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Abstract

The accountability era of the past three decades failed to produce significant educational change, yet the standardized measures of student performance in primarily cognitive domains that epitomized that era continue to consume a disparate amount of energy and influence a disproportionate degree of decision-making in education organizations. That strategic-growth-crippling perseveration on standardized assessments is compounded by a general lack of change-process training, understanding and purposeful use in education contexts, and particularly exacerbated by the inability of education organizations to institutionalize effective innovations. The purpose of this study was to understand how a school district’s leadership team might move beyond a perseveration on parochial standardized assessments to innovate and employ a range of practical measures designed to bolster the district’s strategic improvement and embed operational innovations across the organization through a comprehensive change process. Acting from outside the district as a consultant, the researcher used critical education theory to inform a pragmatic-transformative worldview and appreciative-inquiry approach to that proposed change as well as emphasize the strengths and limits of the district leadership’s application of transformational leadership for organizational improvement. To provide an extensive example of a practical measurement tool, the Change Path Model (Cawsey, Deszca, & Ingols, 2016) is compared to the school district’s accreditation-informed change process; through that practical assessment, strengths of the district’s change process are appreciated and built upon while a lack of straightforward measures for successful institutionalization of innovations within that change process is emphasized and subsequently resolved by the description of novel organizational measures that could be
used by the district’s leadership team to positively inform the district’s strategic growth.

The researcher concluded that the innovation and institutionalization of a broad range of practical, context-specific improvement measures should accelerate a school district’s strategic growth. The limits of using a pragmatic, structural-functionalist approach for social-justice change are acknowledged, and the need for more research into the use of a purely transformative approach to change is considered.
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Executive Summary

This Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) considers the lack of measures used by a school district to inform its strategic growth. That Problem of Practice (PoP) is revealed through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) organizational analysis framework and the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016). An appreciative-inquiry-based change vision (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans, Thornton & Usinger, 2012; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008) celebrates the school district’s effective change strategies and also recommends the innovation and institutionalization of a comprehensive range of school-effectiveness measures within a monitoring and evaluation framework (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016) as the preferred solution to the PoP. Chosen because of its congruence with the school district’s strategic growth plan, the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is used to delineate a change plan for the preferred solution. Three distinct chapters explain specific details.

Chapter One provides context for this OIP. To begin, a brief history of the school district is provided, and its mission, vision and strategic growth plan are described. The district’s strategic growth process is shaped by its accreditation organization’s template for change and identified by the researcher as a form of transformational leadership. Embedded in critical education theory (Apple, 2005; Apple, 2019; Capper, 2019; Peters, 2005), the researcher’s pragmatic-transformative worldview (Creswell, 2014) informs the leadership approach adopted by the researcher to support the school district’s transformational goal of organizational improvement and, at the same time, keep the transformative goal of student maximum potential central to that strategic growth. After Bolman and Deal’s (2017) framework is used to express a change vision, members of the
district’s leadership team and the researcher as consultant are described as the main
drivers of the envisioned change. The chapter concludes with the use of Judge and
Douglas’ (2009) dimensions of organizational change capacity to assess the school
district’s readiness for change; the school district is considered ready to engage in this
OIP.

Chapter Two conveys ideas that underpin the vision for a comprehensive range of
strategic-growth measures in the school district. The chapter opens with a description of
the researcher’s leadership approach for the change presented; housed in appreciative
inquiry (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008), the
researcher adopts a situational leadership approach (Hersey & Blanchard, 1981; Hersey &
Blanchard, 1996; Northouse, 2019) modified by a release-of-responsibility model known
to educators (Collet, 2015). While Kotter’s (2014) change model is considered, the
Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is chosen to critically assess the strategic
growth underway in the district and as frame the proposed change process because it
closely matches the school district’s accreditation-informed change process and stresses
the importance of measurement for strategic growth. To further frame the proposed
change, Chapter Two concludes with a description of the researcher’s leadership ethics;
the relational-ethics posture described reinforces the need to balance the pragmatic change
process recommended in Chapter Three with the transformative ideals that enlighten the
researcher’s worldview (Capper, 2019; Liu, 2017).

Chapter Three proposes implementation, evaluation and communication plans for
a change process intended to improve the school district’s strategic growth: the innovation
and institutionalization of a comprehensive range of school-effectiveness measures within
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a monitoring and evaluation framework (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). A pragmatic implementation plan founded upon the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is used to delineate the proposed change. Then, to inform and enhance decision-making, several tools for monitoring and evaluating the change process are described; those tools are strategically chosen to leverage processes and systems currently used by the school district and at the same time offer examples of measurement tools that might be adopted by the school district within the monitoring and evaluation framework proposed and as an outcome of the change process. Because communication of change is essential for an effective change process (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Bryk, 2015; Cawsey et al., 2016; Kang, 2015; Klein, 1996), Chapter Three concludes with a detailed consideration of strategies to communicate the need for change and the proposed change process.

This OIP celebrates the passionate and skilled transformational leadership driving the strategic growth process in a school district and simultaneously identifies a lack of purposeful measures to guide that strategic growth. As a result of that appreciative critique, the researcher presents a pragmatic change plan that enhances the transformational change underway and at the same time keeps the transformative goal of student empowerment central to that change (Apple, 2005; Apple, 2019; Capper, 2019; Peters, 2005). The limits of using a structural-functionalist approach to effect transformative change (Capper, 2019; Ya’akovy, 2006) are acknowledged, and future considerations include contemplation of how a more critical form of transformative leadership might avoid any form of structural-functionalist change process.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem

The purpose of this Organizational Improvement Plan (OIP) is to explore key ideas relevant to a Problem of Practice (PoP) situated in National Company School District (NCSD). As required, details that reveal the organization under study have been anonymized (University of Western Ontario [UWO], 2017; UWO, 2016). To provide context for this study, this chapter begins with a brief history of NCSD and includes a summary of the organization’s structure, mission, vision and strategic growth plan. Next, my position relative to NCSD, my leadership position and my worldview are explained. With those parameters outlined, the PoP is stated and analyzed before a vision for organizational improvement relative to the PoP is described. This chapter concludes with an analysis of NCSD’s readiness for change; it is determined that NCSD is ready to make the change proposed and needs to make the change proposed.

Organizational Contexts

In this section, the location of NCSD and its basic history are explained. With that context provided, my theoretical stance as an academic practitioner is clarified and the PoP is described.

A Brief History

NCSD is located in a first-world country outside of North America. Established several years after the National Company was created in the mid-1900s, NCSD serves the children of expatriates who work for National Company. Early in the organization’s history, the wife of a North American employee brought North American curriculum books with her to a National Company community to teach her child and several other North American children. Today, NCSD serves almost 4000 expatriate students of
approximately fifty nationalities in seven National Company schools spread across several communities.

**NCSD in the World**

National Company is a large company. It employs 65,000 people, has operations around the world, and provides the foundation of the nation’s economy. While NCSD is located in a single, non-western country, NCSD students represent languages, cultures, traditions, and religions from around the world. In such a cosmopolitan context, there are innumerable worldviews, or belief systems, that underpin the expectations students, parents, and company officials have of NCSD and its employees. Further, while most nationalities present in the company are represented by students in NCSD schools, most NCSD employees are expatriates from North America; only a small number of NCSD employees represent non-western nations.

**Organizational Structure**

As shown in Figure 1, NCSD is similar to many North American school districts. As outlined in Figure 2, however, NCSD is unique because it is one division within the Human Resources department of National Company.
Figure 1. The flow of power and decision-making authority in National Company School District. Like many school districts in North America, NCSD houses senior administrative roles in a central office.
Figure 2. The flow of power in the National Company. NCSD is one division of one department in the National Company; NCSD is subject to many company decisions that are far-removed from education.

NCSD is organized in a way similar to North American education contexts, yet it is nested within the structure of a large company and is therefore uniquely influenced by that company. There are familiar layers of authority at the district level, but the layers of authority above the Superintendent are complex and unique to education contexts. At the bottom of all of these layers of authority are students, who have no power in NCSD or in the National Company. This power relationship is important to note because it informs both my leadership approach to this OIP and the preferred solution I propose for the PoP.

Senior executives make decisions regarding NCSD which, from their perspective, is simply one division in one department of the National Company. NCSD, therefore, is subject to business decisions far-removed from education. For example, hiring of expatriates for the company goes through growth cycles dependent upon economic
circumstances. When the company is growing, there can be major influxes of students due to the hiring of new personnel. In a recent school year, one school’s population grew by approximately twenty percent; class sizes grew from an average of twenty students to an average of twenty-four students. Last year, in another instance, the company finished a housing-development project in one company community and moved dozens of families from a smaller company community into the new houses. The smaller community’s school population of five hundred students shrank by almost two hundred students in one year, while the larger community’s schools had to absorb those students. Company decisions like those significantly impact the daily operations of NCSD. Since many company decisions are perceived to be made without the interests of students in mind, NCSD employees are constantly adjusting to company policy to keep their vision for students central to their work.

Mission, Vision and Strategic Growth

The mission of NCSD is to provide a world-class education for expatriate children so that highly qualified expatriates continue to work for the National Company. The vision of NCSD is to help every student realize their maximum potential through a culture of continuous improvement. With that vision in mind, the current superintendent of NCSD has used the idea of maximum potential as a lodestar for the current strategic growth plan. Through the current strategic plan, the Change Leadership Team (CLT) intends to move NCSD students closer to their maximum potential by empowering and motivating NCSD employees to engage in action research. While ‘maximum potential’ is not explicitly defined by NCSD, it is broadly understood to mean the continuous improvement of students through their experiences in the district, so the action research
undertaken by NCSD employees can focus on any action intended to improve the student experience. Through those action research projects, teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators work together at school sites to innovate change in pursuit of the vision for student maximum potential. Those action research projects are framed by the district’s accreditation protocol and guided by the district’s leadership team.

