author’s position as DOL offers ample opportunity to effect change through collaboration with administrators and teachers throughout the organization to apply leadership approaches based on philosophies of servant leadership, shared leadership, and systems thinking in alignment with the needs of the organization.

Leadership Problem of Practice

The Problem of Practice (PoP) that will be addressed in this OIP is the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse and international school student body. International school leaders overseeing school-wide programming and planning are in a position to launch programs to address the needs of the communities they serve (Stewart & Bailey,
Despite this, TIS has no clearly-stated well-being policy and programming in place to address the unique needs of its international student body.

TIS’s existing school guidance curriculum, based on the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) standards, is not specifically aligned to address the unique challenges of the school’s international student body (Committee for Children, 2018). Third Culture Kids (TCKs) must deal with unique issues of identity, cross-cultural shock, and unresolved feelings of grief due to transitory friendships that ASCA standards do not address (Kwon, 2019; Hayden, 2012). TIS guidance counselors report cases of expatriate students and families in distress: instances of self-harm, mental illness, and emotional difficulties stemming from the stress of frequent transitions. A student-created documentary screened on campus shared personal stories of TCK students struggling to transition when moving to new schools (TIS, 2019a), a common challenge to well-being among international school students (Higgins & Wigford, 2018). TIS has an ethical responsibility to address these pressing challenges to student well-being in line with its stated mission, vision, and values supportive of social-emotional development in a compassionate and caring community (TIS, 2019e).

Changing demographics are resulting in growing numbers of ELL students who face challenges to both learning and socializing in a second language (Sears, 2012) and to adapting to newly implemented international curricula (Baily, 2015). TIS students and parents also report stress arising due to the rigors of the IB curriculum, a common complaint among IB students enrolled in the program world-wide and international school students in general (Higgins & Wigford, 2018; Shaunessy & Suldo, 2010, p. 128). TIS’s accrediting agencies and stakeholder surveys suggest that student welfare and care should be a priority to be addressed in long-term strategic
plans (ACS WASC, 2018; [Author], 2017; [Author], 2018, [Author], 2019). This aligns with findings of recent large-scale studies of student well-being in international schools that state the need for schools to implement systems to support students who face challenges to well-being (Higgins & Wigford, 2018; Viac & Fraser, 2020).

The following four questions emerge: In what ways does TIS show that it supports and values the well-being of its students and community? How can existing efforts to promote student well-being at TIS be aligned, amplified, and/or expanded to build on the strengths of the school community and ensure the flourishing well-being of our students? What systems, programs, and policies can be implemented and integrated by TIS to cater to the specific needs of the diverse international school student population at TIS and support their social and emotional well-being? How can TIS both leverage and ensure the sustainability of the strong sense of community within the school in order to holistically address student well-being?

Framing the Problem of Practice

PESTE analysis. A PESTE analysis helps change leaders ensure that initiatives accurately address and account for a school’s unique environmental contexts (Cawsey et al., 2016). It addresses five dimensions of the organizational environment: the political, economic, sociological, technological, and ecological/environmental. Within the context of this OIP, the political, economic, and sociological dimensions will be analyzed.

Political dimension. As a private international school, TIS acts without direct political government oversight. However, as a for-profit school, the expectations and policies of multiple stakeholders such as accrediting organizations, parents, and the board must be balanced to ensure stability and successful outcomes for the school as an organization within the political dimension. TIS is an ACS WASC-accredited
school and must address certain criteria and recommendations to maintain its status (ACS WASC, 2016). As such, alignment of school initiatives and processes with ACS WASC recommendations is of great importance. The TIS community is composed of students, parents, teachers, and support staff representing over 55 nationalities, each with their own expectations and perceptions of what best practice in schools looks like based on the systems and policies of their home nations. The external influence of global actors like UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP, OECD and World Bank apply neoliberal pressure to improve and measure school performance across academic indicators deemed important to nations’ performance in the global economy (Pollack & Hauseman, 2016; OECD, 2018; UNDP, n.d.; UNESCO, 2012; UNICEF, n.d.; World Bank, 2018). As well-being is increasingly linked to global competencies and 21st-century skill development (OECD, 2014), support for schools pursuing well-being in education among these groups is high. TIS must try to balance and account for the diversity of experience and opinion of the community it serves with regard to how to address these shared goals.

**Economic dimension.** The economic dimension includes the need to reassess TIS’s value proposition and identity as a for-profit institution in response to declining enrollment resulting from global economic changes and the need to ensure sustainable and responsible use of school funds to address initiatives. Decreases in student enrollment limit TIS’s ability to launch large-scale initiatives without first ensuring that resources will be present to support and sustain them over the longer term. The willingness of families to support extra costs through tuition increases is limited due to TIS’s status as a top-tier school with correspondingly high tuition fees. Additionally, TIS is seeking to broaden the scope of the community that it serves by
seeking opportunities to provide services to support a larger population of ELL students for whom English is a second language in order to bolster enrollment.

**Sociological dimension.** Finally, sociological elements include the growing global interest in student well-being and the presence of multiple sub-cultures within the student body and how a culture of well-being can be fostered to meet the needs of these different groups. Though TIS serves a predominantly expatriate student body, the community also includes a sizable group of host national students. Additionally, a sub-culture of students for whom English is a second language is an increasingly large demographic within the school. TIS’s role as a center for the neighborhood expatriate community also presents challenges as families expect and require additional support as they adapt and integrate into their new lives in a new country.

**Well-being.** In addition to TIS’s need to address student well-being in response to stakeholder feedback and ACS WASC recommendations, student well-being is a concept that is a growing focus of research and discussion in the international school sector (Higgins & Wigford, 2018; Viac & Fraser, 2020). Most current research views well-being as being multi-dimensional and involving individual and community perceptions of wellness (Mansfield, Daykin, & Kay, 2020, p. 1). For the purpose of this OIP, well-being will be viewed through a social-emotional lens and defined in alignment with Seligman’s (2011) PERMA framework: experiencing *positive emotional* experiences and healthy responses to difficulty emotions, *engagement* in activities, healthy *relationships*, *meaning* through service to others, and *accomplishment* of goals (p. 39). This definition aligns with the TIS mission, vision, and values, and supports the development of a positive change vision. Research has established that faculty well-being is important for job commitment and motivation (Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012), and that it plays a significant
role in faculty turnover (Odland & Ruzicka, 2009). There is also evidence to support a reciprocal relationship between staff and student well-being and achievement (Brinder & Dewberry, 2007; Day & Qing, 2009; Spit, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011; Viac & Fraser, 2020) and that whole school approaches to well-being may be the best way to address these concerns (Higgins & Wigford, 2018).

**Challenges to international school student well-being.** While all students face challenges in their studies and mental-emotional development, the unique challenges facing international school students are legion: intense academic stress, place identity issues, cross-cultural shock, and unresolved grief due to transitory friendships and a life uprooted (Hayden, 2012). Diverse campuses of mobile students may include varying proportions of host nation students in close contact with transplanted students from foreign lands and cultures, either of whom may need to communicate and learn in a language they don’t speak fluently. In addition, students and parents in international schools often report feeling pressure due to the rigors of the IB curriculum (Shaunessy & Suldo, 2010).

**Academic Stress.** Nurses report that stress resulting from the high academic demands placed on them by school and parent expectations is a cause of negative health consequences such as headaches, exhaustion, and anxiety in international school students, and that these symptoms increase during testing, exam, and parent conference periods (Hansson, Clausson, & Janlov, 2012). Similar reports of students seeking health and well-being services to deal with overbearing academic stress have been reported by international school counselors (Inman, Ngoubene-Atioky, Ladany, & Mack, 2009). These global findings are mirrored in reports from TIS counselors and nurses. IB students have reported experiencing mental exhaustion and responding to academic stress by sleeping, which may be an effort to cope unique to AP and IB
students who are at greater risk for sleep deprivation than others (Suldo, Dedrick, Shaunessy-Dedrick, Fefer, & Ferron, 2015). This stress extends even to academically gifted IB students, who have been found more likely to experience high levels of academic stress and to experience negative outcomes due to stress more frequently than non-gifted peers (Shaunessy & Suldo, 2010).

**English Language Learner Well-being.** One challenge that international students may experience is studying in an English language medium while learning English as an Additional Language (EAL). EAL students who need mental and emotional well-being support can struggle to access resources available to them in the school due to limited English ability and experience additional stress and embarrassment due to communication challenges during visits to support providers (Hansson et al., 2012). High school EAL students report being excluded from groups resulting in negative feelings of marginalization due to language barriers (Sears, 2012).

**Expatriate Third Culture Kid Well-being.** Even international school students fluent in the language of instruction face challenges, especially if they find themselves studying abroad in a country different from that of their birth. Third Culture Kids (TCKs) are defined as children who experience a mobile, cross-cultural upbringing (Useem, Useem, & Donoghue, 1963). The vast majority of students at TIS meet this description. TCKs face context-specific health and well-being issues resulting from their transient lifestyle, in particular their unique psycho-social challenges and needs (Kwon, 2019; Hansson et al., 2012). These challenges stem from the multiple transitions that they face in their early development due to their transient lifestyle, especially as they result in stress due to grief, culture shock, and issues of identity formation.
Unresolved grief and culture shock. Unresolved grief and culture shock are experiences that are more frequently expressed in TCKs than by students in non-international school contexts. Many TCKs experience multiple transitions and moves to other countries and cultures throughout their childhood (Dixon & Hayden, 2008). Elementary-age international school students have exhibited symptoms of culture shock during transitions to new schools and feel unresolved grief due to missing friends and family members (Bjornsen, 2020; Dixon & Hayden, 2008; Lijadi & Van Schalkwyk, 2017). These reports are confirmed by the experiences of nurses and counselors in international schools who report children exhibiting physical symptoms resulting from stress due to homesickness and alienation, and that the majority of visits to international school guidance counselors are for help coping with cultural transitions, culture shock, and losses due to frequent moves (Hansson et al., 2012; Inman et al., 2009).

TCKs and identity. The experience of identity in TCKs is often as fluid as their physical orientation on the globe. Place identity, a sense of belonging and meaning making related to a place, is central to identity development (Easthope, 2009; Seamon, 2011). Usually, place identity relates to a connection one develops to the place they grew up (Creswell, 2004). Since TCKs often lack lasting ties to a specific place, their sense of belongingness is often questioned and their experience of personal identity tends to be in a constant state of confusion or flux (Bjornsen, 2020; Bowman, 2001; Brown & Perkins, 1992; Easthope, 2009; Sears, 2011). TCKs may struggle with maintaining an integrated concept of self as it relates to the idea of ‘home’ and identifying themselves as members of a national or global culture (Bagnall, 2012; Sears, 2011). While less mobile individuals can easily attach aspects of their personal identity to their home nation, TCKs rely much more on experiences
of social relationships to define their identity, and adolescent TCKs face greater challenges when defining their identities than other students (Lijadi & Van Schalkwyk, 2017).

**School culture and community.** School culture as it relates to curriculum, staff, and student demographics, plays an important role in identity building and forging a sense of well-being within an international school community (Bagnall, 2012). In the context of this OIP, the school community will be defined as comprising TIS school administrators, teachers, support staff, students and their families, and recognize the social and emotional relationships that exist between individuals and groups. School culture will be defined as a collective social process of interpretation taking place in a “shared frame of reference of beliefs, expressive symbols, and values” (Connolly, James, & Beales, 2011; Alvesson, 2002, p. 5). Since some students experience the school as their ‘true’ home, it is important that schools support the perception of a school culture that values and supports mobility, transition, and adaptation as normal, positive processes to account for many students’ experiences as global nomads (Sears, 2011). Ensuring that the school culture is open and inclusive towards multiple cultures and mother tongues and fostering inclusive school cultures can also support student well-being and reduce the possible experience of shame and humiliation in EAL students (Lijadi & Schalkwyk, 2017; Sears, 2012).

**Well-being programming, support, and training.** International school students have counseling and support needs that differ from their non-international peers, with counselors reporting more case work relating to mental and emotional issues than to academic support and college prep (Inman et al., 2009). Additionally, TIS counselors report challenges addressing the college preparation needs of a student body applying to universities across the globe with different entry requirements and
student housing resources. Students also require less support with school violence or gang-related issues compared with support for transitions and identity development (Inman et al., 2009). Suldo et al. (2015) underline the importance for students in challenging international programs like the IB to develop a self-awareness of their coping strategies for dealing with academic stress in order to manage it more effectively. Shaunessy and Suldo (2010) state the importance of raising awareness of the availability of school supports, especially for gifted students who may not access them as frequently.

In addition to modifying programming to meet the context-specific needs of the international student body, strengthening existing functions can also help to support well-being. Dixon & Hayden (2008) specifically suggest that better organized ‘transition buddy’ programs to link established students with new students to support their entry into the school might benefit from more central organization, detailed ‘buddy’ selection criteria, monitoring, and training for students to better understand their roles.

To facilitate the provision of context-specific international school programming and support services, specialized training and professional development should be provided to counseling staff relating to serving students with multiple cultural identities and meeting the needs of the TCK student population (Inman et al., 2009). In addition, opportunities for student support staff networking and administrative support related to role clarity and communication within the school can support counselors in their work to ensure the mental and emotional well-being of the students they serve (Inman et al., 2009).

In summary, TIS faces the challenge of achieving its vision of providing for the intellectual, creative, social-emotional well-being and development of its diverse
international student body while addressing a shifting student demographic brought on by regional economic trends and global neoliberal pressures. The challenge is complex and involves numerous actors with occasionally differing goals. The question of how to address this challenge should leverage the school’s current programming and sense of community to bring together the diverse actors and forces to work towards a shared goal.

**Guiding Questions Emerging from Problem of Practice**

The questions that we ask determine what we discover in our processes of inquiry and thus plan for and shape future realities (Cooperrider, Barrett, & Srivastva, 1995; Gergen, 2009; Orem, Binkert, & Clancy; 2011). Central to this OIP are principles of Appreciative Inquiry (AI), a strengths-based change methodology first put forward by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987). The AI process is a collaborative organizational inquiry into what makes the organization successful to direct further efforts to create positive change (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008).

Five core principles underpin AI and impact the nature of the questions chosen to direct inquiry: the ‘constructionist principle’ which suggests that a positive perception of change will lead to positive outcomes, the ‘principle of simultaneity’ which views inquiry and change as concurrent, intrinsically interconnected processes, the ‘poetic principle’ which suggests that the topic chosen for study impacts the results of the inquiry, the ‘anticipatory principle’ which connects current expectations to future results, and the ‘positive principle’ which focuses on a strengths-based approach as opposed to a problem-solving approach (Cooperrider et al., 2008). The five core principles reinforce the need to select powerful, positively worded, vision-focused questions to guide inquiry. Whitney et al. (2002) describe positive questions aligned to the AI approach as seeking “...to uncover and bring out the best in a
person, a situation, or an organization” (p. 65). The following five guiding questions are designed to reinforce the importance of the topic of inquiry and align with the four stages of the AI “4-D” cycle: Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

The first guiding question: “Why is it important that TIS work to ensure the well-being of its students?” reinforces the validity of the PoP and can engage stakeholders in meaning-making related to the affirmative topic, defining the topic of inquiry (Priest, Kaufman, Brunton, & Seibel, 2013).

The second guiding question: “In what ways does TIS show that it supports and values the well-being of its students and community?” aligns with the Discovery phase of the 4-D AI cycle in that it prompts inquiry to uncover the strengths that exist in the school’s current approach to supporting well-being (Cooperrider et al., 2018). It also addresses the need for the emergence of positive and energizing statements of opportunity to create urgency for change (Kotter, 2014).