**The Sustaining Excellence Accreditation Protocol**

The NCSD strategic growth plan is embodied in the Middle States Association Sustaining Excellence Protocol (Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Elementary and Secondary Schools [MSA], n.d. b). The Sustaining Excellence Protocol (SEP) is an accreditation protocol that follows the previous MSA protocol of Excellence by Design (MSA, n.d. a), which NCSD concluded in the spring of 2017. Whereas the Excellence by Design (EbD) protocol focused on alignment across the NCSD system, the SEP *inspires* NCSD employees to use action research to *investigate* problems of practice and *innovate* solutions to those problems of practice. The progression of ‘Inspire’, ‘Investigate’, and ‘Innovate’ is symbolically abbreviated as ‘i3’ (i-three); the i3 symbol has become NCSD’s motivational emblem for the strategic growth process of the SEP.

While the previous EbD accreditation protocol (MSA, n.d. a) recognized the importance of alignment of curriculum and best practices across the district, the current SEP accreditation protocol recognizes the importance of adaptability across the district. The SEP recognizes that circumstances in schools and classrooms vary widely and require context-specific adaptations to support children in their pursuit of maximum potential. The SEP presents opportunities for students to more fully realize their
maximum potential through improved employee practice specific to students in their local context; at the same time, NCSD employees that participate in the SEP more fully realize their maximum potential by engaging in an action-research process to improve their practice. The Senior Transformational Leadership Team (STLT) and District Transformational Leadership Team (DTLT) are two specific teams that support the action research underway through the SEP.

The STLT is made up of the Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, two Curriculum Coordinators, Director of Technology, and seven Principals. The DTLT consists of teacher and administrative representatives from across the district. The members of those teams embody the implementation of the SEP and champion the action-research process in schools and classrooms by empowering and supporting the work of NCSD employees who choose to engage in action-research projects. Those teams and the overall SEP are led by the district’s Change Leadership Team.

**The Change Leadership Team**

The Change Leadership Team (CLT) consists of four of the highest-positioned roles in the NCSD hierarchy: the Superintendent, the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, the Curriculum Coordinator of Strategic Growth, and the Curriculum Coordinator of Instruction. While the organization itself does not identify the CLT as such, I have created the idea of the CLT for the purpose of understanding the change underway at NCSD; those four roles are the key leadership roles spearheading the change taking place through the SEP. All four individuals are experienced, passionate champions of students and teachers in schools, and could be described as
transformational leaders as they motivate NCSD employees to innovate through action research in pursuit of the NCSD mission and vision (Moolenaar, Daly, & Sleegers, 2010).

While transformational leadership can be an effective leadership approach, my leadership approach is somewhat different than the general leadership approach practiced by the CLT. While the CLT practices a transformational leadership approach, I intend to address this OIP through a transformational approach underpinned by a transformative purpose steeped in critical pedagogy.

**Leadership Position and Lens Statement**

Positionality has several meanings with regard to research in an organization (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009). One meaning of position refers to the researcher’s work position in the organization being researched. A second meaning of position refers to the theoretical position of the researcher. Both positions affect my OIP. After my pragmatic transformative leadership position is explained, I describe how that position is applied to this OIP through the lens of critical pedagogy.

**My Position in NCSD**

One meaning of positionality “…relates to the actual location of the policy researcher in respect of the focus of analysis” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009, p. 46). Generally, I am the researcher, and NCSD is the organization that my research is focused on. More specifically, my position as a researcher is as an academic practitioner formerly employed by NCSD. As an academic, my doctoral studies have immersed me in academia focused on a PoP situated in NCSD. Over the past seven years as a practitioner, I have held positions in NCSD as a teacher, instructional coach, and program coordinator. Currently, I am a teacher and program coordinator in a different school system. I am, therefore, now
professionally located outside of NCSD, and I am acting as a consultant to the CLT at NCSD through this OIP. My position as a doctoral student acting as a consultant matches the encouragement for organizations using the SEP to collaborate with higher education institutions (MSA, n.d. b); that idea is important because the Superintendent has acknowledged the value this OIP can have in supporting the work of the CLT through the SEP.

**My Theoretical Position or Worldview**

A second meaning of positionality refers to theoretical stance (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009). One way to understand different theoretical stances is as a continuum: on one end of the continuum is the realist (positivist, objectivist) belief system, and on the other end is the idealist (constructivist, subjectivist) belief system (Adams & Buetow, 2014). Further, there are two associated research methodologies that are used contingent on the belief system adhered to: realists use a quantitative methodology, while idealists use a qualitative methodology (Berg, 2004, p. 3). Creswell (2014) uses the term ‘worldview’ for belief system or theoretical stance and defines worldview as "a general philosophical orientation about the world and the nature of research" (Philosophical Worldviews section, para. 2). Understanding and communicating my worldview and the theories and research approaches inherent in that worldview is critical to a manageable and successful doctoral thesis (Adams & Buetow, 2014; Mills & Gay, 2016). It is important because it affects the focus and conclusions of research regarding organizational challenges. Worldview affects the form of research approach taken and requires reflexivity, the objectivating of oneself to critique personal assumptions and “… arrive at more trustworthy and justifiable accounts of the data” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009, p. 49). Paying purposeful attention to worldview will
make me a more trustworthy, and therefore more effective, educational leader as I engage in this OIP.

**Four contemporary worldviews.** Worldview understanding has evolved and increased in complexity over time (Creswell, 2014), and that evolution has had a significant impact on the contemporary study of change in organizations (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). According to Creswell (2014), postpositivism, constructivism, transformative, and pragmatism are the four worldviews common in current research. Of those four worldviews, postpositivism and constructivism are the traditional paradigm of objectivist (realist) on one end and subjectivist (idealist) on the other. As an adherent of meliorism, I believe that the world tends to improve, and that human effort can enhance that improvement. I lean, therefore, to the constructivist worldview and qualitative research approaches; I also appreciate the usefulness of a positivist stance and a quantitative approach, however, when it comes to gathering, analyzing and making purposeful decisions based on quantitative data that is informed by qualitative data. In that regard, I pragmatically use both qualitative and quantitative data to understand and act on challenges faced in my workplace.

The pragmatic worldview is purposeful and action oriented (Creswell, 2014). To achieve practical ends, pragmatists minimize the importance of worldview and purposefully use both quantitative and qualitative research methods to fully understand organizational problems. Pragmatism “opens the door to multiple methods, different worldviews, and different assumptions, as well as different forms of data collection and analysis” (Creswell, 2014, The Pragmatic Worldview section, bullet 8). The pragmatic approach is important in my PoP context because it is purposeful in its approach to
different worldviews, and because it is open to any research means to understand those different worldviews.

The transformative approach is closest to the constructivist end of the simple worldview continuum because it believes reality can be changed. Like the pragmatic approach, the transformative approach is action oriented (Creswell, 2014). The transformative approach doesn’t just describe reality, it intends to change reality, especially in favour of people who are marginalized (Capper, 2019; Creswell, 2014; Diem & Young, 2015; Khalifa, Gooden, & Davis, 2016; Shields, 2010). This approach is important to me because of its orientation toward taking action on behalf of those who may not be able to take action for themselves; in my PoP context, those others are students in the NCSD system who are at the bottom of the National Company hierarchy.

**My worldview: pragmatic transformative.** In summary, of the four contemporary worldviews outlined by Creswell (2014), I most identify with pragmatism because it is primarily concerned with what works to solve problems. Further, a pragmatic approach increases validity and strengthens conceptual connections because the use of qualitative and quantitative research methods enhances triangulation, and “triangulation allows researchers to offer varied perspectives other than their own” (Berg, 2004, p. 6). At the same time, I like the transformative worldview because of its attempts to elevate others; such moral purpose is essential to the leadership of change in education (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves & Shirley, 2012). The merging of those two worldviews best suits my approach. With regard to worldview, therefore, I identify my position as a pragmatic transformative.
A deeper understanding of the similarities and differences between transformational and transformative leadership, however, is important to this OIP because my leadership approach to this PoP is founded on transformative purpose but enacted through pragmatic, transformational means. What follows, then, is a brief distinction between transformative and transformational leadership and how that distinction informs the version of critical pedagogy I use as a lens for this OIP.

**An Emerging Theory: Transformative Leadership**

The distinction between transformational and transformative leadership is important to my PoP because it underscores the injustice of using only one measurement tool, the Measures of Academic Progress (Northwest Evaluation Association [NEA], 2013), to define student achievement and guide school improvement. Such a practice is unjust because it marginalizes all students through a parochial definition of student achievement and the factors that influence that achievement (Fertig, 2016; Hall, 2010; Ungerleider, 2006); some argue that such a practice is neo-colonial (Gonzales & Shields, 2014).

Through this OIP, I intend to take action as a transformational leader guided by a transformative leadership purpose to create a monitoring and evaluation framework that embraces a comprehensive range of measures. By “comprehensive range of measures”, I mean measures chosen to ensure a broad definition of student achievement, a wide conception of the factors that influence that achievement, and the inclusion of students’ voices. For example, instead of relying only on output measures such as standardized tests, measurement of change process is an often-over-looked factor that influences student achievement, and student voice is currently not an input measure that influences NCSD’s
decision-making in a formal way. The gap between current NCSD measures to guide school improvement and potential future measures that might make a more comprehensive range of school-improvement measures that include process and input measures as well as output measures is outlined in Table 1, below, and explained in detail there.

Education leadership literature is beginning to delineate transformative leadership as an emerging leadership theory related to, yet distinct from, transformational leadership (Capper, 2019; Capper & Young, 2014; Khalifa et al., 2016; Shields, 2010). To begin, it is important to note that as such a theory evolves there are different terms applied to it. For instance, to delineate the same ideas, Shields (2010) uses the term ‘transformative’ leadership while Khalifa et al. (2016) use the phrase ‘culturally responsive school leadership’. Likewise, Capper and Young (2014) use the phrase ‘socially just educational leadership’ to discuss similar ideas. For this OIP, I will use the term transformative leadership to represent such ideas. Further, to clarify my leadership position, it is important to describe some basic similarities and differences between transformational and transformative leadership.

On the surface, transformational and transformative leadership are similar in their potential influence on this OIP because both transformational and transformative leadership focus on improved student learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Capper & Young, 2014). Further, both leadership methods can address student achievement improvement through organizational change (Capper, 2019; Leithwood et al., 2004; Shields, 2010). In my understanding, however, the fundamental difference between transformational and transformative leadership is in its purpose. While the goal of transformational leadership is organizational change and effectiveness, the goal
of transformative leadership is individual and societal transformation (Shields, 2010); the focus on organizational improvement is eclipsed by the need for education to be more responsive to the different needs of all students (Khalifa et al., 2016). Where a transformational leader motivates employees to focus on organizational goals, a transformative leader emphasizes change in social and educational conditions that marginalize students (Shields, 2010).

Transformational and transformative leadership approaches, however, can be synergistic; the organizational improvement goals of a transformational leadership approach can be a powerful lever for the social justice goals of transformative leadership (Apple, 2005; Capper, 2019; Peters, 2005). It is this synergistic view of transformational and transformative leadership that I embrace as I employ a pragmatic approach to the creation of a measurement and evaluation framework with the CLT at NCSD. While on the surface the creation of a monitoring and evaluation framework appears strictly focused on organizational improvement as a transformational leadership tool, the deeper purpose of the pragmatic creation of a monitoring and evaluation framework is the emancipation of NCSD students, the transformative leadership goal that must remain central to this OIP as measurement tools for an NCSD monitoring and evaluation framework are determined and employed. These ideas are explored further in the ethics section of Chapter 2, and are connected to critical theory (Apple, 2005; Apple, 2019; Capper, 2019; Gur-Ze’ev, 2005; Peters, 2005; McKernan, 2013; Smith & McLaren, 2010).

**Lens Statement**

I approach this OIP through the overarching lens of critical education theory. While critical education theory has a long history and continues to evolve through
divergent thinkers (Gur-Ze’ev, 2005; McKernan, 2013; Smith & McLaren, 2010), there are contemporary critical education theorists that espouse the view of pragmatic means for transformative, or social justice, ends (Apple, 2005; Capper, 2019; Peters, 2005). My critical theory lens matches those pragmatic views.

Paulo Freire is widely recognized as the father of contemporary critical pedagogy (Smith & McLaren, 2010; McKernan, 2013), but McKernan (2013) argued that the discipline is rooted in the social ideology of Karl Marx and the social activism of the Fabians in Britain at the end of the 19th Century who “[fostered] equality and community action in public policy and education” (p. 417). Generally, critical pedagogy opposes the goals of neoliberalism, which seeks to use education to reproduce individualism and a culture of consumption in a capitalist framework, calls for equality through the emancipation of individuals and groups oppressed by neoliberal education policy, and demands that educators within the current neoliberal paradigm constantly question their role in supporting that paradigm (Smith & McLaren, 2010). In other words, as transformational leaders intent on the continuous improvement of NCSD as an education organization, the CLT must not be blind to the purposes of NCSD as an organization at the expense of the NCSD children entrusted to their care; the CLT must attempt to balance the transformational goal of organizational improvement with the transformative goal of enabling students to move toward their maximum potential. For the purpose of this OIP, that balance is sought through comprehensive measures housed in a purposeful measurement and evaluation framework.

There are divergent thinkers within the general group of critical pedagogy theorists, and the critical pedagogy thinkers that most closely align with my pragmatic-
transformative world view are Apple (2005), Capper (2019), and Peters (2005). While Capper (2019) stated that, in theory, transformative leadership as a form of critical pedagogy intent on social justice is incompatible with the pragmatic, organizational-improvement goals of transformational leadership, she also acknowledged that organizational improvement approaches can be used to move organizations toward equity. In a similar way, Apple (2005) argues that pragmatic strategies for organizational improvement that support the goals of a neo-liberal agenda, while seemingly heretical, can also transform individuals and communities through the purposeful efforts of critically-inclined school leaders who employ strategies “that are based both on high expectations for their diverse students and on a deep-seated respect for the cultures, histories, and experiences of these students and their parents and local communities” (p. 112). Finally, Peters (2005) acknowledged that there is a place for a pragmatic version of critical pedagogy “congruent with many of the aims and aspirations of Critical Pedagogy” (p. 48) so long as it is counterbalanced by versions of critical pedagogy that disapprove of the approach.

To conclude, I enter into this OIP in agreement with Apple (2019), who stated that “this willingness to be open to new theories that arise from new contexts and altered realities – without sacrificing one’s critically oriented ethical and political commitments – is a crucial stance” (p. 1173) in today’s complex world. Therefore, I enter into this OIP with the critical pedagogy goal of transforming students’ lives through an improved educational experience; the means to improve that experience is pragmatic organizational improvement through a comprehensive measurement framework.
Leadership Problem of Practice

The PoP for my OIP is situated in NCSD. In this section, a gap analysis is delineated, and the PoP is described. The gap analysis is considered three ways: 1) through the past, present, and potential future measures for NCSD continuous improvement; 2) through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) organization analysis framework; and, 3) through Cawsey, Deszca, and Ingols’ (2016) Change Path Model (CPM).

Gap Analysis

Student achievement of maximum potential is the core purpose of NCSD, and, as described above, maximum potential is broadly understood to mean the continuous improvement of students through their experiences in the district. As shown in Table 1, NCSD is presently in a state of transition from its past measurement practices of student improvement to what, through this OIP, can become its ideal measurement-for-continuous-improvement future. This is the initial gap to recognize for this OIP.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Measures</th>
<th>Present Measures</th>
<th>Potential Future Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change Path Model Criteria&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Reading Assessment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolman and Deal Four Frames Assessment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdNW Writing Assessment&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Change Capacity Assessment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Satisfaction Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stages of Concern Continuum&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Understanding Continuum&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CogAT&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Post-Action Critique Form&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General and Specific Action Plans&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Matrix&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Concerns and Recommendations Survey&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. When awakened-inspired to do so, the CLT could add tremendous insight to this table. The purpose, however, would remain the same: to appreciate past and present NCSD measurement tools and envision future tools designed to enhance NCSD strategic growth toward student maximum potential.


In the past, the leadership at NCSD used few data points to measure the effectiveness of NCSD movement toward student achievement of maximum potential; the primary data tools were the MAP and the CoGat, two standardized assessments that measured outputs only. In recent years, to broaden its use of data to inform its improvement efforts, NCSD mandated district-wide reading and writing assessments to support teachers more directly in their classroom instruction as well as guide district-level decisions. The CoGat was also discontinued. More recently, the National Company initiated a parent-satisfaction survey and employee-engagement survey for NCSD. While those current measurement tools have provided important data points for NCSD to determine its effectiveness and inform its continuous improvement in support of developing student maximum potential, they still heavily rely on output measures, and academic literature suggests that to realize robust continuous improvement organizations require a much broader range of effectiveness measurements that include process and input measures as well as output measures (De Maeyer, van den Bergh, Rymenans, Van Petegem, & Rijlaarsdam, 2010; LeMahieu, Nordstrum, & Cudney, 2017b; LeMahieu, Nordstrum, & Greco, 2017c; LeMahieu, Nordstrum, & Potvin, 2017d; National Education Association [NEA], 2013; Sinay & Ryan, 2016). For example, Hopkins, Harris, Stole and McKay (2011) and Nordstrum, LeMahieu and Berrena (2017)
determined that process measures are essential for sustained improvement, while communication is regarded as a vital input for organizational growth (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Cawsey et al., 2016; Gilley, Gilley, & McMillan, 2009; Klein, 1996). NCSD’s adoption of input measures such as the Stages of Concern Continuum or process measures such as the Change Path Model criteria could significantly broaden the range of measures used to guide strategic growth decisions beyond output measures. The Change Path Model Criteria is explained and modeled as a change-process-measurement tool throughout this document, and most of the other potential future measures listed in Table 1 are described in detail in Chapter Three.

The literature that espoused a comprehensive range of organization-effectiveness measures is considered more thoroughly below when I frame the PoP and outline a leadership vision for change using Bolman and Deal’s (2017) framework for organizational analysis, a framework that illustrates a gap in NCSD’s SEP-inspired strategic growth plan (see Appendix A). Table 2 summarizes my analysis of NCSD’s SEP-inspired strategic growth plan; my analysis suggests strength in the Human Resources and Symbolic frames and room for improvement in the Structural and Political Frames.
### Table 2

**Bolman and Deal’s Four Frame Analysis Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolman and Deal Frame</th>
<th>NCSD application of the SEP for strategic organizational growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Frame</td>
<td>3 – fully meets requirements for organizational growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>3 – fully meets requirements for organizational growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>2 – partially meets requirements for organizational growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>2 – partially meets requirements for organizational growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This simple assessment tool is designed to illustrate gaps in the CLT’s application of the SEP for NCSD strategic growth: 1 = not attended to; 2 = partially attended to; and, 3 = fully attended to. Adapted from the overview of the framework outlined in “Artistry, Choice and Leadership: Reframing Organizations” by L. Bolman and T. Deal, 2017, p. 20.