The third guiding question: “How can existing efforts to promote student well-being at TIS be aligned, amplified, and/or expanded to build on the strengths of the school community and ensure the flourishing well-being of our students?” aligns with the Dream phase of the 4-D AI cycle by prompting inquiry into how to creatively leverage opportunities and envision a successful outcome based on the school’s positive core (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It further aligns with Kotter’s (2014) description of the change accelerating function of strategic visions formation and addresses the potential of using systems thinking to analyze existing elements in the organization and reconsider their interactions (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

The fourth guiding question: “What systems, programs, and policies can be implemented and integrated to cater to the specific needs of the diverse international
school student population at TIS and support their social and emotional well-being?” aligns with the Design stage of the 4-D AI cycle by leading inquiry into how TIS can “recreate the organization’s image of itself by presenting clear, compelling pictures of how things will be when the positive core is fully effective in all of its strategies, processes, systems, decisions, and collaborations” (Cooperrider et al., 2008, p. 209).

By explicitly addressing the relationships between multiple systems, departments, and actors and how they can be marshalled towards the goals of the OIP this question also addresses Kotter’s (2014) recommendation to enable action by removing barriers.

Finally, the fifth guiding question: “How can TIS both leverage and ensure the sustainability of the strong sense of community within the school in order to holistically address student well-being?” aligns with the Destiny stage of the 4-D AI cycle by addressing the implementation of sustainable change and its integration into the organizational culture (Cooperrider, 2008) and Kotter’s (2014) final stages of sustaining acceleration and instituting change. Leveraging the entire school community to support student well-being additionally serves to nurture a community identity that expresses beliefs aligned to sustain change across multiple stakeholder groups in order to alter the context of the system as per Fullan’s (2006b) recommendations for school leaders as systems thinkers.

In summary, the preceding questions drive sustained inquiry into the core themes of the OIP and align with the grounding conceptual frameworks and change theories that underpin it. By aligning inquiry with change processes that leverage TIS’s existing strengths and enlist the power of systems thinking, progress can be made towards better enacting TIS’s vision of being a caring community that supports students’ holistic well-being by addressing the lack of strategically-aligned programming to address international school student well-being.
Leadership Focused Vision for Change

**Gap Analysis.** TIS’s vision and mission include language to support care, empathy, connection, and social-emotional well-being in the student body. The TIS Guidance Department currently employs one counselor to serve students in each of the elementary, middle, and high school divisions. Their work involves teaching guidance curriculum lessons aligned with ASCA standards, assisting students in personal and career development, providing responsive services to address immediate concerns, and providing program and school support services (TIS, 2019d). At the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year, the school initiated a Child Protection Policy including outlines to support appropriate student-teacher interactions and protocols for reporting suspected abuse (TIS, 2019b). To address recommendations from the school’s accrediting body, ACS WASC, the school has started to develop an advisory program to support student well-being in the middle and high school divisions. In addition, a proposal for a policy and strategic framework to address student well-being has been put forward to the administration and met with some support (TIS, 2019h). All of these existing initiatives function through shared leadership frameworks and are grounded in service to students in alignment with the leadership approach central to this OIP.

TIS can coordinate the programs currently in place and in development and strategically align them within a guiding school well-being strategy and policy to ensure that community, caring, empathy and social-emotional well-being are supported. In addition, to provide individualized, ‘boutique’ support and address student needs, programming and policy can be aligned to address the unique needs of the TIS student body, including TCKs and EAL students, and with International Student Counselor Association (ISCA) standards. Individual well-being involves
synergistic relationships between multiple components including physical, social, cognitive and emotional elements (Bornstein, Davidson, Keyes, & Moore, 2003; Huppert, Baylis, & Kaverne, 2005; Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2006; WHO, 2010). Addressing this effectively will involve engaging multiple systems and elements and benefit from an iterative planning approach including cycles of monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation that consider the multiple influences on, and reasons for, student well-being, and view the whole of school life as a complex system (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b; Sheppard, Brown, & Dibbon, 2009).

**Change Drivers.** The change drivers that will be leveraged in pursuit of the goals of this OIP align with Bolman and Deal’s (2017) system of four frames through which to analyze organizational change: the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame.

The structural frame relates to the formal roles, responsibilities, policies, and structures present in an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Each school has its own formal and informal systems that leaders must navigate and leverage to move forward their agendas. (Cawsey et al., 2016; Fullan, 2006). Demographic changes and decreases in student enrollment have led to austerity in resource use and an administrative culture hesitant to release funds for new initiatives. To access resources to support this OIP, it will be necessary to leverage existing structures and processes. One such structure is a Five-year Plan for school improvement based on recommendations in TIS’s ACS WASC (2018) report. The Five-year Plan acts as a road map for school improvement and directs yearly funding allocations. Another structure that directs human and financial resource use is the school’s ongoing curriculum and assessment review. School-wide curriculum reviews are carried out in a multi-phase process of research and development, resource acquisition and
planning, professional development, auditing and review. School-supported professional development is typically limited to departments in certain stages of the process. Currently, TIS’s Guidance Department is in the appropriate stage of the review process to receive resource funding and the Five-Year plan calls for action to expand the student advisory program to better serve the student body (TIS, 2019g).

These systems and structures can be leveraged to obtain resources and support for a change vision related to student well-being by drawing upon existing embedded processes that enact shared leadership in the curriculum review and ACS WASC accreditation processes and spirit of service central to the work of the Guidance Department faculty (Cawsey et al., 2016). As a PreK-12 school, TIS is a complex organization with many systems interacting to support the functioning of the entire school. Given the situational factors affecting student well-being, any approach should focus, at least in part, on systemic, whole-school, whole-child, and community well-being. Policy directives should systemically address well-being in all stakeholders, not only students (Ott et al., 2017). A TIS Community Well-being Strategy has been drafted and is being considered for implementation. Elements of this OIP should align with this broader school-wide strategy (TIS, 2019h).

The human resource frame relates to the relationships between the organization and the people it is made up of (Bolman & Deal, 2017). Guidance counselors at TIS report that faculty engagement with their department initiatives is mixed, and report concern about the well-being of TIS students. As the professionals within TIS tasked most directly with safeguarding student social-emotional well-being, guidance counselors and the programs they implement are a powerful lever to effect positive change in student well-being. TIS’s teaching faculty will be another powerful driver of change. Servant leadership processes related to shared ideals
rooted in a moral commitment to children become duties that teachers willingly take part in (Greenfield, 1991; Johnson, 1990). A significant number of the TIS teaching faculty and administration have children enrolled in TIS and express a deep connection to the organization’s ongoing success on a personal level. Since classroom climate is affected by teacher-student interaction (Brackett, Reyes, Rivers, Elbertson, & Salovey, 2011; Brok, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2004; Hamre et al., 2013), policy directives should address well-being in all stakeholders, not only students (Ott et al., 2017), providing teachers with further motivation to support the OIP initiatives.

The political frame relates to the competing interests of groups and individuals and interactions between the coalitions that form within the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). The major stakeholder groups at TIS include board members, administrators, teachers, parents, and students, with individuals at times belonging to multiple groups. Cawsey et al. (2016) note that some change is better approached subtly over the long term through the development of “creeping commitment” and “coalition building” as opposed to broad initiatives and directives. A measured approach involving ‘pilot programs’ tailored to the needs and beliefs of sub-cultures within the school may be the most feasible approach to building up a critical mass of engaged participants; the ‘volunteer army’ of Kotter’s (2014) model, connected to one another through parallel networks (Cawsey et al., 2016; Connolly et al., 2011). The relationship between schools and communities, especially in private international schools, can be viewed through a lens of client-customer accountability or a professional model in which expert practitioners require cooperation from clients to carry out prescribed actions (Gordon & Louis, 2013; Riley & Louis, 2004). However, moving beyond the view of parents as ‘clients’ to one that sees them as ‘partners’ in shared school leadership leads to more meaningful community, parent, and youth
engagement and collaboration between traditionally competing groups (Mediratta, Fruchter, and Lewis, 2002; Mediratta, Shah, & McAlister, 2008; Riley & Louis, 2004).

The symbolic frame relates to symbols, meaning systems, and cultures in organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As an IB World School, TIS supports developing traits in its students described by the IB Learner Profile. Given TIS’s commitment to authorization as a full-spectrum IB World School, any change initiatives promoting the development of traits associated with the IB Learner Profile in students will align with school goals and garner increased support from multiple stakeholder groups. TIS’s stated vision addresses supporting social-emotional well-being and valuing community and compassion. The School Head has made ‘community’ the focus of most speeches during assemblies with parents and faculty, and a number of school initiatives and shared goals have been focused on strengthening and maintaining this sense of community within the school. TIS’s location in the heart of an expatriate enclave neighborhood serves to increase the strength of the symbolic nature of the school as a center of the community. The sense of community is reinforced by the fact that most teachers and administrators within the school also have children enrolled and identify as parent stakeholders. As the majority of faculty and families are expatriates, well-being initiatives designed to address the unique, shared needs and experiences of ‘global nomads’ can cross boundaries that might normally separate stakeholder groups with opportunities for shared learning and benefit.

In summary, a vision for change at TIS should involve energizing the strong community connections between the students, parents, teachers, and administrators through a shared moral commitment to student well-being reinforced by stakeholder
and accreditor recommendations already embedded in foundational strategic documents that drive action and planning within the school and position it in a change-ready orientation.

**Organizational Change Readiness**

TIS’s organizational change readiness can also be viewed through the lens of Bolman & Deal’s Four Frames (2017) as the determining elements support and hinder the main change drivers. Additionally, Cawsey et al. (2016) describe organizational change readiness through the lens of six change-related Readiness Dimensions: previous experiences, executive support, leadership credibility, openness, rewards, and accountability. Combining these frameworks, TIS scores as being positively oriented for change. TIS possesses both strengths and challenges across each of the four frames. The presence of challenges may, in fact, be a positive. Research suggests that the AI approach outlined in this OIP is most effective in organizations that are neither dysfunctional nor thriving: those with a balance of capacity for change and room for growth (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019).

Within the structural frame, TIS is positively oriented for change. Communication channels between faculty, middle leaders, and administrators are established and functional. The school enacts multiple processes to scan and monitor the school environment including informal reviews and feedback carried out periodically about school- and division-wide events in administrative council, elementary school team leader, and head of department meetings. Formal structures like student councils, a teacher advisory council, and a parent steering committee meet regularly with executive leadership to address concerns and provide feedback. The school engages an external vendor to carry out a yearly survey of all school stakeholders across a number of categories. Data obtained from these scanning
mechanisms directly impacts the decision-making process in the school. Future application of the above structures and processes offer opportunities to measure and assess the change proposal and evaluate the impact of the change. A challenge within the structural frame is a culture of fiscal austerity among executive administrators that may be a hurdle should training in AI processes or well-being themes be required. Some members of the senior leadership team may view the change as a ‘nice to have’ rather than a ‘must have’ as executive process is not dependent on the implementation of the OIP, and some within the organization may question if sufficient support will be provided to enact the change. Additionally, the period within which curriculum and assessment review processes may be leveraged to support such expenditures is time-limited. Finally, the proposed holistic approach to well-being proposed in the TIS Community Well-being Strategy document may result in the specific element of student social-emotional well-being addressed by this OIP having to compete with other aspects of well-being. The synergistic relationships between facets of well-being may mitigate negative outcomes of this challenge (Sheldon & Hoon, 2013).

Within the human resource frame, TIS also exhibits readiness to pursue change. Feedback from stakeholder surveys indicates that the change proposed in this OIP will be supported by multiple stakeholder groups ([Author], 2017; [Author], 2018; [Author], 2019). As an administrative leader at TIS, I would be directly involved in supporting the change plan contained in this OIP. A TIS Community Well-being Strategy was presented to the School Head that described a multiple-year action plan to address student mental, physical, emotional, and social well-being and was well-received (TIS, 2019h). TIS’s leadership team is generally trusted and has been effective at leading past change initiatives. The school has been able to retain a number of leaders in the school for much longer than the average retention rate in
similar international schools (Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012). A challenge that will impact the change plan is the small size of the TIS Guidance Department which may limit their effective agency despite the need for counselors to be central change agents and sources of expertise and guiding data in the context of this OIP. Another concern is policy overload: teaching faculty at TIS currently engage in frequent professional development and collaborative work to support implementation of the IB framework school-wide and may resist engaging in ‘one more initiative’ (Fullan, 2000). Over the long term, ensuring that capacity and learning isn’t diminished due to faculty turnover may be another issue given the nature of staffing in international schools (Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012). The mobility of TIS’s student body will create difficulties in using data to measure outcomes and progress on as reports and data may not be valid as year-to-year indicators of progress due to cohort variability resulting from student turnover.

Within the political frame TIS faces both support and resistance to change. The parent steering committee has had members take an active role in planning and supporting multiple well-being workshops related to TCK issues in the previous year. The presence of change champions among the politically powerful parent stakeholder group is a strong indicator of change readiness, as is the parent feedback on recent school surveys suggesting that ‘well-being’ is a topic that parents value ([Author], 2017; [Author], 2018; [Author], 2019). However, TIS’s diverse community may pose an obstacle to change. Differing cultural understandings and expectations for international education may be a barrier to collaboration and some groups may fear that a focus on student well-being will detract from student academic success (Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012).
Finally, within the symbolic frame, TIS is positively oriented for change. TIS has had multiple recent positive experiences with change. Upon the arrival of the current School Head, the school’s vision was rewritten and numerous facilities and infrastructure changes were implemented (TIS, 2019d). At the end of the 2018-2019 school year, after almost two years of preparation, planning and training, TIS received its PYP authorization. Subsequently, in the 2019-2020 school year, the school received MYP authorization mid-year after a similar period of preparation. Both of these successful change experiences involved enacting large-scale changes to curricula, pedagogy, and expected student learning outcomes. These change processes involved sustained work by teachers and administrators over extended time frames and extensive professional development and collaborative planning. Administrators and faculty engaged in shared, school-funded celebrations to mark these achievements. The organization has a culture that is change-positive and striving for excellence is an expectation at all levels, expressed by executive leadership and articulated in the school’s vision, mission, and values. One challenge within the symbolic frame, is that the stereotype of the wealthy, privileged international school student is one that may need to be overcome to secure buy-in from stakeholders. There may be a tendency to minimize the unique challenges and the negative effects that international students suffer due to their perceived privilege, and addressing this stereotype explicitly may be necessary to ensure that such bias doesn’t limit participation (Bjornsen, 2020).

In summary, TIS presents as being an organization that is change-ready and appropriately aligned with the AI model as a framework for change. Effective and trusted leadership, open lines of communication, and previous experiences of successful organizational change lay a foundation for continued successful change
efforts to be supported by an engaged school community of parents, teachers, and administrators.

Chapter 1 Conclusion

Chapter 1 has focused on describing the unique contexts and challenges that TIS faces as an international school community made up of culturally diverse stakeholders. The author’s scope and agency within the organization as DOL was outlined and the shared leadership, servant leadership, and systems thinking approaches were outlined. The PoP central to this OIP was described and framed within a PESTE analysis and a brief review of current research on international school student well-being. The main change drivers for this OIP, existing formal systems and processes and community connections between stakeholder groups within TIS, were analyzed through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) model was also used as a framework in determining that TIS is a change ready school to provide a consistent framework to support systems thinking.

Chapter 2 will focus on the planning and development of an OIP centered on the foundational ideas of shared and servant leadership and systems thinking. Cooperrider’s (2008) Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators will be synthesized as a framework for leading change in the OIP. A critical organizational analysis will be carried out to determine necessary organizational changes accompanied by an ethical analysis of the proposed changes. Finally, a number of possible solutions will be analyzed and evaluated to determine the best approach to address the PoP: the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse and international student body.
Chapter 2: Planning and Development

Chapter 1 of this OIP introduced TIS and described its unique history and context. It further presented the Problem of Practice (PoP) that is the focus of this OIP: the need to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse and international student body. Chapter 2 will develop a framework for understanding change based on a synthesis of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators and apply an organizational analysis to determine necessary changes based on existing gaps at TIS through the lens of Bolman & Deal’s (2017) four frames. The ethical implications of these changes will be investigated and a number of possible solutions will be proposed and analyzed to determine the most appropriate change path to pursue.