“Amber” and “green” are used in this table and throughout this document to visually enhance numeric assessment indicators and emphasize the idea that complexity can be measured in simple ways (Cawsey et al., 2016).

Bolman and Deal (2017) use four frames to consider the effectiveness of an organization and identify where an organization might focus to become more effective; the four frames are intended to serve as “sources of new questions, filters for sorting essence from trivia, maps that aid navigation, and tools for solving problems and getting things done (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 23). To complete this gap analysis, I used the
frames as a filter to sort essence from trivia; through this OIP, I strive to support the CLT as they use the frames as a map to aid their navigation toward measurement tools that help NCSD realize its mission and vision through a transformational leadership means based upon a transformative leadership purpose: the creation of a monitoring and evaluation framework that keeps students, and widely-understood student achievement, at the center of all decisions.

The CLT has masterfully managed the symbolic and human resources dimensions of NCSD as an organization, yet I perceive a gap between current reality and an ideal state in both the strategic and political dimensions of NCSD as an organization. For example, in the strategic dimension, NCSD is lacking a comprehensive measurement framework. In the political dimension, NCSD is lacking a measurement tool to constantly reflect on NCSD’s balance between alignment and adaptability. NCSD is also lacking a measurement tool to track its progress through the change process, where Table 3 summarizes another gap (see Appendix B for the complete assessment).

Table 3

*The Change Path Model (CPM) Criteria for Critical Organizational Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Process Stage</th>
<th>NCSD Application of Change Process Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaken – Inspire (i1)</td>
<td>2.5 – partial/thorough understanding and application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize – Investigate (i2)</td>
<td>3 – thorough understanding and application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate – Innovate (i3)</td>
<td>2.5 – partial/thorough understanding and application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalize – Institutionalize (i4)</td>
<td>1 – initial understanding and application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The corresponding stage of the Sustaining Excellence Protocol is included with the Change Path Model (CPM) stage label (e.g. Awaken – Inspire) to name the change
process stage. Scale: 1 = initial understanding and application; 2 = partial understanding and application; 3 = thorough understanding and application. Adapted from “Organizational Change: An Action-oriented Toolkit” by T.F. Cawsey, G. Deszca, and C. Ingols, p. 55.

Red, amber and green are used in this table and throughout this document to visually enhance numeric assessment indicators and emphasize the idea that complexity can be measured in simple ways (Cawsey et al., 2016).

The gap that is most evident in the SEP-inspired change process underway at NCSD is the lack of understanding and application of an institutionalization phase, which the innovations blooming across NCSD need to survive and grow to sustenance. That gap is explained in detail in Chapter Two; that gap can be filled through the innovation and institutionalization of a monitoring and evaluation framework designed specifically for NCSD by the CLT.

In an ideal future state, comprehensive measures organized in a monitoring and evaluation framework and guided by a broad understanding of student achievement will increase strategic growth toward the NCSD mission and vision. Therein lies the PoP for this OIP.

The Problem of Practice

The problem of practice that will be addressed is the lack of a comprehensive range of measures within a monitoring and evaluation framework to guide an international school district’s continuous improvement. School district leaders who consult external experts can improve their organization’s measurement capacity (Ball, Maguire, Braun, & Hoskins, 2011; Godkin, 2010). For over a decade, NCSD has relied entirely on Measures of
Academic Progress (NEA, 2013b) data to understand its effectiveness as an organization and guide its improvement. Measures of Academic Progress, or MAP, is a norm-referenced assessment tool used to measure student achievement in reading, language usage, mathematics, and science (NEA, 2013b). On the one hand, that practice is good because standardized test results from measures such as the MAP are understood as critical to school system improvement (Mourshed, Chijioke, & Barber, 2010). On the other hand, it is naïve to use MAP data on its own to measure the effectiveness of NCSD because student achievement in the cognitive domain is only one of many critical variables that inform school system improvement (Fertig, 2016; Hall, 2010; Komatsu & Rappleye, 2017; Ungerleider, 2006). For example, solely using standardized test data from the MAP neglects the understanding that standardized tests do not assess the broad range of student competencies that schools develop (MSA, n.d. b; Ungerleider, 2006), that collective teacher efficacy is one of the most powerful influences on student achievement (Donohoo, 2017), and that actively measuring change process is essential for organizations to move toward their visions for student achievement (Hopkins et al., 2011; Nordstrum et al., 2017).

To more fully realize its mission and vision, NCSD must create a system to comprehensively measure a wide range of variables that affect student achievement and use those measures to guide NCSD continuous improvement. How might NCSD innovate a monitoring and evaluation framework that employs comprehensive measures to guide its strategic growth and more fully realize its mission and vision?

Framing the Problem of Practice

Combined with its successful use as a tool to analyze education organizations (Goldman & Smith, 1991), the decades-long endurance of the Bolman and Deal
framework makes it an appealing choice to understand this PoP within broader political, economic, and social contexts, inclusive of macro-, meso-, and micro-discourses (Goldman & Smith, 1991; Bolman & Deal, 2017). Bolman and Deal (2017) use four lenses, or frames, to analyze an organization: the symbolic frame, the human resources frame, the structural frame, and the political frame. Those four lenses provide prodigious perspective on this PoP because the NCSD SEP protocol thus far is a change process that emphasizes the symbolic and human resources frames but minimizes the structural and political frames. This PoP stems from a lack of leadership attention to the structural and political frames of NCSD as an organization.

**Symbolic Frame**

The symbolic frame “centers on complexity and ambiguity” where “vision bring[s] cohesiveness, clarity, and direction in the presence of confusion and mystery” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 263). The NCSD CLT has worked extensively through the SEP to breathe collective life into the vision of maximum potential for NCSD students. One powerful symbol of vision renewal is the creation and use of a tree image to capture and communicate NCSD’s collective vision for the SEP (see Appendix C). Another example of the symbolic work of the CLT is the purposeful renaming of teams by the Superintendent to emphasize the transformational leadership work underway through the SEP. For example, what was formerly the Senior Administrative Team, or SAT, is now known as the Senior Transformational Leadership Team, or STLT. The STLT is made up of the Superintendent, Associate Superintendents, two Curriculum Coordinators, Director of Technology, and seven Principals. The former Executive Council is now known as the District Transformational Leadership Team, or DTLT, and consists of teacher and
administrative representatives from across the district. The members of those teams embody the implementation of the SEP and champion the action-research process in schools and classrooms by empowering and supporting the work of NCSD employees who choose to engage in action-research projects. Moreover, the CLT has chosen to build capacity in NCSD by training employees to use the transformational methodologies found in adaptability structures (Garmston & Wellman, 2016; Dolcemascolo & McKandies, 2017) and design thinking structures (Brown, 2009; Riel & Martin, 2017). By clarifying the organization’s vision through an enduring symbol, renaming teams to symbolize their renewed purpose, and training employees in transformational change methodologies, the CLT has energized and empowered NCSD employees. The purposeful work of the CLT in the symbolic frame meets the needs of NCSD employees; at the same time, the needs of NCSD as an organization are also met.

Human Resources Frame

The human resources frame seeks to understand the balance between the needs of the organization and the needs of the individuals who work in the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). The ideal balance between employees and the organization occurs when “individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 133). The SEP empowers employees to find meaning and satisfaction through the autonomous pursuit of action-research initiatives that support the attract-and-retain mission and maximum-potential vision of NCSD. For example, an action-research project underway in one NCSD school focuses on the in-take process for kindergarten students.
The traditional kindergarten in-take practice at the school was to have all kindergarten students arrive together on the first day of school as all the higher grades in the school did: parents delivered their children, wished the teacher well, and went on their way. Kindergarten teachers then spent weeks managing collective class routines and instructional activities before they fully understood students’ individual and collective needs. Unlike all higher grades in the school, which use the school’s robust student-assessment practices and processes to provide student- and class-data profiles to immediately guide teacher planning and instruction at the beginning of each new year, the kindergarten teachers were starting from scratch with no previous school-assessment data to inform their work with their new students. Importantly, teachers also recognized they weren’t tapping into the knowledge parents held of their children.

Kindergarten teachers found the traditional procedure ineffective; they were frustrated by the time it took to complete the individual assessments necessary to guide their instruction of individuals and the class as a whole while they were already engaged in their classroom instruction and management processes. Empowered by the opportunity to engage their challenge through the action-research process, kindergarten teachers initiated a change to their in-take model: they delayed the whole-class start until they met privately with each child and the child’s parents over the first two weeks of the new school year. At those private meetings, each child was assessed individually using a variety of assessment tools, including parent interviews. Initial feedback from kindergarten teachers and parents indicate the innovation is highly successful. Through the SEP, kindergarten teachers at one school were empowered to find meaning and satisfaction through the autonomous pursuit of an action-research initiatives that focused
on the vision of student maximum potential and at the same time increased parent satisfaction in support of the attract-and-retain mission.

I have witnessed such creative innovation before, and I have seen excellent practices remain isolated or cease to exist because they were not scaled up or institutionalized; education is excellent at innovation, but terrible at institutionalization (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Goldman & Smith, 1991). The CLT has empowered all members of NCSD to inquire, investigate and innovate to realize their vision and mission, but they have not provided a purposeful measurement structure to monitor and support the institutionalization of the innovations blossoming across the district (Cawsey et al., 2016; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016).