Leadership Approaches to Change

Change processes in this OIP will leverage approaches grounded in systems thinking, shared leadership, and servant leadership to advance change in TIS to address the lack of strategically-aligned policy, programs, and systems to support international student well-being. A brief description of how these approaches apply in the context of this OIP follows.

Schools represent complex organizations of multiple stakeholders and systems, both formal and informal, with sometimes conflicting needs and motivations that leaders must navigate and put to work towards moving forward agendas (Cawsey et al., 2016; Ewy, 2009; Fullan, 2006b). Formal systems in schools include the hierarchies, departments, roles, tasks, planning, and processes that structure and influence what happens and how it happens in a school (Cawsey et al., 2016). Informal systems in schools can be loosely defined as the ‘culture’ of the school; the shared beliefs, rituals, norms, expectations, and behaviors that provide a sense of
identity in the school and are taught to new members (Cawsey et al., 2016; Leo & Wickenberg, 2013). The Systems School Leadership (SSL) approach, defined as leading wholes, taking a multidimensional view, influencing indirectly, and evaluating the significance of issues (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b), has been proposed as an effective framework for decision-making in interconnected problem-situations that arise in such complex environments (Shaked & Schechter, 2019).

TIS is as complex as any other school in most regards but is unique in the degree of overlap between the many formal and informal systems and stakeholder groups present within the school community. This strengthens the potential of TIS to support and leverage decentralized shared leadership approaches to change. Approximately 70% of TIS administrators have a spouse employed as a teacher at TIS or a child enrolled as a student. About 50% of the teachers employed in the school are parents of one or more children who attend and study at TIS. Given the relatively small size of the school community this is a significant proportion of individuals with roles in multiple stakeholder groups, facilitating rapid communication within the community and transfer of shared ideals across the entire organization. Figure 2, below, is a visual representation of the word-of-mouth “ripple effect” communications impact multiplier that exists within the TIS school community due to the “critical mass” of stakeholder group overlap of teachers and administrators among the TIS parent population (Oetting, 2009).
The aforementioned bonds also connect individuals and groups across the elementary, middle, and high school divisions. These factors, combined with the enclave-like nature of the neighborhood in which TIS is situated and high percentage of families and faculty living within walking distance of the school results in multiple links between major stakeholder groups and dense networks of communication. All of the above highlight the potential power of shared leadership, leading wholes, and indirect influence as elements of the SSL systems thinking approach as effective leadership approaches to change in TIS’s unique context (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

There is no perfect formal system or organizational structure; every school’s organizational design presents hurdles to be overcome and challenges related to gaps or overlaps in duties among departments and administrators (Cawsey et al., 2016). Change agents must be aware of the systems and structures in place in their schools and how best to use them to get formal approval to support and legitimatize change (Cawsey et al., 2016). Formal structures provide individuals and departments with the capacity to influence others and resources to support sustained change initiatives and act as a lever through which to operationalize the SSL principle of leading wholes and
indirect influence (Cawsey, et. al 2016; Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). Change agents should work closely with decision-makers and administrators to develop change plans that relate to the school’s vision, balance costs and benefits to multiple stakeholders, and align with budget cycles and other processes to enhance their prospects for approval (Cawsey et al., 2016).

In addition to working with the formal systems and structures in their schools, change leaders must also leverage the informal systems and structures embedded in the school’s culture to bring change initiatives to fruition (Cawsey et al., 2016). These informal systems offer another opportunity to enact SSL principles of influencing directly and leading wholes to support change initiatives (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). A school’s culture can be expressed in visible and invisible ways such as the physical appearance of faculty and facilities as well as in the values and norms that are publicly expressed and privately held (Cawsey et al., 2016; Leo & Wickenberg, 2013). Differing views on the nature of culture represent it as either an external, objective feature of schools that can be managed or as an internal, subjective construct that varies between individuals (Connolly, et al., 2011). Regardless of the perspective taken, school leaders, as agents of change, should feel empowered to leverage symbols, engage subcultures within and outside of the organization, and examine and modify processes to ensure that the values that drive them manifest as artifacts and activities that will feedback in positive ways to build cultures supportive of change (Connolly et al., 2011, Leo & Wickenberg, 2013).

School leaders exert power to effect change in formal school structures that can affirm further positive changes to informal cultural structures within their organizations. Formal leadership structures can be modified to share leadership among faculty to reinforce initiative and a sense of efficacy among teachers, and
physical and time resources can be structured to ensure that teachers have time for collaborative professional development focused on advancing change visions (Leo & Wickenberg, 2013). Though different schools have different needs, change leaders benefit from flexible, decentralized formal structures that support innovation (Cawsey et al., 2016). Especially in international contexts, where the tenure of a school leader at any given school can be so fleeting (Hayden, 2006), the need for sustainability in leadership is of paramount importance. Decentralizing leadership and building a high capacity for shared leadership throughout the school can help to ensure such sustainability (Lambert, 2007).

In a school with high shared leadership capacity all stakeholders develop and are responsible in part for leadership, including students, teachers, and parents; information is used to guide inquiry; and institutional growth is guided by a shared vision (Lambert, 2007). Removing the ownership of leading the school from a single individual and sharing it across the institution and its systems and processes helps to ensure that initiatives can survive the changes in leadership that are so frequent in international schools (Adelman & Taylor, 2007).

Clearly defined roles and interdependencies are important to ensure that organizational growth initiatives are maintained over the long term (Adelman & Taylor, 2007). Ideally, the distribution of roles and responsibilities should support independence and empower teachers as leaders in the school (Lambert, 2007). Leaders may act as organization facilitators who train and empower teacher-led change teams to catalyze and actualize change towards the school’s vision (Adelman & Taylor, 2007). Purposeful near- and long-term action towards change goals can also be facilitated through the use of collaborative action planning (Cawsey et al., 2016). Ensuring that plans and change visions are clearly linked to the school vision,
and outline progress through a series of milestones and intermediate steps, can ensure that a sense of need and urgency is maintained beyond the tenure of any one member of a change group (Cawsey et al., 2016).

Servant leadership seeks first to ensure that the most pressing needs of others are served (Greenleaf, 1970). The tie that binds all stakeholder groups together at TIS is a commitment to serving students in their learning and well-being in the school. This is heightened due to the fact that the majority of teaching faculty have children enrolled at the school: the motivation to serve students is both professional and personal. Framing change initiatives with compelling narratives that combine logics and discourses can help bring together stakeholders with different agendas to work towards shared visions (Ball, Maguire, Braun, & Hoskins, 2011, p. 628). While self-interest can bring about complacency even in the face of crisis (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 142), a change initiative that acts as a ‘boundary spanner’ to engage the ideas and talents of diverse stakeholders towards a shared change vision can create fluid and connective opportunities that produce workable plans for action, cognitive shifts, reframing of challenges, and democratic and communitarian approaches to shared leadership (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011, p. 120; Gordon & Louis, 2012, p. 349; Starratt, 2008, p. 89). Fullan (2006b) suggests that commitment to serving a moral purpose as a shared goal at both the individual and system level is an element of sustainability in schools.

In summary, this OIP will approach change leadership through the application of principals of servant and shared leadership and systems thinking. Servant and shared leadership approaches are suited to the context that exists at TIS due to the need for sustainability to overcome faculty and administrative turnover. Shared leadership approaches will facilitate the alignment of existing programs across
different departments by bringing together middle leaders around a shared goal. Servant leadership addresses the moral imperative to serve student well-being that stakeholders within TIS experience as caring adults: teachers and parents. Principles of systems thinking leverage the complex overlap of stakeholder groups that can multiply the effect of word-of-mouth communication within the community.

**Framework for Leading Change Process**

In seeking to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse and international student body, this OIP will use a change framework based on the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach outlined by Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros (2008) supplemented by and aligned with elements of Kotter’s (2014) accelerators. A brief description of the key elements and principles of the two change approaches and their alignment in the context of this OIP and description of and justification for their integration follows.

**Appreciative Inquiry.** Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a strengths-based change approach grounded in social constructionist thought that has been put into practice by numerous organizations and individuals since its first introduction in 1985 (Cooperrider, 2017; Bushe & Kassam, 2005). Foundational to the approach is the application of a four-stage “4-D cycle” of inquiry focused on a strategically selected affirmative topic guided by five core principles (Cooperrider et al., 2008). The 4-D cycle of inquiry is preceded by the strategic selection of an affirmatively worded topic and proceeds through four stages of Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

The Discovery stage seeks to engage inquirers in discovering and appreciating the value of the current strengths and successes present in the organization related to the topic of inquiry (Cooperrider et al., 2008). As part of the process, participants
engage in social bonding and consensus-building and begin the construction of a shared vision based on the sharing of ideals (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

Second, in the *Dream* stage, participants envision new possibilities for growth and development based on the existing strengths discovered in the previous stage (Cooperrider et al., 2008). They consolidate their thinking and articulate the shared changed vision nascent in the *Discovery* stage. The socially constructed nature of the shared vision created in these first two phases align with the context of this OIP by offering an opportunity to leverage and strengthen the focus on community and strong bonds that already exist among stakeholders in the school.

Third, during the *Design* stage, plans and organizational architecture are co-constructed to strategically leverage and enhance the existing organizational strengths and new ideas to move towards the shared vision from the *Dream* stage (Cooperrider et al., 2008). The focus on improving upon existing strengths and high-functioning processes in the organization aligns with the context of this OIP by serving to align existing efforts to address international student social-emotional well-being and by securing buy-in from important faculty stakeholders such as Guidance and Student Support Department faculty by valuing and highlighting their existing efforts.

Finally, during the *Destiny* stage the plans and actions articulated in the previous stage are enacted to achieve shared visions and transform the organization through collective action (Cooperrider et al., 2008). This stage aligns with the goals of this OIP by addressing the need for sustainable outcomes to ensure continued international student well-being at TIS.

Cooperrider et al. (2008) offer five principles to guide the implementation of the 4-D Appreciative Inquiry cycle: the constructionist principle, the principle of simultaneity, the poetic principle, the anticipatory principle, and the positive principle.
The constructionist principle states that change is socially constructed and that outcomes are determined by the thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of the change agents involved (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). This aligns with the underlying social constructivist worldview and shared leadership approach that are foundational to this OIP, and express awareness of the effect that different groups and individuals have on one another and the appreciation of a multi-dimensional view inherent in the SSL systems thinking approach (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

The principle of simultaneity and poetic principle state that change begins with inquiry and that positive outcomes are supported by positive inquiry (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Positive inquiry aligns with the servant leadership approach foundational to this OIP that seeks to empower individuals to lead through focusing on their strengths and is uniquely suited to engage TIS faculty due to the high institutional capacity for inquiry-based approaches fostered through extensive and ongoing training in inquiry-based learning to support of TIS’s authorization as an IB World School since the 2017-2018 school year (TIS, 2018; TIS, 2019c; TIS, 2019d; TIS, 2019e; TIS, 2019g).

The anticipatory and positive principles reinforce the power of positive imagery and visions to affect motivations and perceptions of participants. Positive language, principles, and tools that support social bonding, camaraderie, and reflection on positive experiences can help to ensure that the change process in the OIP doesn’t trigger or intensify negative well-being outcomes in participants and may serve to increase stakeholder well-being as part of the process (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Dunlap, 2008).

In addition to these contextual alignments, AI’s utility as a framework for evaluation will be of use in creating questions and processes in the monitoring and
evaluation stage of the OIP to be addressed in Chapter 3 (Preskill & Coghlan, 2004), and the collaborative nature and positive focus of the processes and tools will make the resulting feedback well-suited for inclusion in reports to TIS’s accrediting bodies. Limitations of AI are the broad and loosely-defined 4-D phases as a change process and its lack of consideration of how institutional hierarchies and systems affect communication and implementation within the organization (Grant & Humphries, 2006).

**Kotter’s (2014) accelerators.** To provide a more detailed, step-wise change process to communicate and integrate procedures and processes to administrative actors within the school, the OIP will incorporate Kotter’s (2014) model of eight change accelerators into the AI framework. This will help to address the loosely defined phases of the AI approach and its lack of consideration of how hierarchies and systems affect organizational processes previously noted as limitations in the preceding section. In this regard, Kotter’s (2014) accelerators will also serve as guidelines for integrating change processes aligned with the AI 4-D phases into the existing systems and structures present at TIS in the change implementation plan proposed in this OIP.

The first accelerator, *create a sense of urgency*, reaffirms the power of a shared vision centered on a “Big Opportunity” to mobilize stakeholders and motivate change (Kotter, 2014) and aligns with the selection of and affirmative topic of inquiry that precedes the AI 4-D cycle and the vision-building that proceeds through the *Discovery* and *Dream* stages.

The second accelerator, *build and evolve a guiding coalition*, further reinforces the socially constructed nature of change and the need for involvement of all stakeholder groups within the organization (Kotter, 2014). It aligns with TIS’s
focus on sustaining an engaged and involved school community and empowers stakeholders to lead in line with shared and servant leadership approaches (Sergiovanni, 2013). This accelerator begins with the selection of the focus on inquiry by change leaders invested the organization and proceeds through all four AI 4-D phases as stakeholders of the organization self-organize into groups to support community-created initiatives of their choice (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

The third accelerator, form a change vision and strategic initiatives, focuses on the need to select initiatives that engage stakeholders to propel the organization towards shared visions (Kotter, 2014). It aligns with AI’s Dream phase in which visions are articulated and the Design phase in which plans and strategies to support change are created (Cooperrider et al., 2008).

The fourth accelerator, enlist a volunteer army, engages the power of stakeholder led initiatives and shared leadership to create buy-in among larger groups of stakeholders and community members to support change (Kotter, 2014). This aligns with this OIP’s focus on leveraging TIS’s engaged community in shared and servant leadership. It also supports systems thinking and AI’s constructionist principle by incorporating silo-breaking to engage stakeholders from various groups to enact change initiatives in the Design and Destiny 4-D phases (Kotter, 2014; McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019).

The fifth accelerator, enable action by removing barriers, aligns with the Design and Destiny phases of AI, shared leadership approaches, and systems thinking by designing organizational architectures that leverage existing initiatives and connect individuals from multiple stakeholder groups and subgroups within and outside the formal hierarchy in the organization (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Kotter, 2014).
The sixth accelerator, *generate short-term wins*, aligns with the *Design* and *Destiny* phases of AI by strategically planning change processes to include opportunities for visible success and acknowledges the power of positive messages to motivate and sustain change in line with AI’s positive principle (Kotter, 2014; McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019).

The seventh accelerator, *sustain acceleration*, focuses on the need to maintain momentum by focusing continued energy towards emergent opportunities and sub-initiatives and aligns with AI’s *Destiny* stage which focuses on taking action on innovative ideas to work towards shared change visions (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Kotter, 2014).

Finally, the eighth accelerator, *institute change*, aligns with the *Destiny* phase of the AI cycle and addresses the goal of this OIP to institutionalize systems and processes to ensure sustainable change over the long term (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Kotter, 2014).

A summary of the alignment of AI’s 4-D phases and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators can be found in Figure 3, below.
In addition to providing a more differentiated and clearly articulated pathway through the change process, this model focuses on leveraging a ‘dual operating system’ consisting of a traditional administrative hierarchy operating in parallel with a fluid network (Kotter, 2014). This ‘dual operating system’ acts as a framework to allow the democratic processes of AI to integrate and function within the existing organizational structures present in TIS as an element of shared strategic leadership and systems school leadership (Pitelis & Wagner, 2019; Schaked & Schechter, 2013b). This approach will likely resonate with stakeholders within the organization due to the school’s history of using focus groups to address accreditation processes and working groups to address change initiatives (ACS WASC, 2018; TIS, 2018; TIS, 2019d; TIS, 2019g). The dual operating system also leverages and labels existing informal connections between stakeholder groups and across organizational levels.
arising from the multiple connections between individuals within the school community.

To conclude, AI’s inclusive approach that engages all stakeholders in self-organizing groups to envision, design, and implement change initiatives aligns with the social constructivist worldview, shared leadership approach, and systems thinking foundational to this OIP. Synthesizing AI with Kotter’s (2014) accelerators provides more clearly-articulated steps to enact change processes and communicate the broad goals of the AI 4-D processes to stakeholders. Meanwhile, AI’s foundational integration of democratic and shared leadership processes addresses critiques of Kotter’s (2014) process that suggest it relies too much on direction from upper management and is not inclusive of the whole organization (Drew & Wallis, 2014). Kotter’s (2014) ‘dual operating system’ provides a similar framework for understanding and analyzing the nature of self-organizing networks of action and communication that will emerge in AI’s later 4-D phases.

**Critical Organizational Analysis**

As AI is a fundamental element of the framework for leading change developed in service to this OIP, it is appropriate to begin the critical analysis of TIS by identifying the strengths within the organization (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Avolio and Luthans (2006) suggest that strengths-based approaches to organizational development can empower individuals to take responsibility for their own development and promote optimism and positive psychological capacities in alignment with the desired outcomes of this OIP and its servant leadership approach (Greenleaf, 1970). This further helps to ensure that potential change processes produced by this analysis consider the limited financial resources available due to the school’s small size and recently decreased enrollment by leveraging existing systems.
and programs to their fullest potential to produce sustainable change that doesn’t waste resources or incur debt (Hargreaves, Harris, & Boyle, 2013). Having previously outlined TIS’s organizational change readiness and change drivers within the framework of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames model, this critical organizational analysis will continue to apply the framework to structure this analysis of the changes needed within the organization. The structural, human resource, and political frames will be applied once to support deeper analysis of the organizational elements central to creating a foundation for change and moving change initiatives forward at TIS.

The structural frame. The structural frame relates to the positions, duties, policies, and bureaucracies in an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As noted in Chapter 1 of this OIP, TIS is positively oriented for change when viewed through the lens of the structural frame. Within the formal organizational structure, communication channels are functional and established. Through all levels of the organization regular meetings are scheduled and carried out to facilitate communication, including, but not limited to, team and department meetings at the faculty level, weekly collaborative planning and learning sessions including division principals, coordinators, and teachers, biweekly meetings between division principals and the School Head, and monthly administrative council meetings including heads of all administrative departments. The use of working groups comprising representative stakeholders has been well-established through IB authorization and ACS WASC accreditation processes (ACS WASC, 2018).

The ACS WASC accreditation process is a powerful change driver in support of this OIP: it directly informs the goals of annual and five-year plans and the most recent report suggests that student well-being should be prioritized in the school
(WASC, 2018; TIS, 2019d; TIS, 2019g), which has resulted in the creation of an advisory program to support students in the middle and high school division. The school’s cyclical curriculum review currently focuses on the Guidance Department and opens the possibility to address the need for curriculum standards aligned with the needs of international students (TIS, 2019d).

**Structural frame strengths.** Research indicates that whole school approaches to well-being may be the best way to address student well-being in international school contexts (Higgins & Wigford, 2018). At TIS, such an approach could be used to connect and align processes and programs already in place that support student well-being. TIS currently runs a transition program for students transitioning between elementary and middle school. Guidance counselors are employed to address student mental and emotional issues in the elementary, middle, and high school divisions. A teacher-conducted middle and high school advisory program is being piloted to address content related to study skills, health, and social-emotional well-being (TIS, 2019d). A Child Protection Policy was enacted at the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year addressing teacher responsibilities to ensure that abusive practices are prevented and reported both in and out of school (TIS, 2019b).

**Structural frame gaps.** TIS lacks programming to support students and families transitioning in and out of the school community and address the challenges faced by many TCKs due to their mobile lifestyle (Dixon & Hayden, 2008; Lijadi & Van Schalkwyk, 2017). ACS WASC recommendations, curriculum review processes, and annual and long-term plans have not been leveraged to create a school-wide well-being committee, working group, or school-wide student well-being policy to set sustainable practices in place to ensure that student well-being is not overlooked and align existing training, programs, and departmental efforts. Similarly, the strong and
established communication channels in the organization are not being used to align and organize efforts to support student well-being in the organization.

**The human resource frame.** The human resource frame relates to the individuals who make up the organization and their relationships with each other and the organization as an entity (Bolman & Deal, 2017). As related in Chapter 1 of this OIP, TIS exhibits change readiness in this frame as well. Multiple stakeholder groups, including students, parents, teachers, and administrators have expressed desire for well-being initiatives in TIS (TIS, 2019h). Trust in leadership exists broadly within the organization and TIS is successful at retaining experienced and qualified leaders (Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012). The strong relationships between members of the school community that cross stakeholder groups that result from the school’s unique position in the center of an expatriate enclave community and the nature of hiring processes in international schools that see teaching couples and their children integrated into multiple stakeholder groups are a strength that supports change.

As administrators, teachers, and parents are heavily invested in the well-being of the students in the school for both professional and personal reasons, the TIS community is powerful change driver in support of the goals of this OIP. The school guidance counselors represent key change drivers in the context of this OIP due to their expertise and responsibilities related to student support and well-being. As an administrator whose scope and agency crosses multiple departments school-wide I am able to leverage my role to engage numerous stakeholders through multiple processes to support the OIP and facilitate change.

**Human resource frame strengths.** As previously mentioned, the TIS school community comprises sub-groups of administrators, teachers, parents, and students that overlap significantly. Members of the TIS parent community currently self-
organize by language into groups connected via social media to facilitate communication and have independently lobbied to host well-being focused workshops and events on campus. For example, an external consultant was invited to lead workshops on TCK well-being and a screening of a student-created documentary on the experience of TCKs at TIS was held.

_Human resource frame gaps._ Despite the strong sense of community and self-organized communication channels among stakeholders in the organization, changing student demographics have resulted in gaps within the community. Increasing numbers of families not fluent in English as a language of communication are being welcomed into the community. Currently, English is the only official language of communication in the school community. This results in difficulties communicating important information to large groups of stakeholders and may result in lack of awareness of and access to student support services provided by the school (Hansson et al., 2012).

A further gap within the human resource frame is a lack of institutional knowledge and awareness of the well-being challenges faced by international school students. Despite the existence of a teacher-led advisory program, no training is currently provided to teachers in how to support international student well-being. Furthermore, this information is not officially communicated to parents.

_The political frame._ The political frame relates to the decision-making processes in organizations comprising groups with competing interests competing for limited resources (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this frame, TIS’s change readiness is less supported. Positive elements of change readiness include a powerful parent steering committee with a history of interest and support for well-being initiatives in the school and evidence that multiple stakeholder groups within TIS value well-being
Obstacles to change relate to differing priorities among the various stakeholder groups competing for limited resources in the school. As a school with a student body representing over 55 different nationalities, TIS’s school community contains sub-cultures with varying expectations and interpretations of international education. Initiatives to focus time and fiscal resources towards promoting and supporting student well-being may face resistance from subcultures, departments, and administrators who feel that focusing on initiatives more directly connected to academic outcomes would better serve students and the school as a for-profit organization.

The most powerful change driver in the political frame supporting the change vision proposed in this OIP is represented by the parent community given the nature of the school as a for-profit organization. The Guidance Department represents another driving force for change given their school-wide mandate to support student well-being. Finally, trends within the international education industry can also exert political pressure on the school as an organization as it seeks to represent current expectations of what services are provided at effective international schools.

**Political frame strengths.** Having previously expressed interest in well-being through surveys and previous parent-initiated events and workshops, and having representatives in the organization as teachers, counselors, and administrators, TIS’s parents represent powerful political change agents in support of the goals of this OIP. Recent literature suggesting the importance of well-being in the international education industry may secure buy-in from administrators if well-being can be presented as a marketable and meaningful route to school improvement (Higgins & Wigford, 2018).
**Political frame gaps.** The lack of discourse within the school around topics concerning international school student well-being presents a gap. In the current state, culture-based subgroups within the TIS community may differ in their views on the priority that student well-being has in international education (Baily, 2015). The awareness of research indicating the positive correlation between student well-being and academic achievement is not widespread (Brinder & Dewberry, 2007; Day & Qing, 2009; Spit, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011). Bridging these gaps with a shared vision of student success is not yet an explicit priority within the organization at the current time.

**The symbolic frame.** The symbolic frame relates to meaning-making in the organization through the use of symbols, stories, histories, and culture (Bolman & Deal, 2017). In this frame, TIS is well-placed to support successful change initiatives. The school has a strong recent history of pursuing excellence through change successfully as evidenced by consecutive successful IB authorizations and accreditation processes (TIS, 2019e).

Symbolic change drivers in support of the change vision presented by this OIP are well-represented in TIS. As an IB World School, TIS promotes the development of IB Learner Profile characteristics such as being caring, balanced, and reflective in its students as learning outcomes (TIS, 2019e; IBO, 2019). Practices that support student social-emotional well-being can align with developing these traits and support the school’s symbolic connection to its status as an IB school (Cushner, 2016; Glick & Bluck, 2013; Munn & Ryan, 2016). Additionally, the school’s vision supports developing students’ social and emotional capacities in line with the goals of this OIP (TIS, 2019e). The heavy focus on TIS as a center of the neighborhood community represents another powerful symbolic support for school and community well-being.
Symbolic frame strengths. The strength of the TIS community and the symbolic focus placed on it by the school is a strength in this frame. Leveraging this sense of the school as a center of the local community can help to address the difficulty that TCKs sometimes face in integrating their self-concept with the idea of ‘home’ (Bagnall, 2012). Building on this strength and continuing to highlight the community as a source of identity and as a ‘home’ for students is an opportunity that TIS’s symbolic focus on community affords the school. The presence of explicit reference within the IB Learner Profile to balancing intellectual, physical, and emotional well-being represents another powerful symbolic lever to support the goals of this OIP (IBO, 2019).

Symbolic frame gaps. Despite the existence of many symbolic drivers and strengths within the frame that can be leveraged to push forward and agenda in support of student well-being, there currently exists no explicit reference to well-being in the school’s vision, nor is there a prevailing culture within the school overtly focused on student well-being or well-being issues in general.

Necessary change. In summary, TIS as an organization is change-ready and levers and change drivers in all four frames exist that can be aligned to move forward change initiatives to support the well-being of TIS’s international student body. That said, there is no explicit school-wide policy, training or communication initiative, or symbolic driver focused on addressing school-wide student well-being in place in the organization. Any plan seeking to solve the problem of practice of addressing the lack of policies, programs, and systems to support international school student well-being will need to address this and ensure that school-wide discourse around the topic is supported.
Based on the gaps present across the four frames, the following five changes are necessary:

1. The establishment of a school-wide student well-being working group and authoring of a well-being policy to align ongoing practices and processes.

2. Implementation of appropriate international counseling standards to guide practice in the Guidance Department.

3. Provision of well-being awareness training and workshops to prompt discourse and raise awareness of international student needs.

4. Investigation into ways to ensure awareness of available student well-being resources among non-English speaking stakeholders in the TIS school community.

5. An initiative to create symbolic drivers that explicitly support international student well-being within the TIS school community and culture.

Leadership Ethics and Organizational Change

Ehrich, Harris, Klenowski, Smeed, & Spina (2015) define ethical leadership as a dynamic, continuing practice concerned with the moral purpose of education (p. 198) and argue that leaders must balance multiple accountabilities to enact ethical leadership. Northouse (2016) describes five general principles of ethical leadership: respect others, serve others, justice, honesty, and community building. The leadership approaches foundational to this OIP enlist participative and democratic approaches of shared leadership that can be incorporated into organizational change processes to extend leadership past the leader’s presence and take into account stakeholders’ input (Amanchukwu, Stanley, & Ololube, 2015). In this way, fluid constructions of ‘leader’ and ‘follower’ can emerge to democratize decision-making and ensure that contextual ethical choices are co-constructed based on dialogue within a community (Liu, 2015).
Further, servant leadership is recognized for its ethical approach (Reinke, 2004) due to its central moral component (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Mittal & Dorfman, 2012) and focus on the development and well-being of followers rather than self-interest (Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004).

For the purpose of this OIP, Starratt’s (1991) three ethics of critique, justice, and caring will be used as a framework to analyze the ethical considerations and challenges inherent in the approaches to change and necessary changes outlined in this OIP. The ethic of critique calls upon educational leaders to challenge the status quo and inquire into the power dynamics inherent in systems and structures in place in schools (Starratt, 1991; Ehrich et al, 2015). This aligns with principles of servant and shared leadership foundational to this OIP. The ethic of justice is concerned with the application of democratic principles to build a community in which just choices of individuals reflect community choices aligned with just policies (Starratt, 1991, 1996). The ethic of justice aligns with the focus on community central to the values of TIS and this OIP. While overlapping stakeholder identities present the possibility for ethical issues in some realms of school life, the shared benefit to all stakeholders resulting from supporting the well-being of TIS students precludes this as an issue in the context of this OIP. The ethic of care focuses on the intrinsic worth of stakeholders as individuals and on the integrity of relationships (Ehrich et al., 2015; Starratt, 1996). This aligns with the strengths-based focus of AI as a change process used in this OIP. The three ethics are complementary and work synergistically to provide a multi-dimensional framework to examine ethical concerns within schools (Starratt, 1991).

**AI & Kotter’s (2014) accelerators as change approaches.** The choice of AI and Kotter’s (2014) ‘dual operating system’ as tools to embed and enact shared
leadership practices and flatten hierarchies attempts to empower all stakeholders by offering them an equal voice in the change process through the structure of the AI 4-D phases and voluntary participation in self-organized action teams. The ethic of critique is addressed by acknowledging that the existing organizational structures at TIS may hinder effective communication and provides routes for stakeholders to engage as empowered change agents in this OIP. Furthermore, the choice to base the change process on AI principles is grounded in the ethic of care. The AI approach is seen as an ethically sound approach when dealing with issues of student well-being that encourages participants to feel enthused and value their worth (Nel & Pretorius, 2012; Ward, 2011). AI practices have also been found to foster organizational well-being in line with both the ethic of care and the fundamental goals of this OIP (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019).

A common critique of AI is that, with its focus on positive stories and experiences, negative experiences and may be repressed or ignored (Egan & Lancaster, 2005; Miller, Fitzgerald, Murrell, Preston, & Ambekar, 2005; Pratt, 2002). A counterpoint to this criticism of AI is raised by Fitzgerald, Oliver, and Hoxsey (2004) who suggest that the nonjudgmental approach of AI results in suppressed or underdeveloped organizational elements being more likely to be addressed. Throughout the change process, it will be important to ensure that the ethic of care be supported so that meaningful personal experiences of stakeholders are not devalued by blind adherence to AI processes (Pratt, 2002). By intentionally incorporating Starratt’s (1991) framework, limitations of AI can be mitigated.

Ethical analysis of necessary change #1. The establishment of a school-wide student well-being working group provides a sustainable structure within the organization to ensure that the voices of diverse stakeholders are heard in the context
of addressing the problem of practice of this OIP. The creation of a well-being policy proposed earlier in this chapter offers the opportunity to the school as an organization to embed processes and protocols into the foundational organizational policies that are community-authored to address the concerns of this ethic in line with the ethic of justice. The acknowledgment of the need for such a policy applies the ethic of critique to the existing structures and policies in place in TIS. Consideration of the ethic of critique and justice requires that processes be incorporated into the drafting and approval of policies to ensure that diverse stakeholder input is incorporated and considered to ensure that it reflects the needs and views of the TIS school community.