**Structural Frame**

According to Bolman and Deal (2017), “[s]tructure provides the architecture for pursuing an organization’s strategic goals” (p. 51). For the purpose of this OIP, the structure being considered is a monitoring and evaluation framework intended to clearly define broader measurements designed to enhance the continuous improvement of NCSD toward the vision of student achievement of maximum potential. The importance of such measurement for organizational growth is emphasized by Cawsey et al. (2016): “[k]ey change leadership skills include identifying assessment measures, building them into the change process, adapting them as needed, and using them as tools to aid in decision making, communication, and action taking” (p. 340). Specific to NCSD as an organization, the continuous measurement of a wide range of school improvement indicators is essential to school improvement (Buccino, 2011; Creemers & Kyriakides, 2010; De Maeyer et al., 2010; Frederick, 1987; Hopkins et al., 2011; LeMahieu, et al.,
The action-research-based kindergarten-intake innovation in one NCSD school is a school-improvement initiative that will become even better, or fade away, according to the measurement structures used to inform the innovation’s implementation and institutionalization. Four significant themes in contemporary research literature offer direction for the purposeful measurement of school procedures and systems like the kindergarten-intake innovation: 1) measure inputs, processes, and outcomes; 2) use qualitative and quantitative measurement tools; 3) ensure context-specific measurement decisions; and, 4) include the wider community in the improvement work. Those themes are the cornerstones of the change vision described later in this chapter. However, while the structural frame of organizational improvement is not fully addressed by the CLT, neither is the political frame.

**Political Frame**

Bolman and Deal's (2017) political frame describes organizations as arenas where limited resources and "differences in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality” lead to competition, coalitions, and conflict (p. 184). Importantly, Bolman and Deal (2017) emphasize that politics are not necessarily negative, and instead assert that “[c]onstructive politics is a possibility—indeed, a necessary option if we are to create institutions and societies that are both just and efficient” (p. 199). The dynamic tension between the efficiency of alignment and the justice of adaptability is a theme revealed in the political frame. By efficiency of alignment I mean the organizational efficiencies that come from aligning processes, procedures, and systems across an
organization. In the NCSD context, that alignment can be seen in the use of the various standardized tests to assess all students across the district, in the common curriculum required across the district, and in the equipping of all schools with requisite resources to meet curriculum objectives. It can also be seen in the alignment of the process for school start-up; kindergarteners, like all other students, arrived at school on the first day of school. By justice of adaptability, I mean seeking the equity that comes from moving away from the generalities of alignment to best meet the needs of students in a specific context, even as the kindergarten teachers at one school moved away from an aligned practice to better serve their students. There are other innovations underway across NCSD to modify general alignment practices and adapt to specific contexts, and purposefully chosen measurement tools will help NCSD keep the balance between alignment and adaptability as it strives toward student maximum potential.

To conclude, Bolman and Deal’s (2017) analytic framework provides excellent perspective on this PoP because the SEP protocol is a change process that emphasizes the symbolic and human resources frames but minimizes the structural and political frames. The leadership vision in this OIP is focused on the structural and political frames because this PoP stems from the lack of CLT attention to the structural and political frames of organizational analysis and understanding. Several guiding questions emerging from the PoP inform the leadership vision of this OIP.

Questions Emerging from the Problem of Practice

There are several questions that emerge from the PoP. Three will be discussed. First, what is a monitoring and evaluation framework? A monitoring and evaluation framework is an “overarching plan” that describes “how data are collected, aggregated, and
analyzed on a regular basis” (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 20). In essence, a monitoring and evaluation framework is a written plan that describes what measurement tools will be used when to inform the continuous improvement of an organization. As described in Chapter Three, an overarching monitoring and evaluation framework for organizational learning is synonymous with an overarching formative and summative assessment plan for student learning, a concept that NCSD educators are entirely familiar with. The simple outline of past, present and potential future measures described above in Table 1 can be considered a monitoring and evaluation framework because it lists what measures guide NCSD improvement; missing in that simple table, however, is the when of those measures.

Monitoring and evaluation frameworks are easy to understand, but their creation and consistent use requires commitment. As well as outlining a change implementation plan for the innovation of a monitoring and evaluation framework for the SEP, Chapter Three outlines a monitoring and evaluation framework for this OIP that is intended to be a model for the CLT to consider as they engage in the process of innovating a monitoring and evaluation framework through this OIP.

Second, why are monitoring and evaluation frameworks important? Monitoring and evaluation frameworks are important because they provide a clear plan for the gathering and use of measurement data to inform strategic growth decisions (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). Measurement data is vital to the success of the innovations budding across NCSD through the SEP (Cawsey et al., 2016; Fullan, 2006; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016), and a monitoring and evaluation framework helps make measurement data “readily comprehensible…effectively disseminated and actively used” (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 22). The importance of measurement to the success of the SEP is wisely
emphasized by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Commissions on Elementary and Secondary Schools, the body that created and supervises the SEP: “successful efforts with this protocol will identify a need that will benefit all students and facilitate the development of plans to achieve and measure intended results toward the school’s preferred future” (MSA, n.d. b, p. 5). The purpose of this OIP is to support the CLT in developing an overarching plan, a monitoring and evaluation framework, to measure intended results toward NCSD’s preferred future of student maximum potential. That purpose leads to the fundamental question that emerges from the PoP.

Finally, how might NCSD innovate a monitoring and evaluation framework that employs comprehensive measures to guide its strategic growth and more fully realize its mission and vision? To be brief, the CLT can innovate a monitoring and evaluation framework by participating in a purposeful change process through this OIP. A potential process to support the CLT in such a change is described in Chapter Three. The following vision for change outlines important factors the CLT must consider if it chooses to embark on such a journey.

**Leadership Focused Vision for Change**

Evans, Thornton and Usinger (2012) say it all: “[t]he importance of grounding organizational change in theory cannot be overemphasized as it provides leaders with comprehensive structure to view organizational evolution and suggests appropriate options to positively impact the process” (p. 174). Certain change theories have more merit than others, and those change theories that have merit include a bias for reflective action (Fullan, 2007). Bolman and Deal’s (2017) framework for understanding and reflecting on factors that influence organizational change has merit for this OIP because it is a simple, four-part
structure that illuminates the general change process underway in NCSD through the SEP. At the same time, both the SEP itself and the CPM are more specific change models that provide tremendous insight into this OIP and, as described in detail in Chapter Two, provide clear direction for addressing the PoP. Before using Bolman and Deal’s (2017) organizational change framework to present a leadership focused vision for change, however, it is helpful to consider the individuals who will propel this proposed change.

**Change Drivers**

Whelan-Berry and Somerville (2010) describe change drivers as “events, activities or behaviors that facilitate the implementation of change” (p. 179). The change-theory model outlined by Cawsey et al. (2016) differs because the model focuses on people as change drivers. For my PoP, considering key individuals as change drivers makes sense since NCSD is a hierarchy with decision-making authority for the proposed change held by members of the CLT. Table 4 names and describes the particular change drivers that could propel change relevant to this PoP; those roles are specific to the CLT and include me in my role as consultant.

Table 4

**Change Drivers for this OIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change-Driver Roles</th>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Key Individuals in the Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Leader</td>
<td>Person who leads the change</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal change leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Initiator</td>
<td>Person who identifies need and vision</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champions the change</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Adapted from “Organizational Change: An Action-oriented Toolkit” by T.F. Cawsey, G. Deszca, and C. Ingols, pp. 25 - 29, and applied to the NCSD context.

It is important to reiterate at this point that this proposed change is intended to enhance the tremendous work of the CLT in their empowerment of NCSD employees across the district through the SEP. The ultimate goal of strategic growth at NCSD is student maximum potential, and it is a collective and collaborative effort of all roles in the district through the SEP. This change plan, however, is focused specifically on the work of the CLT as leaders of the SEP. The recipients that will benefit from this change are the NCSD members participating in the SEP because an improved SEP will enhance their ability to successfully engage in the action research projects they have designed to pursue the vision for student maximum potential.

Ultimately, if the Superintendent is not supportive of the change proposed in this OIP, it will not happen. Likewise, as initiator, champion, and implementor of this potential change, the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction is essential
to the success of this change initiative. Finally, my role as consultant is also crucial; I will affect the change through the CLT, and primarily through the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction. The better those key roles perform their change duties, the greater the likelihood that change recipients will support and benefit from the following vision for change.

**A Vision for the Structural Frame**

Any measurement framework the CLT innovates must be influenced by four significant themes in contemporary research literature that offer direction for the purposeful measurement of schools and school systems: 1) measure inputs, processes, and outcomes; 2) use qualitative and quantitative measurement tools; 3) ensure context-specific measurement decisions; and, 4) include the wider community in the improvement work.

**Measure inputs, processes and outcomes.** Measurement frameworks that propel school improvement must include a wide range of indicators from system inputs, processes and outcomes (Baker, Grunow, LeMahieu, Nordstrum, & Gomez, 2017; Buccino, 2011; De Maeyer et al., 2010; Hopkins et al., 2011; LeMahieu et al., 2017b; LeMahieu et al., 2017c; LeMahieu et al., 2017d; NEA, 2013a; Nordstrum et al., 2017). De Maeyer et al. (2010) determined that while the measurement of a broad range of improvement indicators is complex, the validity of measurement increases when a broad range of measurement indicators are measured. Further, while the measurement of outcomes such as student achievement in literacy and numeracy are considered an important part of a broad range of measures, process measures are considered critical to sustained improvement (Hopkins et al., 2011; Nordstrum et al., 2017). An important
piece of using data to inform change is to assess whether changes in practice are having the desired results (Scott & McNeish, 2013) because schools improve their effectiveness when they purposefully use measured indicators over time to identify weaknesses and take action to improve policy and practice regarding teaching and learning (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2010; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). In order to measure inputs, processes, and outcomes, educators must use both quantitative and qualitative measurement methods.

**Use quantitative and qualitative methods.** School improvement indicators must be measured using both quantitative and qualitative methods (Creemers & Kriakides, 2010; LeMahieu et al., 2017b; Frederick, 1987; Sinay & Ryan, 2016). This is not a new understanding; Frederick’s (1987) literature review underscored the idea that school improvement measures should include qualitative indicators (school climate, instructional leadership, high expectations) as well as quantitative indicators (standardized achievement scores). Only now, however, is there evidence of an international trend in improving student achievement by using both quantitative and qualitative measurement data (Sinay & Ryan, 2016). Regardless of the combination of qualitative and quantitative measurement approaches selected by the CLT, the improvement measures chosen must be context specific.

**Ensure measurement decisions are context specific.** There are many different ways to approach school effectiveness measurement (Botha, 2010; LeMahieu, Bryk, Grunow, & Gomez, 2017a; NEA, 2013a). Regardless of the approach chosen, school improvement decisions must be context specific (Frederick, 1987; LeMahieu et al., 2017a; Nordstrum et al., 2017; Sinay & Ryan, 2016). Again, this is not a new
understanding; in her review of school improvement literature in the late 1980’s, Frederick (1987) understood that measurements of effectiveness should reflect the local context. Thirty years later, LeMahieu et al. (2017a) again proclaimed the importance of context in school improvement efforts:

[school improvement research is] about making the many different parts that comprise an educational organization mesh better to produce quality outcomes more reliably, day in and day out, for every child and across the diverse contexts in which they are educated. (p. 3)

Context is important because the indicators used to define and measure improvement programs are significantly influenced by the individuals who implement the programs, by those individuals’ worldviews and beliefs about the program, and by the broader context within which the program is being implemented (Nordstrum et al., 2017). When the rationale for ensuring that improvement measurements are context specific is understood, the importance of including the wider community is logical.

Include the Wider Community. School improvement practices have evolved to recognize the importance of collaboration with the wider community (Aggarwal-Gupta & Neharika, 2010; Baker et al., 2017; Hopkins et al., 2011; LeMahieu et al., 2017c; Nordstrum et al., 2017; Sinay & Ryan, 2016; Ungerleider, 2006). That trend is explained by Hopkins et al. (2011), whose literature review and synthesis indicated a general transition from school-centered improvement initiatives to a widening of partnerships between schools and community-based social- and health-services to support students. Given that up to 70% of the factors that impact student achievement are found external to schools (Ungerleider, 2006), it makes sense that the wider community is engaged in
school improvement efforts. Moreover, the importance of collaboration between researchers and practitioners echoed throughout contemporary school improvement literature (Baker et al., 2017; LeMahieu et al., 2017d; Nordstrum et al., 2017; Scott & McNeish, 2013; Sinay & Ryan, 2016). Sinay and Ryan (2016) claimed that it is the dynamic interaction between research, policy and practice that matters most of all for school improvement. In another example, Scott and McNeish (2013) argued that the most important understanding about using research to inform change is to assess whether the changes in practice are having the desired results; that claim underscores the importance of collaboration with researchers to inform process measurements. Finally, in their recent case-study of the relationship between one university and two Michigan school districts, LeMahieu et al. (2017d) described a new kind of researcher-practitioner relationship, where educational practice is improved through iterative research at multiple levels of an education system. They determined that such a model requires the provision of a substantial infrastructure for research and the development of strong partnerships between researchers and practitioners.

Those four themes in contemporary academic literature offer direction for the purposeful measurement of schools and school systems. The future desired state of NCSD envisioned here is a monitoring framework that includes measurement across those four themes, yet there are broader factors found in Bolman and Deal’s (2017) political frame that also influence this problem of practice and must be considered by the CLT when measurements are created.
A Vision for the Political Frame

A review and synthesis of literature regarding the political frame suggests three practical ways to enhance it in the NCSD context: take control of accountability; be ambidextrous; and, engage in purposeful reflective practice.

**Take control of accountability.** Accountability is a factor revealed in an analysis of NCSD through the political lens. At the macro-discourse level, the accountability era in education was born during political shifts in Western nations in the 1980s and 1990s, where governments increasingly turned to standardized tests to hold school systems, schools, and teachers accountable for student achievement (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2012). Even though accountability through standardized testing has failed to realize improvement in student learning (Houchens & Keedy, 2009), the accountability trend opened the education door to, and is fueled by, big business, which partially accounts for the international spread of the standardized-testing phenomenon (Steiner-Khamsi, 2016). In a related way, Fertig (2016) acknowledges accreditation as a business-driven, macro-level accountability factor, while Kingdon et al. (2014) emphasize how the power of politics prescribes the kind of educational change pursued.

At the meso-discourse level, NCSD adopted the MAP standardized-test programme in 2008 during its first formal accreditation cycle. MAP data has been used since then as a tool to measure and communicate the effectiveness of NCSD to its primary stakeholders: employees, students, parents, and National Company managers. Over time, accountability pressure has mounted at the meso-level as the National Company itself has increased its gathering and use of data for quality assurance and continuous improvement goals through the adoption of the monitoring framework called
Operational Excellence (National Company, 2014). For instance, as part of its Operational Excellence efforts, the National Company recently imposed on NCSD a parent-satisfaction survey and an employee-engagement survey, both completed annually and used as measures to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of NCSD as a division of National Company. The stakes are high in that regard because there are some in the company that argue NCSD provides a service that should be contracted out.

Accountability pressures underpinned much of the rationale for NCSD’s previous EbD accreditation cycle, which focused on alignment of curriculum, alignment of resources, and alignment of teaching practices across NCSD. Accountability pressures continue to mount for NCSD as National Company refines its use of the Operational Excellence monitoring framework, further exposing NCSD to alignment and adaptability tensions.

**Be ambidextrous: align and adapt.** The constant organizational struggle between alignment and adaptability is visible in NCSD’s transition from the EbD accreditation cycle, where alignment was the goal, to the current SEP accreditation cycle, where adaptability is the goal. At the macro-discourse level, the dynamic tension between alignment and adaptability is a theme noted in organizational literature (Cawsey et al., 2016; Garmston & Wellman, 2016; Judge & Douglas, 2009). For example, Cawsey et al. (2016) explain that an organization must control its operations at the same time as maintaining its flexibility, while Judge and Douglas (2009) espouse organizational ambidexterity, the ability to balance alignment and adaptability, as the key to an organization’s capacity for change.
At the meso-discourse level, the previous EbD accreditation cycle and the current SEP accreditation cycle symbolize the dynamic tension between alignment and adaptability within NCSD, while at the micro-discourse level NCSD employees live through alignment-adaptability tension on a daily basis as they balance the alignment requirements of both NCSD and the parent National Company with the need to adapt to their individual context in specific schools and classrooms across NCSD. The danger of an imbalance between alignment and adaptability is organizational dysfunction: an overemphasis on alignment is organizational paralysis, while an overemphasis on adaptability is chaos (Cawsey et al., 2016). At the meso-discourse level, the CLT must be mindful of those dangers as they guide NCSD through the SEP while at the same time being aware of the mounting pressure from National Company to use purposeful measures to inform operational excellence. Likewise, at a micro-discourse level, NCSD employees must be aware of the same dangers as they engage in their daily work. The exhaustive exploration of ideas, decisions and change actions related to accountability and the dynamic tension between alignment and adaptability requires an aptitude for reflective practice.

Engage in purposeful and skilled reflective practice. The seminal work of Argyris and Schön regarding the importance of reflective practice in organizational change is underscored in innumerable organizational change publications (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Cawsey et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Demers, 2007; Dunne & Martin, 2006; Houchens & Keedy, 2009; Lawson, Duran, Wilcom, Gregory, Schiller, & Zuckerman, 2017; Martin, 2009; Pietrzak & Paliszkiewicz, 2015; Riel & Martin, 2017; Scheerens, 2015; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth, & Smith, 1999). The heart of
Argyris and Schon’s argument is that reflective, or double-loop, thinking is essential to more effective decision making when organizational leaders manage change (Argyris, 1976). Such double-loop thinking is effective because it includes reflection on the assumptions underpinning the design of actions; by understanding underlying assumptions and bias that affect decision making, individuals are able to more flexibly and creatively innovate actions to address problems of practice (Houchens & Keedy, 2009; Riel & Martin, 2017).

Macro-level discourse regarding measurement of change underscores the importance of reflection on assumptions in change effectiveness: “[measurement has the power] to dispel commonly held, though inaccurate, beliefs” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 340). Further, the use of measurement data to deepen understanding of assumptions used to make decisions is wise and effective practice (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). At the meso- and micro-discourse levels, NCSD employees at all hierarchical levels of the organization will benefit from reflective practices that aid decision-making processes (Barth, 2013; Khalifa et al., 2016; Lambert, 2007; Sheppard, Brown, & Dibbon, 2009). For example, Lambert (2007) claimed that in schools “reflective practice leads to innovation” (p. 313), while Khalifa et al. (2016) found that culturally responsive school leaders engage in critical self-reflection and offer opportunities for their colleagues to develop capacity in the same skill. Finally, Barth (2013) asserted that reflective practice in schools is key to maximizing personal and organizational learning.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, the leadership vision for change seeks to augment the structural and political frames of NCSD through the innovation and institutionalization of a monitoring
and evaluation framework comprised of comprehensive measures that take control of accountability, balance alignment and adaptability, and enhance purposeful and skilled reflective practice. NCSD as an organization is ready for such a change, and the CLT is ready to lead it.