**Ethical analysis of necessary change #2.** Implementation of appropriate international counseling standards to guide practice in the Guidance Department addresses the ethic of justice insofar as it provides standards of practice that ensure appropriate care is provided to international students at TIS. Aligning practice and instruction to a common set of standards designed to explicitly address the social-emotional well-being needs of international students will help to ensure that the choices made by individuals within the Guidance Department and communications from the department to the school community at large are just and equitable to meet the needs of the students being served. Furthermore, as so many of the specific social-emotional well-being issues faced by international school students deal with relationships and self-identity (Dixon & Hayden, 2008; Lijadi & Van Schalkwyk, 2017) incorporating standards of practice to address international school student needs serves to address the ethic of care by focusing on individuals and their relationships in the community. The ethics of critique, justice, and care need to be considered in regard to the members of the department themselves by ensuring that their input as
key stakeholders is central to the planning process with regard to determining timeframes and priorities for implementation.

**Ethical analysis of necessary change #3.** The provision of well-being awareness training and workshops to prompt discourse and raise awareness of international student needs, the third proposed change suggested by this OIP, serves to address both the ethics of justice and caring. By providing stakeholders with training to support student well-being at TIS, alignment between organizational and individual choices with just outcomes for students can be promoted in line with the ethic of justice. Furthermore, as students and parents gain fluency with tools and information to support them taking positive action to support their well-being the ethic of care is addressed. Finally, by providing stakeholders with training to participate more deeply in school-wide processes to promote student well-being their capacity to engage more deeply and effectively in strategic planning and change processes related to the initiative is likely to increase, thus addressing the ethic of critique by ensuring that democratic and participative engagement in the change process is facilitated. Training sessions should be offered to all stakeholders, students, teachers, parents, and administrators and differentiated appropriately to ensure that the ethic of justice is considered and sessions should be structured so as to include participative elements.

**Ethical analysis of necessary change #4.** Investigation into ways to ensure awareness of available student well-being resources among non-English speaking stakeholders in the TIS school community addresses concerns related to the ethic of critique as it seeks to level power imbalances in the school community by ensuring that marginalized groups within the community are uplifted and supported within the structures and systems at TIS. As expatriate TCKs living outside of their country of origin while studying in a school in which the language of instruction is not their
mother tongue they are twice marginalized in the community. Additionally, by ensuring that these stakeholders within the school community receive adequate mental and emotional well-being and support, the ethic of justice is addressed. To further ensure that ethical approaches are used throughout the change process, communication and information to support participation in the change process will need to be provided in multiple languages and translation services will need to be sought out from within the community to ensure that non-English speaking stakeholders can participate and offer meaningful input in the process.

**Ethical analysis of necessary change #5.** An initiative to create symbolic drivers that explicitly support international student well-being within the TIS school community and culture addresses the ethics of justice and care. Creating a shared culture supportive of international school student well-being at TIS will support the alignment of individual and community choices towards just practice that addresses the needs of vulnerable groups within the school. By creating drivers to engage the school community towards supporting student well-being, individual students within our school community can live and learn in an environment that acknowledges their social-emotional needs and seeks to nurture their positive growth in line with the ethic of care.

In summary, the leadership approaches in this OIP employ participatory and democratic approaches of shared leadership that democratize decision-making and help ensure ethical outcomes for the school community (Amanchukwu, Stanley, & Ololube, 2015; Liu, 2015). The five necessary changes emerging from the gap analysis address Starratt’s (1991) ethics of critique, care, and justice by investigating and modifying school policy, addressing individual student well-being, and serving the unique needs of the community, respectively, to address the lack of strategically-
aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse and international student body.

Possible Solutions to Address the Problem of Practice

To address the recommended changes emerging from the previous critical organizational analysis, four possible solutions are introduced and evaluated in the following section. As AI is a foundational element of the framework for leading change in this OIP, three of the solutions presented will be applications of AI processes that have been previously identified in research (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). The solutions will be evaluated based on the time, human, and fiscal resources required for implementation and the potential impact and long-term sustainability of the approach.

Solution #1: Maintain the status quo. Given the strength of community, well-developed communication infrastructure and degree of integration of stakeholder groups at TIS, maintaining the status quo could be seen as a viable solution. Systems and programs are in place to support student well-being in the organization and community-led initiatives focusing specifically on international student well-being have occurred occasionally in the past.

Evaluation of solution #1: Resources required to maintain the status quo at TIS are impossible to predict. With no plan or specific student well-being goals outlined progress could be rapid or non-existent depending upon the presence or absence of motivated stakeholders in the school community. Without implementation plans, the likelihood of securing funding for emergent initiatives is limited: those led by members of the Guidance Department could be supported with funds from the department budget pending approval from division principals and the School Head. Without an articulated policy or initiative to justify expenditures the possibility of
approval is unlikely. Similarly, the impact and sustainability of any initiatives would depend upon stakeholder buy in and the scope of the initiatives suggested.

Though the possibility for meaningful change exists with this solution, it doesn’t address increased need for well-being supports arising due to changing demographics, nor does it indicate to accrediting bodies that TIS has taken recommendations to heart when planning for school improvement. Further, the need for specific programming to address the unique need of TCK and EAL students is not addressed. Thus, a change solution should be implemented to address the problem of practice in this OIP.

**Solution #2: AI well-being learning teams.** The first possible AI application proposed is the formation of AI well-being learning teams to address international school student social-emotional well-being at TIS. An AI learning team is a small group formed within an organization that works towards a goal using the AI 4-D cycle (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008, p. 71). Such teams could be formed by members within the Guidance Department, EAL Department, and other interested stakeholder groups and focus on projects and initiatives of shared interest in their areas of responsibility (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). AI learning teams are recommended as ways to promote innovative practices and faculty development (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). Furthermore, existing faculty development processes include the creation of department goals and reporting to supervisors on progress throughout the school year. This process could be leveraged as a tool to monitor and evaluate progress within departments. It also avoids the problem of policy and initiative overload and fragmentation that can prevent effective implementation of policy and decrease teacher well-being by engaging existing
processes to scaffold change planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Ball, Maguire, Braun, & Hoskins, 2011; Fullan, 2000).

*Evaluation of solution #2: AI well-being learning teams.* The strength of this solution is in how it leverages existing faculty development and departmental improvement structures to further well-being goals. The time resources required to initiate the solution would be determined by the teams in each department based on the scope of the goal that they elect to work towards. TIS faculty already expect to dedicate time to such shared goals and would not experience this solution as requiring time resources in excess of normal expectations. Prior to faculty goal meetings at the start of the school year it would be necessary to train team members on the AI 4-D cycle and outline expectations. By focusing on departments directly engaged in work that supports TIS student well-being human resource requirements could be limited to those individuals most invested in the work.

As the nature of the changes implemented would be limited to those that could be enacted by small groups, the fiscal resources required would be less than those that might be needed to enact larger, school-wide initiatives. The impact and sustainability of the changes produced would be magnified by the alignment of the goal of increasing student well-being with existing departmental tasks and roles and the capacity of the team members to enact positive change due to their existing training in supporting student well-being. Given that I would facilitate this solution directly in my role as DOL and evaluating supervisor of the faculty in the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments, it would be best suited to address previously described structural gaps relating to guidance curriculum, human resource gaps related to awareness of unique international student well-being needs, and political gaps relating to EAL student and family supports.
Drawbacks to this solution are the limited scope of the changes: this approach does not address the structural gap represented by the lack of a school-wide well-being policy to align practices across the organization, or the symbolic gap that exists in the lack of explicit reference to well-being in the school’s vision or overt focus on well-being in the school’s culture. Additionally, this approach does not involve the engagement of TIS’s student and parent community, already analyzed as being a powerful potential change driver in the school.

Solution #3: Progressive AI well-being meetings. Similar to the previously analyzed AI well-being learning teams approach, the third possible solution, progressive AI well-being meetings, represents an approach to Appreciative Inquiry that is limited in scale (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). In this approach, groups move through the AI 4-D cycle through a series of multiple short meetings over an extended period of time (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). In the context of this OIP, TIS’s weekly professional development and collaborative planning time would be used to lead faculty through a 4-D cycle focused on addressing supporting student well-being school-wide. Over the course of the school year, TIS faculty meet for approximately 40 weekly sessions, 10 of which are extended two hour sessions facilitated by early student dismissal once per month. The progressive AI well-being meeting approach typically requires a series of 10 to 12 meetings of 2 to 4 hours, which is possible given the current infrastructure. Over the course of a school year, faculty would engage in meetings as outlined in Figure 4, below.
After learning the fundamentals of the AI process, the fall trimester sessions would revolve around professional learning and inquiry into international student social-emotional well-being topics and stakeholder needs and experiences. Such an approach is in accordance with best practices suggesting the importance of ensuring that stakeholders in strategic planning processes possess the requisite language and expertise to be participative (Gordon & Louis, 2013; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Starratt, 2008). This trimester focuses on the Discovery phase of the AI 4-D cycle.

The winter trimester sessions bridge the Discovery, Dream, and Design phases as groups use data from interviews to map the strengths and gaps in existing student well-being programming and processes and redesign them within the scope of their agency based on their departmental affiliation and connection to other groups within the school. To promote critical thinking, problem solving, iterative planning, and to overcome the limitations of hierarchical bureaucracy and promote innovation and collaborative construction of new knowledge, a “studio” model of collaborative planning, involving open physical spaces, fluid group composition, and honest
sharing is suggested (Chance, 2012, pg. 50). TIS’s on-site collaborative professional development sessions have historically utilized such an approach, so faculty fluency and comfort with such an approach is high.

Finally, the summer trimester would be largely spent in the Destiny 4-D phase with groups organizing, implementing, and aligning plans. During meetings, groups would be called upon to share work, seek opportunities to further collaborate, share resources, and celebrate milestones. A final review of progress would occur at year’s end to prepare for next steps.

*Evaluation of solution #3: Progressive AI meetings.* The progressive AI well-being meetings approach offers many benefits. A benefit of the approach with respect to time requirements is the short duration of the meetings and the use of existing scheduled collaborative time to carry out processes. This approach minimizes disruption to teachers’ schedules and provides an ongoing structure to support teams in moving through the 4-D phases. Human resource requirements for this approach are high: all faculty would be engaged in the meetings multiple times throughout the year. The number of faculty stakeholders collaborating in diverse planning teams can facilitate fluid and connective opportunities to produce workable action plans, cognitive shifts, and reframing of challenges, and apply democratic and communitarian approaches to stakeholder shared leadership (Gordon & Louis, 2012; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Starratt, 2008). As this approach relies on existing collaborative practice within the school, fiscal resources required would be limited and already accounted for in existing yearly budgets. In terms of impact and sustainability, encouraging faculty engagement across school divisions supports the implementation of school-wide solutions which are suggested to be more effective at promoting well-being in schools (Higgins & Wigford, 2018). Engaging numerous
stakeholders in initiatives to support student well-being also promotes sustainability in spite of annual faculty turnover.

A drawback is that this approach competes for collaborative planning and professional development time that is in high demand. Other processes, such as school reporting, accreditation focus groups, and general meetings require the use of this time and division principals, IB coordinators, and the DOL may have different priorities regarding how it is used. Another drawback involving the timing of this approach is that continuity and momentum may be difficult to maintain among faculty when individuals miss meetings or when other priorities arise (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008).

A fiscal drawback to the proposed plan is that the timing of the sessions limits the possibility of acquiring funding for initiatives to be enacted in the summer trimester. School budgets are finalized at the end of the winter term and teams would not be able to request funding specifically earmarked for their initiatives until the following year, possibly limiting impact and resulting in a lack of trust among participants that resources will be made available to support positive and sustainable change. Finally, this solution does not explicitly address the structural gap in TIS represented by the lack of school-wide policy and supports, though it could be leveraged to do so.

**Solution #4: Standalone AI well-being summit.** The fourth proposed solution is the implementation of a standalone AI well-being summit during the inservice week prior to the start of the school year. The AI summit is an organization-wide, structured, group planning, designing, and implementation meeting that functions to discover an organization’s strengths and leverage them for future success (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2018). Participants in the
summit would include all TIS stakeholders: administrators, teachers, parents, students, and other community members.

The AI well-being summit would be focused on international student well-being at TIS as a topic of relevance and structured to ensure that all stakeholders present have an equal voice (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). Over the course of the one- or two-day event, participants would proceed through an entire modified 4-D cycle as outlined by Watkins & Mohr (2001) to include integrated AI capacity building while engaging in pair interviews and both small- and large-group activities (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008, p. 62). Through facilitated sessions, participants will discover and assess existing programming and formal and informal supports for student well-being at TIS. They would then collaborate to form a shared, organization-wide change vision and self-organize to devise plans to achieve change goals. Finally, initial work could begin and carry over past the end of the session (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). Over the course of the following school year, plans would be shared, progress marked, and milestones celebrated intermittently to maintain momentum (Jansen, 2004).

*Evaluation of solution #4: AI well-being summit.* A strength of the AI well-being summit solution is the limited time required to initiate changes and accomplish organization-wide change. In-service days are traditionally used for school-wide professional development events at TIS and funding and time resources are set aside to accommodate it. Leveraging this time resource to carry out an AI well-being summit would align well with common practice in the school. From a human resource perspective, the AI well-being summit solution is effective in making the best use of the entire school community as human resources with its community engagement approach. Fiscal resources to support school-wide professional development are
provided a separate budget within the school that is managed by the DOL that would be more than sufficient to fund such an event on the TIS campus. In fact, it might be seen as a fiscally responsible approach to professional development and be supported by the board: typically significant funds are allocated to flying guest presenters to the school from abroad. The AI well-being summit would use that time for meaningful professional development while expending significantly fewer fiscal resources.

The AI well-being summit approach promises meaningful change despite the limited time spent: the approach has been applied successfully in a number of organizations (Bushe & Kassam, 2005; McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). The engagement of high-level actors like administrators and influential parent stakeholders offers increased potential for structural gaps in existing policy to be addressed publicly which may increase the likelihood of sustainable changes being implemented at the school policy level. The whole-school event might serve to raise awareness in a visible way and serve to address the symbolic gap existing in TIS as it relates to the need for a culture of well-being.

Drawbacks to the AI well-being summit approach are similar to those of the progressive AI well-being meeting approach. First, it uses time set aside for faculty collaboration and staff development that is a limited resource. Second, mandating whole faculty engagement in the summit may lead to resulting resentment or diluted engagement. Of the solutions presented, the AI well-being summit requires the highest up-front investment of resources: time resources in the form of full-days of in-service planning time; human resources in the form of participants and staff required to plan, organize, communicate, and manage the event; and fiscal resources to fund the event and logistics. This may hinder administrative support. Another drawback is
that the size of the impact and implementation of sustainable changes is not a foregone conclusion given the short-term format of the event.

**Summary and evaluation.** Four solutions to the problem of practice were outlined and analyzed: maintaining the status quo, creating AI well-being learning teams, initiating faculty-wide progressive AI well-being meetings, and running a school-wide AI well-being summit event. The strengths and weaknesses of each proposed solution are summarized in Figure 5, below.

![Figure 5. Summary and evaluation of possible OIP solutions](image)

As indicated by Figure 5, upon analysis none of the possible solutions is poised to adequately address all of the necessary changes proposed as a result of the critical organizational analysis presented earlier in this OIP. Therefore, a fifth solution is proposed that combines Solution #2, AI well-being learning teams, and Solution #4, the AI well-being summit. Doing so represents the most resource-efficient approach to adequately address all five necessary changes and organizational gaps.

By limiting mandated all-faculty involvement to a single one- or two-day event, push-back against the initiative will be minimized while the benefits of a highly-visible, community-wide event can be reaped to raise awareness and address the need for school-wide policy and a culture that supports student well-being as a goal. Throughout the year, self-organizing groups of interested community members
could work towards goals and school-wide communication of progress would be carried out through standard channels like the school newsletter and intermittent meetings of a well-being committee composed of diverse school community stakeholders. The participative processes and whole-community engagement central to the AI well-being summit component aligns with the shared leadership approach foundational to this OIP. The voluntary nature of participation in self-organized change initiatives enacts conceptualizations of servant leadership. Meanwhile, those within the school whose work is most aligned with student well-being would be enlisted in AI well-being learning teams to address necessary changes within the organization by working to create a research-based student well-being policy, providing training to faculty, students, and parents throughout the year, and ensuring that non-English speaking students and families are aware of the student support services available in the organization to support equity and inclusion.

**Chapter 2 Conclusion**

Chapter 2 has focused on the planning and development of an OIP to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional learning of TIS’s international student body grounded in systems thinking, shared leadership, and servant leadership. To do so, a synthesis of Cooperrider et al.’s (2008) AI approach and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators and ‘dual operating system’ was created as a framework to lead the change. A critical organizational analysis based on Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames model identified five necessary changes to address the outcomes of this analysis. Starratt’s (1991) three ethics of critique, justice, and caring were used as a framework to analyze the ethical considerations and challenges in the approaches to change and necessary changes of this OIP. Finally, four possible solutions centered on various applications of the AI approach were
proposed and evaluated based on the resources required, the degree to which they
address organizational gaps identified in the critical organizational analysis, and their
potential to successfully undertake the five necessary changes. Based on this
evaluation, a fifth solution was synthesized to best address the necessary changes and
gaps in an efficient way. In Chapter 3, a plan for implementing, monitoring, and
communicating the organizational change process will be developed.
Chapter 3: Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication

Chapter 1 of this OIP described the history and context of TIS and presented the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse international body as the Problem of Practice (PoP) of this OIP. Chapter 2 developed a framework for understanding change based on a synthesis of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators and applied an organizational analysis to determine necessary changes based on existing gaps at TIS. After evaluating a number of possible solutions, it was decided that the most appropriate involved a combination of two elements: (1) a school-wide AI well-being summit and support of subsequent stakeholder-lead change initiatives, and (2) the creation of AI well-being learning teams comprising members of the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments.

In Chapter 3, the shared leadership, servant leadership, and systems thinking practices outlined in Chapter 2 and aligned with the leadership position and lens statement in Chapter 1 will be articulated through AI approaches and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators in plans that outline how the solution selected in Chapter 2 will be implemented, monitored and evaluated, and communicated.

Change Implementation Plan

Effective planning applies principles of systems thinking to address school and community concerns in a holistic way and not as isolated parts (Shaked & Schechter, 2013a; Shaked & Schechter, 2016). The change implementation plan that follows outlines a process with measurable and timely goals that takes into account multiple stakeholder needs while supporting organizational learning and principles of shared leadership foundational to this OIP described in Chapters 1 and 2 (Sheppard et al., 2009). Since the change solution proposed by this OIP comprises two distinct parts,
both a school-wide AI well-being summit and department-centered AI well-being learning teams running in parallel, goals, stakeholder reactions, resources, and challenges for each element will be addressed separately. Implementation timelines and procedures for each element will be described within the framework of Kotter’s (2014) accelerators and the AI 4-D process as outlined in the previous chapter.

**Component 1: AI well-being summit.** The first element of the change implementation plan is the delivery of a school-wide AI well-being summit.

**AI well-being summit goals.** The AI well-being summit element of the change implementation plan is included with the goal of addressing the following necessary changes outlined in Chapter 2 of this OIP: the establishment of a school-wide student well-being working group, the provision of well-being trainings and workshops to promote discourse and raise awareness, and the creation of symbolic drivers in the form of initiatives and events to explicitly support international student well-being within the school community and culture.

By engaging stakeholders from across the entire school community into a discussion on international school student well-being at TIS, the AI well-being summit will apply processes that enact key elements of systems thinking and Shaked and Schechter’s (2013b) SSL approach discussed in Chapter 1 of this OIP. Bringing stakeholders from all segments of the community together provides opportunities for considering how groups influence one another and the connections between elements of the community and organization (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

The application of the 4-D process throughout the event and the subsequent implementation of community-driven initiatives will engage stakeholders in evaluating the significance of issues as they share their experiences and perceptions and reflect on the outcomes of the actions taken (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019;
The democratic and inclusive nature of the discussions and interviews carried out during the AI well-being summit event engage stakeholders in shared leadership and the following stakeholder-led initiatives present an opportunity for leadership opportunities to be shared among individuals from various stakeholder groups to lead for meaningful change (Gordon & Louis, 2013). The organic formation and varied composition of these groups creates the dynamic network half of the ‘dual operating system’ described in Kotter’s (2014) accelerator framework that operates alongside the traditional organizational hierarchy at TIS.

**AI well-being summit stakeholder reactions.** The foundational importance of stakeholder input and shared discourse inherent in the process of delivering the AI well-being summit will engage stakeholders in providing feedback through all steps of the process (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008). Prior to the event itself, the formation of a well-being working group composed of champions from within the organization to plan and facilitate the event will gauge initial stakeholder and administrative reactions and concerns, as will ongoing reports and feedback obtained through formal and informal meetings and communications with well-being working group members and initiative leaders, and formal reports during administrative council meetings (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). The frequent, periodic feedback will allow for adjustments to be made as required to reflect new data, stakeholder feedback, and emergent issues as needed. For example, should shifts in student demographics occur during the course of the year or data indicate that specific issues in student well-being become pressing, plans can be made to address these issues specifically during the summit event.

The voluntary nature of participation in stakeholder-led change initiatives should limit negative reactions and resistance to the AI well-being summit process.
over the long-term as individuals self-select into groups pursuing activities that they find personally meaningful and that engage their abilities, interests, and competencies (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Lyubomirsky, 2008). Due to the diverse cultures and interests that may be represented by group members, disagreements and challenges may arise. The DOL will facilitate remediation of disputes during follow-up meetings should this occur.

**AI well-being summit key change agents.** The selection of key change agents involved in the AI well-being summit will occur prior to the event through the selection of the well-being working group members who will be tasked with the planning and facilitation of the event. In order to engage stakeholders at all levels of the change plan from all major stakeholder groups in the TIS school community, the well-being working groups should include representatives from school-wide administration, division leadership and teaching faculty, the EAL and Guidance Departments, parents, and students. This will operationalize the core ideals of leading wholes and taking a multidimensional view of the SSL systems thinking approach (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). The DOL will chair the group and volunteers will be sought from the stakeholder groups above to complete the body. Attendance at the AI summit event will be open to all who wish to participate within the community, with mandated attendance by certain groups within the school such as teaching faculty, counselors, division leadership, student council leadership, and representatives from the parent steering committee.

During the course of the AI well-being summit event, participants may voluntarily form teams to pursue initiatives that emerge from the discussions and planning sessions that take place during the event (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). Participation in these teams will not be managed by the school administration or well-
being working group beyond facilitating communication between members from differing stakeholder groups, providing logistic and limited financial support for resulting initiatives, and ensuring that processes and outcomes are safe and ethical.

**AI well-being summit supports and resources.** To ensure that the AI well-being summit event is successful and effective, the DOL and well-being working group will need to procure and organize resources to support the delivery of the event. The AI well-being summit event will require, at a minimum, a single in-service professional development day to be set aside at the beginning of the 2021-22 school year (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). Prior to the event, the working group will require a number of official meetings and ongoing informal communication in order to prepare for the event. This is predicted to require between three and twelve months (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). As such, preparations and planning meetings should commence during the 2020-21 school year in order to provide adequate time to prepare for the event. Afterwards, time will need to be scheduled for meetings with teams leading initiatives and follow up communications to maintain momentum.

To host the event and the subsequent meetings the school has sufficient human and technological resources as well as ample physical facilities on site. This will help to limit financial resource requirements. Costs will be limited to refreshments and meals for participants. These costs are well within the scope of the annual school-wide professional development budget to absorb.

**AI well-being summit implementation timeline.** As described in the previous chapter, Kotter’s (2014) accelerators provide a clear set of step-wise benchmarks by which to measure the progress of the AI well-being summit preparations, implementation, and follow-up. The implementation plan is best viewed as comprising two phases: a planning/logistics phase in the 2020-21 school year and an
implementation phase during the 2021-22 school year. The alignment with Kotter’s (2014) accelerators and the AI 4-D phases is best viewed as two change cycles linked by the AI summit event as the final stage of the first cycle and the beginning of the second cycle. The timeline in Figure 6 summarizes the steps of a draft implementation plan and their alignment with the two cycles of both change frameworks.

![Timeline Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.** AI summit implementation plan & change framework alignments

Key milestones in the first cycle are the creation of a school-wide well-being working group, draft agenda, and plan for the logistics of the AI well-being summit event during the 2020-21 school year. The AI well-being summit serves as a bridge between the two change cycles, representing the institution of the change goal of the planning and implementation phase and the initiating event that will create urgency, continue coalition-building, and engage school-wide stakeholders in creating shared visions and strategies for change in action groups of inspired volunteers. These groups of volunteers will be supported in their efforts by the DOL over the remainder of the 2021-22 school year as they enact change initiatives to support student well-being at TIS, and their progress will be monitored through small-group meetings and
communications, and celebrated and communicated school-wide. A final progress report in the fourth quarter of the 2021-22 school year will be shared with all stakeholders.

**AI well-being summit issues.** The limited scale of the AI well-being summit as a single-day event hosted on-campus precludes major issues for implementation outside of scheduling issues due to limited foreknowledge of regional holidays without fixed dates and the possibility of limited engagement by certain stakeholder groups. To offset the former, multiple possible dates could be selected from to facilitate the summit event: in-service dates prior to the start of the 2021-22 school year, scheduled first quarter in-service professional development days, or contracted weekend professional development days. To address the latter, pre-registration and identification of champions from different groups within the TIS community might be addressed during the planning and logistics phase in the second half of the 2020-21 school year to ensure that all groups are represented. If this does not serve to address the issue, the fact that significant numbers of teachers and administrators have children enrolled as students at TIS, discussed in Chapter 1 can partially address the need for stakeholder representation by selecting teacher-parents to fill the role of parent stakeholders and children of teacher-parents to act as student representatives as needed.

**Component 2: AI well-being learning teams.** The second element of the change implementation plan suggested in this OIP is the implementation of AI well-being learning teams composed of members of the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments. An AI learning team is a small group formed within an organization that works towards a goal using the AI 4-D cycle (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2008, p. 71).
**AI well-being learning team goals.** The AI well-being learning team component of the change implementation plan is included with the goal of addressing the following necessary changes outlined in Chapter 2 of this OIP: the drafting of a school well-being policy, the implementation of appropriate international counseling standards to guide practice in the TIS Guidance Department, the provision of well-being trainings and workshops to promote discourse and raise awareness, and the investigation into ways to ensure awareness of available student well-being resources among non-English speaking stakeholders in the TIS school community. Members of the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments at TIS are uniquely suited to address these goals and motivated by shared professional and moral commitments to student well-being to support ongoing engagement in AI well-being learning teams over the course of the 2021-22 school year (Greenfield, 1991; Johnson, 1990). For example, members of the Guidance Department currently offer workshops to parents on various issues related to student well-being on a voluntary basis and EAL instructors have reached out within the organization for translation support to facilitate communication with parent stakeholders.

The curriculum alignment and stakeholder training sessions will impact student well-being by building capacity among parents and teachers to support TIS student well-being during their interactions with students, leveraging a systems thinking approach foundational to this OIP through SSL principles of leading wholes and taking a multidimensional approach that addresses change from multiple angles (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). For example, teachers and parents might receive training on self-management tools to share with students to combat academic stress at relevant points throughout the year. Teachers can be made aware of the unique stressors experienced by EAL students and receive professional development on how
to differentiate to meet the needs of second language learners. Implementation of
international school counseling standards aligned with student need will help ensure
that advisory lessons address issues pertinent to TCKs to provide tools to students to
help them cope with being an expatriate TCK.

Ideally, a second outcome of this component of the OIP change
implementation plan would be the enlisting of stakeholders from these departments in
the well-being working group proposed in component one, the AI well-being summit.
In this way, members of the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments could
serve as champions supporting changes to increase international school student social-
emotional well-being school-wide, meeting a need identified for organizational
change in general (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Cawsey et al., 2016) and for AI summits
in particular (McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). The current school organizational chart
supports this due to the DOL’s role in evaluating the Guidance, EAL, and Student
Support Departments and in championing the school-wide change vision of this OIP.

**AI well-being learning team stakeholder reactions.** The stated philosophy of
the TIS Student Support program is to “... foster cultural understanding, personal
safety, [and] emotional well-being ... in close collaboration with parents and other
stakeholders” (TIS, 2019f, p. 3). As such, the AI well-being learning team goals of
implementing internationally-aligned guidance curricula, reaching out to families for
whom English is a second language, and educating school stakeholders broadly align
with the program directives. Formal and informal feedback from the departments in
question further support that stakeholder reactions to the implementation of AI well-
being learning teams in pursuit of the aforementioned goals will be favorably
received. Department members currently pursue annual professional goals aligned
with school-wide initiatives as a part of school-wide evaluation processes overseen by
the DOL and will be leveraged as a contractual obligation in service of the goals of the OIP.

**AI well-being learning team key change agents.** A number of structures and procedures within the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments currently exist that support and inform the selection of key change agents for this component of the change implementation plan. The DOL interfaces directly in monthly meetings with the elementary school EAL Team Leader, and middle and high school Student Support teacher at scheduled monthly cross-division meetings and, given their leadership roles in their respective departments, they qualify as key stakeholders. Due to the small size of the Guidance Department and division-specific role of each of the counselors, all three individuals warrant inclusion as key stakeholders from the Guidance Department. High level AI well-being learning team planning meetings and progress monitoring will take place on a monthly basis in the previously mentioned meetings, with these key stakeholders leading their respective teams in the interim as middle-leaders, embodying ideals of shared leadership foundational to this OIP and conducive to successful professional development (Sheppard et al., 2009).

**AI well-being learning team supports & resources.** As an elaboration on existing processes and procedures enacted within TIS, the implementation of AI well-being learning teams requires only limited support and resources to successfully implement as a component of this OIP’s change implementation plan. The stakeholders engaged in implementing this component of the change plan will not be called upon to spend additional time outside of their currently contracted duties. As a function of TIS’s ongoing curriculum review, funding has been secured for annual membership of guidance department faculty in the International School Counselors’ Association (ISCA). As a result, the department has access to the ISCA guidance
curriculum standards and reduced fees for professional development to support implementation. Department budgets are sufficient to support this professional development and training.

Additional human and information resources will be required in order to address the need for improved communication with families of ELL students at TIS. The school currently does not employ translation services and will need to look within the school faculty and parent community for volunteers willing to translate documents to facilitate communication of important community-facing information about available student well-being supports to different groups within the TIS community. Parent stakeholders have volunteered to provide such support on an ad hoc basis in the past and the topic can be addressed specifically during the AI well-being summit component of the plan to communicate need and enlist volunteers. The strong culture of parent-involvement in the TIS community and multilingual faculty suggest that accomplishing this task is feasible. Financial resources may need to be procured or earmarked for this purpose during budget planning.

**AI well-being learning team implementation timeline.** The implementation of AI well-being learning teams will leverage existing structures and processes and be informed and augmented by AI principles. During the 2020-2021 start-of-year in-service week, the DOL will meet with all stakeholders to provide an information session regarding the AI well-being learning team initiative. At this time, all stakeholders will be engaged in activities to address the Discover and Dream AI 4-D phases. During subsequent monthly Student Support and Guidance Department meetings in the first quarter of the school year, the DOL will facilitate meetings during which stakeholders can engage in the AI 4-D Design phase. Action plans will be finalized during professional goal meetings with all stakeholders at the end of the
first quarter. Progress toward goals will be monitored in monthly department meetings, third quarter professional goal progress meetings, and end-of-year evaluations. Informal communications occurring as a consequence of the frequent daily interaction between the stakeholders will further facilitate adaptation and progress.