**Organizational Change Readiness**

Generally, NCSD as an organization is wholly ready to participate in this OIP. Specifically, as the primary actors in this proposed change, the CLT is also entirely ready to lead this OIP. In this section, I will describe organizational change readiness and explain the change readiness of the CLT as a group and NCSD as an organization.

**Organizational Change Readiness**

Conceptualizing the potential for change described in this OIP as ‘readiness’ is appropriate because the word ‘readiness’ implies a positive approach to change consistent with a proactive and purposeful change-management process (Armenakis & Harris, 2009) that resonates with appreciative leadership and appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Orr & Cleveland-Innes, 2015; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2016; Zande & Cooperrider, 2008). At a basic level, the expression ‘change readiness’ refers to the attitude of an organization’s members toward a potential change and the willingness of those members to support that potential change (Devos, Buelens, & Bouckenooghe, 2007). Change readiness, however, is influenced by many factors (Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Cawsey et al., 2016; Bouckenooghe, Devos & van den Broeck, 2009; Devos et al., 2007; Judge & Douglas, 2009), and all of those factors must be considered and actioned to realize organizational transformation (Cawsey et al., 2016; Devos et al., 2007; Judge & Douglas, 2009). For example, both Armenakis and Harris (2009) and Cawsey et al. (2016)
emphasized the need for change as a primary factor in change readiness. In another example, Judge and Douglas (2009) used a series of empirical studies to determine “a combination of managerial and organizational [factors] that allows an [organization] to adapt more quickly and effectively” (p. 635). I have considered the readiness of NCSD for this change through an assessment of the general need for change and through a specific assessment of NCSD’s change capacity using Judge and Douglas’ (2009) organizational-change-capacity dimensions and questions.

The Need for Change

One important change-readiness factor that must be considered is the need for change (Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Cawsey et al., 2016). Therefore, the gap analysis outlined above is important. First, Table 1 above indicates a gap between NCSD’s current state and preferred state by listing current measures utilized by NCSD to inform strategic decisions and potential future measures that include process, input and output considerations. That gap shows a need for change. Second, as shown in Table 2 above, Bolman and Deal’s (2017) framework illustrates that NCSD use of the SEP for strategic growth emphasizes the symbolic and human resources frames but under-emphasizes the structural and political frames. There is a need to address the structural and political frames in the NCSD context. Third, as illustrated in Table 3 above, my analysis of the SEP using the CPM identifies a need to address institutionalization, and in particular the measurement of implementation to realize institutionalization. Finally, using the MAP as the primary tool to measure and communicate strategic growth to stakeholders such as parents and National Company executives is troublesome because when the traditionally high
achievement of NCSD students the MAP wavers those stakeholders may perceive that NCSD is not performing as it should be.

Those four indicators illustrate the gaps in NCSD’s SEP-based strategic growth, all of which are opportunities that need to be addressed by the CLT to allow NCSD to accelerate its improvement. Providentially, an assessment of NCSD’s capacity to change indicates a state of readiness for change.

**Organizational Change Capacity Assessment**

Both Judge and Douglas (2009) and Bouckenooghe et al. (2009) group change readiness factors into similar organizers with similar dimensions. Bouckenooghe et al. (2009) defined eleven dimensions within three organizers (process of change, climate of change, and human attitudes toward change), whereas Judge and Douglas (2009) described eight dimensions also within three organizers (within human capabilities, organizational culture, and organizational processes). The attention to context, process and capacity is recognized in both models. Moreover, both researchers recognized similar dimensions, such as trust, capable leaders, and wide involvement in the change process. While both models are empirically validated and mutually reinforcing, I decided to use Judge and Douglas’ (2009) model for its simplicity. Table 5 summarizes my assessment of NCSD’s readiness for change using Judge and Douglas’ (2009) model (see Appendix D for the complete assessment).
Table 5

An Assessment of Eight Organizational Change Capacity Dimensions at NCSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Change Capacity Dimensions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Followers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable Champions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved Mid-management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable Culture</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale: 1 = rarely; 2 = occasionally; 3 = regularly; 4 = often; and, 5 = always. Again, this is my assessment of NCSD; the CLT could inform this assessment and use it purposefully to guide their SEP decision-making. Adapted from “Organizational change capacity: the systematic development of a scale” by W. Judge and T. Douglas, 2009, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(6), p. 638.

Overall, my assessment of NCSD’s readiness for change using Judge and Douglas’ (2009) model suggests that NCSD is ready to enter the change process proposed in this OIP. While half of the dimensions score in amber, it is important to remember that a rating of three indicates that although there is room for improvement in a certain change dimension, the change dimension is regularly met and therefore indicates readiness for change. The assessment of change readiness indicates an organization’s current preparedness for change and at the same time identifies specific areas to address to increase
the potential for successful change (Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Cawsey et al., 2016). In that regard, Judge and Douglas’ (2009) model is a formative assessment tool that could also be applied as a meaningful measure in a monitoring and evaluation framework innovated by the CLT to move NCSD toward its vision of student maximum potential.

Chapter 1 Conclusion

The purpose of this OIP is to explore the key ideas relevant to a PoP situated in NCSD. My hope is to awaken NCSD’s CLT to the need for a wider range of school-improvement measurements to enhance SEP-directed strategic growth toward the vision of student maximum potential. Further, it is my aim that the CLT as change leaders in NCSD augment their transformational leadership approach with a commitment to the social justice goals of transformative leadership. Such an augmentation fits naturally with the vision of student maximum potential; keeping students at the centre of decision-making is paramount whatever the measures used to inform those decisions.
Chapter 2: Planning and Development

In this chapter, leadership approaches for the proposed change are first considered before a framework for leading the change process is defined. Next, the critical organizational analysis of NCSD undertaken to identify the PoP is explained. Afterwards, possible solutions to the PoP are presented and a preferred solution is identified. Finally, a review of leadership ethics with regard to the change required for this OIP is presented.

Leadership Approaches to Change

The intent of this OIP is to help NCSD achieve its preferred state as an organization. This section describes the preferred state of NCSD as an organization and the leadership approach I will apply to this OIP.

The Preferred State of NCSD

The mission of NCSD is to provide a world-class education for expatriate children so that highly qualified expatriates continue to work for the National Company. The vision of NCSD is to help every student realize their maximum potential through a culture of continuous improvement. Student realization of maximum potential is the lodestar for the current strategic growth plan in NCSD; through that strategic plan, the CLT intends to move NCSD students toward their maximum potential by empowering and motivating NCSD employees to engage in action research. Student realization of maximum potential is the preferred state of NCSD, and the general objective of this OIP is to help NCSD reach that preferred state. The specific objective of this OIP is to have the CLT employ a comprehensive range of effectiveness measures to inform and accelerate its growth toward its vision: the realization of student maximum potential.
Institutional Leadership Development

To achieve that specific objective of this OIP, I believe the CLT and I must initially develop shared understanding of the concepts outlined in Chapter One. First, to keep student maximum potential at the center of this change, the important difference between the purposes of transformational and transformative leadership must be mutually understood. Second, to deepen the potential for measurement innovation, collective understanding of the four purposeful measurement themes outlined in the vision for Bolman and Deal’s (2017) structural frame must be explored. Third, to enhance the purposeful practicality of innovated measurements, the three key ideas outlined in the vision for Bolman and Deal’s (2017) political frame must be considered. Finally, with those concepts collectively understood, the synergy between the CPM and the SEP change theory models outlined later in this chapter can be used to guide the change proposed as a solution for the PoP. Overall, with those understandings, the CLT will be able to accelerate NCSD strategic growth and overcome the change inertia that occurs when “the [measurement] information gathered is inadequate enough to generate actions and results beneficial to the organization” (Godkin, 2010, p. 199).

To support the CLT’s comprehension of those concepts, I believe it is best for me to use a leadership method loosely connected to the situational leadership approach established by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Hersey & Blanchard, 1981; Hersey & Blanchard, 1996; Northouse, 2019) and housed within the appreciative inquiry model pioneered by David Cooperrider (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Kovach, 2009; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008).
My Leadership Approach

To realize and sustain improvement, leaders must connect planned organizational change with a suitable theory of change (Evans et al., 2012; Houchens & Keedy, 2009). In my position as a consultant, I am leading from outside NCSD. The members of the CLT, therefore, are not followers; instead, they are able leaders and former colleagues. As a result, my leadership approach is housed in appreciative inquiry, includes aspects of situational leadership, and relies upon my role as an agent of learning external to NCSD.

An agent of learning. Agents of learning accumulate, generate, and translate knowledge to inform organizational change (Ball et al., 2011; Godkin, 2010). Such individuals can be found within organizations or act from outside organizations as a consultant; in this OIP context, I am acting from outside NCSD as a consultant who has seven years of experience within the organization. Agents of learning are “proactive, but reflective; [aspirational] while being realistic about limitations; able to identify [with organizations] while remaining critical of those organizations; and, independent in outlook while cooperating with others” (Godkin, 2010, p. 198). Agents of learning help organizations and their leaders overcome organizational inertia by uncovering flawed learning, tacitly held theories of action, and assumptions. While there are potential risks to engaging a consultant (Godkin, 2010), external expertise is increasingly acknowledged for its potential contribution to organizational learning (Ball et al., 2011; Swaffield, 2004). Because I am acting as a leader from outside NCSD, a situational leadership approach is required to increase CLT understanding of transformative leadership theory and the themes related to this OIP inherent in Bolman and Deal’s (2017) structural and political frames.
Situational leadership. Hersey and Blanchard’s situational leadership model was developed in the late 1960’s and has evolved since then (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Graeff, 1983; Hersey & Blanchard, 1981; Hersey & Blanchard, 1996; Northouse, 2019; Raza & Sikandar, 2018). While the model is criticized for its lack of research support (Graeff, 1983), it also has a history of usefulness (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Northouse, 2019; Raza & Sikandar, 2018), including as a model to guide teacher instruction of students (Raza & Sikandar, 2018). The strength of the model lies in its simplicity and pragmatism. The model provides a practical framework to understand how I might best address the measurement-knowledge gap I perceive in the CLT.