**AI well-being learning team implementation issues.** The facilitation of communication between non-English speaking members of the TIS parent community and the Guidance, EAL, Student Support teams relies on the availability of bilingual community members willing to volunteer their time to engage in this component of the change implementation plan by translating key documents throughout the year. Given the large number of different languages and cultures present in the TIS community, willing or able participants may not be available to meet the needs of all groups in the school. Enlisting stakeholders from within the EAL and Guidance Departments to prioritize needs based on enrollment and other data will help to ensure that the progress pursued is effective and meets the needs of the greatest number of community members.

In summary, the change plan suggested by this OIP will progress over a two-year time frame and consist of two parallel elements, an AI well-being summit and AI well-being learning teams, as determined most appropriate in Chapter 2. The AI well-being summit process will span two years: the first year focusing on planning, preparation, and capacity building among key stakeholders and the second focusing on the summit event itself and the support of subsequent initiatives stemming from the summit. Concurrent with the second year of the AI well-being summit, AI learning teams will be initiated within the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments to address curricular alignment with international guidance standards, community
education and awareness sessions, and improvements in student support service access for EAL students and families. Both components will leverage existing processes as often as possible as channels and frameworks to provide support and to facilitate monitoring and evaluation.

**Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

Continued monitoring and evaluation of the change process will help ensure that progress is made across all components of the OIP change plan and that outcomes are beneficial in supporting the social-emotional well-being of the international student body at TIS (Adams, 2000; Sheppard et al., 2009). In the context of this OIP, monitoring refers to tracking change process implementation, progress, and outcomes, while evaluation refers to forming judgements about program performance (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 12). Monitoring and evaluation are considered to exist in an integrative relationship in which monitoring provides data which can be used to evaluate progress and outcomes, which in turn allows participants to qualify and learn from the data (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). A general conceptual framework for monitoring and evaluation of the change implementation plan follows, and subsequent sections will outline detailed monitoring and evaluation plans for the AI well-being summit and AI well-being learning teams separately.

**Conceptual framework for monitoring and evaluation.** This conceptual framework addresses monitoring and evaluation through a lens of strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycles (Sheppard et al., 2009) and AI in order to align with the systems thinking and shared leadership approaches foundational to this OIP.

**Strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycle.** Traditional quality improvement methods, such as the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) approach, are frequently presented as a cycle of planning, action, and inquiry that repeats itself
across multiple iterations of a change process, as represented in Figure 7, below. Such an easily digested presentation of a reflective change implementation process fails to account for the nature of schools as being a part of larger, complex systems (Pascale, 2001; Sheppard et al., 2009). To address this in line with the systems thinking approach to change foundational to this OIP, a more complex implementation of strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycles, such as that suggested by Sheppard et al. (2009) and illustrated in Figure 8, below, will be utilized as a tool for monitoring and evaluation.

Figure 7. The Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle. Adapted from “Using the PDSA model for effective change management” by P. Donnelly and P. Kirk, 2015, Education for Primary Care, 26, p.279.
This strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycle model will be applied through structures present in the change implementation plan described earlier in this chapter and existing school processes to ensure that appropriately developed monitoring approaches are used that are feasible to implement and address strategic needs (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). The evaluations carried out throughout the process may be considered both formative in nature, serving to improve processes, and summative in nature, serving to review and judge the quality of outcomes due to the cyclical nature of the strategic thinking and learning cycle and the iterative 4-D phase cycles it contains.

*AI in monitoring and evaluation.* As a framework for leading change foundational to this OIP and a process central to the change implementation plan, AI principles and the 4-D cycle will be adhered to throughout the monitoring and evaluation framework to maintain alignment and leverage the method’s strengths as a
tool in this regard (Preskill & Coghlan, 2004). Using AI processes in support of evaluation will align this element of the OIP with the foundational social constructivist and shared leadership approaches and with an ongoing, iterative, and inquiry based process outlined in the strategic thinking and learning cycle by obtaining participating stakeholder feedback to periodically assess progress and iteratively re-design plans to achieve goals (Dunlap, 2008; Howieson, 2011).

Formal, scheduled meetings between stakeholders and administrators outlined in the change plan implementation section earlier in this chapter will follow a condensed AI 4-D process when enacting the 4-D phase sub-cycles present in the strategic thinking and learning cycle processes described in Figure 8, above. The condensed AI 4-D inquiry will address the evaluation questions described in the next section and outlined in Figure 9, below. Such an approach has been shown to reduce negative experiences and increase participant ownership and participation in evaluation (Mohr, Smith, & Watkins, 2000; Odell, 2002).

**AI evaluation questions.** Alignment of monitoring and evaluation in this OIP are supported by focusing on common evaluation questions throughout the process. These questions stem from the guiding questions arising from the PoP described in Chapter 1 and are outlined in Figure 9, below. This alignment ensures that the processes and programs implemented align with and address organizational needs related to the PoP. It further ensures that integrative complementarity is maintained throughout monitoring, formative, and summative assessment in the OIP (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016).
Figure 9. Alignment between OIP guiding questions and monitoring and evaluation questions.

**Monitoring & evaluation plan.** The following monitoring and evaluation plan is intended to describe what is monitored and evaluated in each of the two parallel components of the OIP change process and how it is accomplished. Due to the integrated nature of monitoring and evaluation in the strategic thinking and adaptive learning approach of this OIP, they will be described concurrently in the sections that follow. Finally, a complementary process of quantitative student well-being data collection will be outlined and described.

**Component one: AI well-being summit monitoring and evaluation.** The monitoring and evaluation plan for the AI well-being summit component of the change process described in this OIP follows. Monitoring and evaluation processes
and procedures are outlined for the two phases described in the change implementation plan: (1) planning and logistics during the 2020-21 school year, and (2) implementation during the 2021-22 school year.

**AI well-being summit phase 1: Planning and logistics.** During the initial planning and logistics phase of the AI well-being summit component of the change process monitoring and evaluation will be carried out as an ongoing function of the meetings of the well-being working group and through quarterly administrative council meetings to review progress on the school’s annual action plan. Figure 6 in the change implementation plan section of this chapter outlines a sequence of steps to be carried out during the 2020-2021 school year. Each of these steps will necessitate, at minimum, one meeting of the well-being working group to address. These meetings will follow an AI 4-D process aligned with the evaluation questions outlined above and apply principles of strategic thinking and adaptive learning outlined earlier to allow for necessary modifications to ensure efficient, appropriate, and effective implementation on an ongoing basis (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016).

Progress will be evaluated according to the change implementation plan, with Kotter’s (2014) accelerators used as benchmarks to evaluate appropriate step-wise progress through the change process. Additional accountability will be obtained through the inclusion of the steps in Figure 6 into the TIS 2020-2021 annual school action plan. Progress on the annual school action plan is evaluated for timeliness and fidelity at quarterly administrative council meetings of the TIS leadership team in order to ensure adherence to accreditation policies set forward by ACS WASC and the IB. Monitoring and evaluation data will be tracked, recorded and communicated by the DOL as a function of the role within TIS as it relates to school-wide learning and new program implementation.
AI well-being summit phase 2: Implementation. The implementation of the AI well-being summit comprises two parts: (1) the AI well-being summit event itself, and (2) the resulting work of the self-initiated teams generated as a result of the event. The event itself will be evaluated through a participant survey to be conducted post-event consisting of the evaluation questions presented in Figure 9. This data will be reviewed and analyzed by the well-being working group to determine if further support is required to increase engagement within the school community.

Additionally, artifacts representing the work of groups during the event will be recorded and evaluated to determine further monitoring needs based on the groups formed and initiatives created. Monitoring and evaluation of self-initiated teams will be carried out during the bi-annual goal meetings of TIS faculty, monthly check-in meetings, a progress review event, and a formal progress report outlined in Figure 6.

Teachers involved in self-initiated teams will have the option of using their team’s work as one of their annual professional goals. As part of standard, school-wide faculty supervision and evaluation processes, faculty are required to produce action plans and meet with their supervising administrator to monitor and evaluate their progress towards these goals. Year-end faculty evaluations report on achievement of goals based on completion of action plan steps, faculty self-assessments, and supervisor assessment of outcomes. A list of faculty opting to pursue initiatives emerging from the AI well-being summit will be provided to the DOL by supervising division principals and progress reports will be shared as a function of monitoring and evaluation of this OIP.

At the end of the AI well-being summit event, contact information from self-initiated teams will be collected, and in-person or technology-facilitated meetings will be arranged to monitor and evaluate progress using the evaluation questions outlined
in the previous section. Cumulative progress of all groups will be shared, celebrated, and evaluated by all stakeholders at a mid-year AI well-being summit progress review event structured around the common evaluation questions. Finally, a final progress report will be compiled at the end of the 2021-2022 school year to be evaluated and analyzed by the well-being working group to inform future planning and initiatives and by the TIS administrative council as a function of annual action plan review processes.

**Component two: AI well-being learning teams monitoring and evaluation.**

The monitoring and evaluation plan for the AI well-being learning team component of the change process described in this OIP follows. As the participants involved in this component are limited to faculty employed in the Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Departments under the direct supervision of the DOL, monitoring and evaluation processes will be integrated into existing communication, supervision, and evaluation processes within the departments, particularly monthly department meetings, biannual professional goal meetings, and end-of-year faculty evaluations.

As described earlier in this chapter, these processes involve the creation and monitoring of action plans to guide implementation of initiatives and the evaluation of outcomes based on achievement of professional goals. Meetings will follow a structure aligned with the AI 4-D phases centered on addressing the evaluation questions previously described in Figure 9. To assess and evaluate the fidelity and impact of the initiatives, additional means of monitoring and evaluating progress will be used as detailed below.

The first goal to be addressed by the AI well-being learning teams is the drafting of a school well-being policy. Once drafted, the policy will be shared with the
well-being committee and TIS administrative council for feedback and revision prior to being presented to the School Head for Board approval.

The second goal to be addressed by the AI well-being learning teams is the implementation of appropriate international counseling standards. The curriculum and assessment review cycle overseen by the DOL will be used as a tool to closely monitor the fidelity of implementation of such standards in Guidance Department and advisory lesson content, and end-of-year progress will be evaluated and reported to the administrative council as an existing function of that process. Additionally, mid-semester community feedback surveys related to student well-being experiences will be embedded into action planning in order to ensure accountability and obtain data to determine the effectiveness and impact of the initiative. Separate surveys will be sent to parent and student stakeholders via email and in-class during advisory programming, respectively. This data will be shared during goal meetings and department meetings to inform ongoing planning.

The third goal of the AI well-being learning team component of this OIP is the provision of well-being training and workshops to raise awareness and create a culture supportive of international student well-being at TIS. A professional development plan will be created as a part of the action planning process inherent in the creation of professional goals plans and progress and completion will be tracked by the DOL as a function of the position. Faculty ‘exit ticket’ surveys will be collected at the end of sessions to evaluate impact and learning and feedback will be gathered via bi-annual professional development feedback surveys already implemented at TIS. The data acquired will be shared during department meetings and professional goal progress meetings to inform practice and planning. Feedback and outcomes will be reported to
the school-wide professional development working group and the School Head as standard practice at TIS.

The final goal of the AI well-being learning team component of this OIP is to investigate ways to ensure the awareness of student well-being resources among non-English speaking stakeholders at TIS. To support the diverse school community and facilitate communication, each year parent volunteers are selected as ‘country representatives’. These parents are typically bilingual and are called upon by school administration to assist with translation of key documents and to facilitate communication between the school and other families from their nation or language group. To engage stakeholder input, monitor and facilitate progress, and evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives the DOL will enlist the Director of Community Relations to engage parent stakeholders already assigned as country representatives to collect feedback at the beginning of the 2021-22 school year and on a quarterly basis thereafter.

**Quantitative student well-being data collection.** A complementary process of quantitative student well-being data collection will be outlined and described that will serve to monitor student well-being in the middle and high school divisions at TIS and provide quantitative data to triangulate outcomes and gain insight into how student well-being changes throughout the year. This data may be of value for both formative feedback for ongoing improvement initiatives outlined in this OIP, and as summative data to compare outcomes year-to-year and address the continuing neoliberal drive for quantitative data to support policy and prove outcomes to the board (Fielding & Fielding, 2008; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016; White & Kern, 2018).

The proposed process for the collection of quantitative well-being data engages the existing middle and high school advisory framework at TIS as a medium
for the quarterly administering of the EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well-being (Kern, Benson, Steinberg, & Steinberg, 2016). The self-report well-being assessment tool measures five positive mental-emotional characteristics associated with well-being: engagement, perseverance, optimism, connectedness, and happiness and is one of few scales expressly created to measure adolescent well-being (Kern et al., 2016; Rose et al., 2017). The criteria measured align with Seligman’s (2011) PERMA theory of well-being, foundational to the conceptual understanding of well-being proposed by this OIP but adjusted to be developmentally appropriate for middle and high school students (Gregory & Brinkman, 2015). The validity of the tool has been confirmed through multiple studies with adolescents around the world, supporting its applicability within the multicultural school community at TIS (Kirca & Eksi, 2018; Osborn et al., 2019; Sobri, Hashim, & Mohammad, 2019; Zeng & Kern, 2019). The alignment between the PERMA and EPOCH criteria is summarized in Figure 10, below.

![Figure 10. Alignment of EPOCH and PERMA well-being characteristics. Adapted from Development of the Australian Student Wellbeing survey: Measuring the key aspects of social and emotional wellbeing during middle childhood (p. 14), by T. Gregory, and S Brinkman, 2015, Adelaide: Fraser Mustard Center.](image-url)
The assessment will be completed electronically during scheduled advisory classes by middle and high school students at TIS and managed and analyzed by the Guidance Department faculty and DOL as a function of their existing roles in the organization. Aggregate results will be shared with executive leadership to help evaluate the effectiveness of the OIP and inform future initiatives as needed. Heed will be paid to Campbell’s Law (Sidorkin, 2016) which states: “The more any quantitative social indicator is used for social decision-making, the more subject it will be to corruption pressures and the more apt it will be to distort and corrupt the social processes it is intended to monitor” (p. 322). As such, any use of quantitative data will only be to supplement and inform analysis of more qualitative measures in order to prevent corruption of vision due to system gaming (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2012; Wiggins & McTighe, 2007). A combined timeline of the monitoring and evaluation plan for both components of the OIP and the complementary quantitative testing element is provided in Figure 11, below.

*Figure 11. Combined OIP monitoring and evaluation timeline.*
In summary, monitoring and evaluation for both the AI well-being summit and AI learning team components of the OIP will significantly leverage existing school-wide monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes and proceed according to a framework of ongoing, iterative cycles described by the strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycle (Sheppard et al., 2009) evaluated according to affirmative questions aligned with the guiding questions emerging from the PoP outlined in Chapter 1. A complementary quantitative student well-being data measurement tool will be administered via middle and high school advisory classes to provide data for analysis to support iterative planning, formative assessment of progress, and summative evaluation of the effectiveness of the OIP in meeting its stated goals. Results of all monitoring and evaluation processes will be communicated to the school community to celebrate progress and success and maintain momentum towards change goals.

Plan to Communicate the Need for Change and the Change Process

Communication plays a central role in organizational change throughout the entire process by communicating the change vision, generating buy-in, increasing understanding of the initiative, and facilitating change adoption (Bordia et al., 2004; Whelan-Bery & Somerville, 2010). Communication in the context of this OIP is viewed through a social constructivist lens and refers to a social process where individuals co-create and share meaning within the organization (Souza, 2006).

The following plan to communicate the need for change and the change process will apply various tools and approaches to accomplish different strategies (Simoes & Esposito, 2014). First, a conceptual framework supporting the communication plan will be described as it aligns with principles of AI foundational to this OIP, Armenakis and Harris’s (2002) five key change message components, and
Klein’s (1996) key principles of organizational communication. Then, the key communications media leveraged in service of the OIP will be described and aligned with each component and phase of the change process.

**Conceptual framework for communication of change process.**

Communication plays a powerful role in shaping the interpersonal and symbolic environments of organizations (Fritz, 2013). Chapter 2 proposed five necessary changes resulting from the critical organizational analysis, all of which address communication within TIS to some degree, outlined in Figure 12, below. Due to the central importance of communication to the success of this OIP, alignment of the communication framework with principles of AI will help to ensure fidelity of outcomes with the theoretical frameworks that ground the plan.

![Figure 12. OIP-defined necessary changes as they relate to organizational communication.](image)

**Principles of AI and communication.** Communication practices and processes in this OIP will align with foundational principles of AI previously summarized in Chapter 2. Their specific relationship with the importance of how communication in the context of this OIP will be conducted will now be briefly addressed.
The constructionist principle directly relates to communication processes and how “words create worlds” as organizational reality is created through language and conversations between stakeholders (Cooperrider et al., 2008; McQuaid & Cooperrider, 2019). The poetic principle describes how organizational life is expressed and constantly co-authored in the stories that are told every day (Bushe et al., 2011). The anticipatory principle relates to how positive messages and images inspire positive action. (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Dunlap, 2008). Finally, the positive principle describes how positive questions lead to positive change and increase social bonding via positive messages (Cooperrider et al., 2008; Dunlap, 2008).

To ensure fidelity with the principles of AI foundational to this OIP, formal communications will be focused on addressing the positively worded guiding questions provided in Chapter 1 and the aligned positively worded evaluation questions outlined earlier in this chapter in Figure 9 as part of the change process monitoring and evaluation plan.

**Armenakis & Harris’s (2002) key change message components.** The content and structure of the communications supporting this OIP will be aligned with Armenakis and Harris’s (2002) five key change message components. These components are stated by the authors to apply to Kotter’s (1995) change approach, the precursor of Kotter’s (2014) accelerators foundational to this OIP (Armenakis & Harris, 2002). The components further align with the guiding questions emerging from the PoP outlined in Chapter 1 and the AI evaluation questions outlined in the change process monitoring and evaluation plan earlier in this chapter which will provide the framework for formal communications processes to support the OIP. A brief description of the change message components follows.
Armenakis and Harris’s (2002) five key change message components are discrepancy, efficacy, appropriateness, principal support, and personal valence. The first key component, discrepancy, addresses communicating the need for change and addressing gaps between current organizational states and desired outcomes (p. 170). Efficacy addresses individuals’ belief in their ability and the ability of the organization to achieve the desired goals (p. 170). Appropriateness refers to the ability of the proposed change to adequately and appropriately address the problem of practice (p. 170). Principal support refers to the availability of resources and ongoing support of leadership for the proposed change plan (p. 170). Finally, personal valence refers to the positive outcomes that individuals feel they will experience or accrue by participating in the change process (p. 171). The alignment between these five change message components and the guiding questions of this OIP and AI evaluation questions is outlined in Figure 13, below. The message components generally correspond to the 4-D phase-aligned guiding questions and their corresponding AI evaluation questions.
Klein’s key principles of organizational communication. Klein (1996) offers a list of research-supported principles of organizational communication as a strategy to support communication for successful organizational change. A brief summary of the principles and their alignment with the Systems School Leadership approach foundational to this OIP follows.

Klein’s first communication principle is the value of message redundancy and repetition and the use of many media to communicate effectively (Klein, 1996). It aligns with the SSL characteristics ‘taking a multi-dimensional view’ and ‘leading wholes’ insofar as it approaches communication through the perspectives of multiple
stakeholders and views the viewing different communications channels as being part of a larger system (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

The second communication principle Klein shares is the value of face-to-face communication over other media (Klein, 1996). This applies SSL approaches by addressing the value of ‘indirect influence’ through micropractices: small acts of kindness or respect, inherent in face-to-face interpersonal communications (Fritz, 2013; Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). It also entails the change leader ‘evaluating the significance’ (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b) of communications to individual recipients and tailoring messages for different stakeholders.

Klein’s third and fourth principles highlight the effectiveness of line hierarchy and direct supervision as communications channels (Klein, 1996). This addresses the SSL characteristics of ‘leading wholes’ and ‘influencing indirectly’ by leveraging existing structures and roles in the organization to apply influence to different stakeholder groups (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b).

The fifth principle offered by Klein (1996) is that opinion leaders can impact attitudes toward change initiatives. This principle addresses the systems thinking characteristics ‘taking a multi-dimensional view’, ‘leading wholes’, and ‘influencing indirectly’ by acknowledging the role champions play as informal change leaders within organizations through their collegial communications (Schaked & Schechter, 2013b).

Finally, Klein (1996) describes the need for information that is shared to be personally relevant to recipients. This applies all four characteristics of SSL by ‘evaluating the significance’ of the change initiative to individuals by taking a ‘multi-dimensional view’ of the problem of practice and solution in order to tailor communications to meet their individual needs. To accomplish this, leaders must ‘lead
wholes’ by seeing individual recipients of communication as stakeholders who can ‘influence indirectly’ to accomplish organization-wide goals through their individual actions (Shaked & Schechter, 2013b). The relationship between Klein’s (1996) principles and Shaked and Schechter’s SSL approach is summarized in Figure 14, below.

![Figure 14. Relationship between Klein’s (1996) principles of organizational communication and Shaked & Schechter’s (2013b) SSL model.](image)

Klein’s (1996) principles of organizational communication will direct the selection of media for communication and inform the processes used within TIS to carry out the functions of the communication plan implemented in support of this OIP.

**Key media for communication of change process.** The media selected for communication of the change process to TIS stakeholders comprise three broad categories: existing school communications media, structures emerging from OIP processes, and informal communications. Media within these categories and their application as it relates to communication of need for change and the change process of this OIP will be described and aligned with Klein’s (1996) key principles of
organizational communication to reinforce the application of characteristics of systems thinking in school leadership and differentiated by the 4-D phase they align with.

**Existing school communications media.** As a top-tier international school, TIS employs various media to support communication between stakeholders within the organization and market itself within the region. This OIP will leverage existing structures and tools to support communicating the need for change and change processes. These existing structures include a public-facing school website and private intranet, a weekly school electronic newsletter, and email communications with stakeholders facilitated by TIS’s Marketing and Communications Department. Additionally, regularly scheduled meetings with various stakeholder groups and committees such as the parent steering committee, student council, and teacher advisory council will be utilized to share information related to the OIP. Weekly professional development sessions provide another opportunity to update faculty on progress of initiatives and to celebrate successes.

Mass communications media like the website and newsletter will be extensively utilized during the AI 4-D *Discovery* phase, leveraging the high-visibility of these traditional media to inform stakeholders about objectives and activities, and to create urgency and justify change (Klein, 1996; Simoes & Esposito, 2014). They will continue to be leveraged throughout the *Dream, Design,* and *Destiny* phases of both the AI well-being summit component and the AI learning teams component to visibly recognize and celebrate progress and support the development of a culture that supports student well-being in line with the goals of this OIP by providing consistent, reinforcing communications in support of these values (Klein, 1996). The multiple channels of communication align with Klein’s (1996) principle of redundancy and use
of multiple media to communicate change. In the case of committee meetings and scheduled events like School Head addresses and weekly professional development sessions, Klein’s (1996) principles of the effectiveness of face-to-face communications and use of direct line supervisors to communicate are applied.

**Communications structures emerging from OIP processes.** In addition to existing communications channels, the change process of this OIP results in the emergence of structures for planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation that will be further leveraged as media for communication throughout the OIP.

In the AI well-being summit component these include scheduled meetings of the well-being working group, the AI well-being summit event, monthly check-in communications with volunteer teams, and mid- and end-of-year progress reviews. In the AI well-being learning team component, they include monthly department meetings, semi-annual goal meetings, and faculty and parent well-being-related professional development sessions. These media will be used throughout the entire 4-D change cycle to facilitate and communicate progress towards the goals of the OIP.

The participative nature of the AI well-being summit and stakeholder-created change initiatives applies Klein’s (1996) principles of face-to-face communication, personal valence, and enlisting opinion leaders to champion change efforts. The collaborative nature of the AI learning team component and alignment of the OIP goals with the stated goals of the student services and guidance department faculty applies Klein’s principle of personal valence and face-to-face communications. The DOL’s parallel roles of change agent and direct evaluating supervisor for the faculty involved applies Klein’s (1996) principles of direct supervision and line hierarchy.

During the Dream and Design 4-D phases, utilizing the monitoring and evaluation meetings for the dual purpose of ongoing communications as outlined
above will support the ongoing strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycle outlined in the change process monitoring and evaluation plan earlier in this chapter. It will further leverage the scope and agency of the DOL to act as a boundary spanner to promote increased stakeholder engagement and communication, formal and informal networking between action groups, and foster collaborative and shared leadership and a culture of trust (Chance, 2010; Gordon & Louis, 2013; Sheppard et al., 2009; Starratt, 2008). They will be reported on and communicated on through the aforementioned existing school communications media when appropriate to further apply Klein’s (1996) principle of message redundancy.

**Informal communications.** In addition to working with the formal communication systems and structures in schools, change leaders can also leverage informal communication and structures to bring change initiatives to fruition and ensure that the values that drive them manifest as artifacts and activities that will feedback in positive ways to build cultures supportive of change (Cawsey et al., 2016; Connolly et al., 2011; Leo & Wickenberg, 2013). Throughout all of the 4-D phases in both the AI well-being summit and AI well-being learning teams components, the DOL and well-being committee members will leverage Klein’s (1996) principle of opinion leadership to apply indirect influence through communications micropractices by “role modeling urgency” in informal, day-to-day communications within the school (Fritz, 2013; Kotter, 2014, p. 123). The impact of this form of “ripple effect” communication at TIS is magnified due to the degree of stakeholder group overlap described in Chapters 1 and 2 and communicated visually in Figure 2 (Oetting, 2009).

Effective communication of the need for change and change processes is a major factor affecting the success of change initiatives (Whelan-Berry & Somerville, 2010). In summary, communication of change processes within the context of this
OIP will leverage existing communications media, processes and structures emerging from the change implementation and monitoring and evaluation plans, and informal communications, to apply communications principles that support a systems thinking approach to change leadership and reinforce the AI principles foundational to the plan.

**Chapter 3 Conclusion**

This chapter has focused on the implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and communication of an OIP to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s diverse international student body through a two-component solution comprising (1) a school-wide AI well-being summit and the subsequent stakeholder-led initiatives spawned from it, and (2) AI well-being learning teams made up of members of the TIS Guidance, EAL, and Student Support Department. To do so, a change implementation plan was outlined that addressed the goals of the OIP, possible stakeholder reactions, key change agents, required support and resources, and a possible implementation timeline.

Next, a change process monitoring and evaluation plan was provided that applied strategic thinking and adaptive learning cycles to address the need for networked communication throughout the change process as described by Kotter’s (2014) accelerators. It centered around positively-phrased AI evaluation questions based on the guiding questions emerging from the PoP outlined in Chapter 1 to ensure alignment with principles of AI foundational to the OIP. Application of a quantitative measure of well-being, the EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well-being, was proposed to triangulate evaluation of successful progress towards achieving well-being goals as described by the PERMA well-being theory used to frame the PoP.
Finally, a plan to communicate the change process and need for change was outlined and aligned with principles of AI foundational to this OIP and their correspondences to Armenakis and Harris’s (2002) key change message components through the application of the AI evaluation questions of the change process monitoring and evaluation plan as the focus of content of communications. Communications media were then selected to apply Klein’s (1996) key principles of organizational communication as a means to address this OIP’s foundational concepts of systems thinking through their alignment with the SSL approach outlined in Chapter 2. Existing communication media, media emerging as a result of the change implementation plan, and informal communications were selected and aligned with the various AI 4-D phases and Kotter’s (2014) accelerators across the change process.

**Next Steps and Future Considerations**

This OIP has focused on the need to address the lack of strategically-aligned policies, programs, and systems to support the social-emotional well-being of TIS’s international student body. It has provided a plan to leverage the engaged TIS school community in both voluntary and school-mandated processes represented by an AI well-being summit event and AI well-being learning teams, respectively. The outcomes of the plan at the end of the OIP will be the establishment of a school-wide well-being working group and well-being policy, the implementation of international counseling standards, the provision of well-being training workshops, the improvement of access to well-being resources for non-English speaking students, and the development of a culture supportive of student well-being in the school.

Four follow-up steps related to the well-being working group and well-being policy at the end of the process outlined in this OIP are proposed: the review and publication of the resulting school-wide well-being policy, ongoing review of the
international standards implementation in the Guidance Department curriculum, continued work to support student well-being at TIS, and outreach initiatives to address regional international school student well-being.

The first follow-up step involves the review of the well-being policy by school administration and publication to ensure school stakeholder access. In-service sessions dedicated to communicating policy to faculty at the start of the school year will need to be updated to ensure that the new policy is effectively and efficiently communicated. Based on the outcomes of the two-year OIP process, the well-being working group would be tasked with carrying out further review and audit of school-wide well-being, addressing remaining gaps in service related to social-emotional well-being not successfully addressed by this OIP, or, depending on need, addressing other aspects of student well-being outlined in the TIS Well-being Strategy Proposal (TIS, 2019h).

As a second follow-up step, the implementation of international school counseling standards in the Guidance Department, will require continuing monitoring and review through the existing curriculum and assessment review process overseen by the DOL. As with other curricula at TIS, the implementation of the standards will be reviewed in a 6-year cycle to ensure fidelity of implementation and address emerging needs for faculty training and the provision of program resources. Feedback on the professional development workshops related to student well-being provided as a function of this OIP will be collected and used to plan for future sessions based on stakeholder input. Should it be determined that capacity gaps still exist, future training and development can be planned and provided by the DOL as a function of the role in the school.
Third, the application of the AI summit and AI learning team processes used in this OIP in service of social-emotional well-being could further be leveraged to support other aspects of student well-being; for example, physical health and well-being as a follow-up step. This would support comprehensive implementation of the TIS Well-being Strategy Proposal (TIS, 2019h) and take advantage institutional capacity built throughout the implementation of this OIP to further support student well-being and maintain momentum through the ongoing AI 4-D Destiny phase to support sustained support and culture-building in line with the goals of the plan.

Finally, to further support international school student social-emotional well-being in line with the systems thinking focused SSL approach foundational to this OIP, a powerful fourth step following this OIP would include the engagement of other schools in the region in conversations and actions to support student well-being. The need for school leaders to show concern for the success of all schools in their district in order to change the broader educational context in which they operate to improve their own is an element of systems thinking in school leadership (Daly & Finnigan, 2016; Fullan, 2005; Fullan, 2014; Shaked & Schechter, 2016). In the context of this OIP, hosting professional learning events at TIS for visiting members of other schools in the region or a national AI well-being summit for private international schools in TIS’s host nation would break silos between schools, forge professional relationships at all levels in the community of educators, and create a field for future action in which an educational culture that supports student mental and emotional well-being is strengthened. This further aligns with parallel school goals of raising TIS’s profile in the region as a hub for professional learning and leader in innovative, student-centered practice.
As a private, for-profit international school, TIS faces challenges of managing the expectations of multiple stakeholders: parents-as-customers with varying culturally-informed expectations, a board concerned with ensuring the profitability of the school as an organization, international accrediting and authorizing agencies with elaborate guidelines and success criteria, and a high-turnover faculty of teachers coping with the pressures of teaching a student body with diverse origins, languages, and experiences. Thankfully, all of the stakeholders at TIS share a common goal: the vision of the school as a thriving community that supports the positive holistic growth of the students it serves. TIS is uniquely suited to a strengths-based AI approach that leverages its sense of community and existing structures to meet the well-being needs of its student body. As children of the world and students in our classrooms, the international students of TIS deserve to be cared for and treated as unique and valuable individuals deserving of care and understanding from the teachers and administrators who serve them, in line with the goals of this OIP.
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