Situational leadership theory suggests that “different situations demand [one of four] different kinds of leadership”: directing, coaching, supporting and delegating (Northouse, 2019, pp. 113 – 114). Further, the four kinds of situational leadership depend on the commitment and competence of the followers (Northouse, 2019). Of course, the members of the CLT are both highly competent leaders and highly committed to the vision for student maximum potential. At the same time, increased CLT understanding of the specific concepts related to this OIP is required to accelerate NCSD’s movement toward the vision of student maximum potential (Godkin, 2010). The situational leadership I will apply, therefore, is intended to build CLT competence in the understanding, innovation and institutionalization of a comprehensive range of measures to guide NCSD’s continuous improvement toward the preferred state of student maximum potential. Moreover, the situational leadership I apply will transition through the directing, coaching, supporting and delegating modes of situational leadership as the CLT builds their measurement system capacity. Because my leadership is as a consultant
without hierarchical authority, however, Figure 3 shows how I will be releasing the CLT into interdependent collaboration (Collet, 2015) instead of delegating responsibility.

Figure 3. A modified situational leadership model to show the gradual release of the CLT from consultant dependent to collaborative interdependence. Adapted from “The gradual increase of responsibility model for coaching teachers: Scaffolds for change” by V. Collet, 2015, *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 4*(4), pp. 32-33, and “Leadership: Theory and Practice” by P. Northouse, 2019, pp. 112-115.

As consultant, I direct, coach, support and then release; my support declines over time. The CLT transitions from dependent on me to interdependent upon each other as they collaborate to manage a measurement framework.
To apply my agency as a leader for this OIP, my conception of a situational leadership model informed by a release of responsibility model familiar to educators engaged as coaches mentoring teachers (Collet, 2015). With increased understanding of the themes related to measurement systems for school improvement outlined in Table 1, above, and delineated in Chapter One, the CLT will better appreciate what current NCSD measurement practices are effective and where there are areas that can be improved. Importantly, after engaging in the dialogic learning of this first step in the OIP, the CLT will be inspired to investigate, innovate and institutionalize a comprehensive measurement framework.

**Appreciative leadership.** Appreciative leadership is “the relational capacity to mobilize creative potential and turn it into positive power” (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2016, p. 62), and “the role of an appreciative leader is to be a catalyst of change and to look for and nurture the best in others” (Orr & Cleveland-Innes, 2015, p. 237). Appreciative leadership is grounded in appreciative inquiry (Orr & Cleveland-Innes, 2015; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2016). Appreciative inquiry is a theory of change pioneered by David Cooperrider; it shifts away from a problem-based change approach to a strengths-based change approach (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). Further, as shown in Figure 4, appreciative inquiry is a cyclical change-process model that moves from appreciating through envisioning impact to co-constructing and sustaining.
Figure 4. Adapted from “Theoretical Frameworks to Guide School Improvement” by L. Evans, B. Thornton, and J. Usinger, 2012, NASSP Bulletin, 96(2), p. 171.

The strengths-based aspect of appreciative leadership and the appreciative inquiry it is grounded in makes it suitable to the change context because it celebrates the tremendous work underway by the CLT and the employees of NCSD as a whole. As a consultant, that approach celebrates NCSD growth already achieved and from that place guides inquiry to determine other ways to realize NCSD’s vision. There is no deficit to overcome; there is only greater benefit to be realized through purposeful inquiry into how measurement might accelerate and sustain changes designed to support students’ movement toward maximum potential.
Keeping in mind that the SEP is the current change model being used by the CLT to guide NCSD strategic growth while the CPM is the change model used both in Chapter One for a gap analysis and later in this chapter for a critical analysis of NCSD as an organization, another reason to employ appreciative leadership through appreciative inquiry is because appreciative inquiry is a theory of organizational change (Evans et al., 2012). As shown in Table 6, an appreciative inquiry model is analogous to both the SEP and the CPM.

Table 6

*The Appreciative Inquiry Model compared to the SEP and CPM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciative Inquiry Model&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Change Path Model&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Sustaining Excellence Protocol&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciating</td>
<td>1. Awaken</td>
<td>1. Inspire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Evans, Thornton, and Usinger (2012, p. 171).  
<sup>b</sup>Cawsey, Deszca and Ingols (2016, p. 55).  
<sup>c</sup>NCSD’s interpretation of the accreditation change process outlined by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Elementary and Secondary Schools (n.d. b).  
<sup>d</sup>The missing fourth step of NCSD’s interpretation of the SEP change model.

By applying an appreciative leadership stance, there is no major shift in the CLT’s change work; there is only reflection on, celebration for, and enhancement of the SEP change process already underway. As a result, appreciate inquiry as the appreciative leadership approach applied to this change will support the purposeful adoption and
implementation of measures designed to inform the continuous improvement work underway in NCSD without adding cumbersome complexities.

Finally, Markiewicz and Patrick (2016), prominent voices in the application of measurement frameworks for organizational growth, found that several methods can be used to successfully implement a comprehensive range of measures to inform and accelerate organizational growth toward a vision (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). A learning approach based in appreciative inquiry theory is one of those methods. Two other methods for the development of a measurement framework offered by Markiewicz and Patrick (2016) and relevant to this OIP are the social-justice approach based in reflective evaluation and the systems approach based in developmental evaluation. In the social-justice approach, “appreciative inquiry and collaborative forms of [measurement] emphasize social constructivism”, where learning from measurement is iterative, integrated into organizational life, and includes structured processes (Dunlap, 2008, p. 27). In the systems approach, an external voice adds value by participating in decisions on how to measure the organization (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). My agent-of-learning collaboration on this PoP from an appreciative-inquiry leadership stance analogous to the SEP change cycle will help the CLT innovate and institutionalize a hybrid measurement approach influenced by appreciative inquiry, social justice, and systems thinking specific to the NCSD context. A clear framework for leading the change process is required to achieve that goal.
Framework for Leading the Change Process

In this section, change process theory is defined and its importance is explained. Change process models relevant to this OIP are then considered. The Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is identified as the best change process model for this OIP.

Change Process Theory Defined

Change-process theories are the constructs used to guide the understanding, implementation, and evaluation of change (Evans et al., 2012). Such theories “describe routines, procedures and specific practices for dealing with problems common to the practice environment” (Houchens & Keedy, 2009, p. 50). In addition, change process theory captured in policy is complex and subject to the influence of specific contexts and the values of policy actors in those contexts (Ball et al., 2011).

Change Process Theory is Important

Change-process theory is important. Without change-process theory actively being used to guide change in education settings, change is either ineffective or, perhaps worse, effective but not sustained (Evans et al., 2012; Harris, 2011). Certainly, school-system leaders require a profound understanding of change theory to effectively manage complex change (Evans et al., 2012; Fullan, 2007). Without a masterful understanding of change theory, change leaders either focus on only one stage of the change process or use stages superficially; change leaders who understand change process thoroughly, however, employ all stages of the change process and self-correct throughout the process (Fullan, 2007). Masterful understanding of the change process allows change leaders to effectively adjust and adapt as they lead through the change process.
Moreover, change is more effective when leaders use a framework to describe the change process: “a theoretical framework provides a common language for discussion of issues related to planned changes” (Evans et al., 2012, p. 173). A theoretical framework allows change leaders to name and rely on effective drivers of change, such as shared vision and implementation (Evans et al., 2012), instead of over-relying on ineffective drivers of change, such as external accountability tools like the MAP (Harris, 2011). Deliberate capacity-building in change-process leadership is crucial to successful, and sustained, change (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Harris, 2011).

**Relevant Change Process Theories**

It is possible for three change theories to inform this OIP: the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016), the Eight-Stage Accelerate Model (Kotter, 2014), and the SEP accreditation process itself. Table 7 aligns the process stages of each model for comparison. The SEP accreditation process is an action research model for change in an

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Path Model</th>
<th>Sustaining Excellence Protocol</th>
<th>Eight-Stage Accelerate Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Awaken</td>
<td>1. Inspire</td>
<td>1. Establish urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Create coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Empower employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Continue to generate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Cawsey et al. (2016), Kotter (2014), and the SEP (MSA, n.d. b).*
education organization. The SEP is a change theory that has merit because it includes a bias for reflective action: “[action research] works towards a resolution of the impetus for action with the reflective process of inquiry and knowledge generation, to generate new practices” (Somekh & Zeichner, 2009, p. 18). Through the SEP, NCSD is engaged in change through a type of action research that is “locally sponsored systemic reform sustained over time” (Somekh & Zeichner, 2009, p. 5). The action-research-based change process of the SEP is congruent with the change frameworks presented by both Cawsey et al. (2016) and Kotter (2014), which makes both models effective tools to communicate and increase understanding of the change-management process underway in the NCSD context.

Well-planned communication of the change process is essential to change management (Cawsey et al., 2016; Klein, 1996; Kotter, 2014). Through the SEP, the change process is being managed and communicated masterfully through the Inspire, Investigate, and Innovate (i3) stages. Yet, the final stage of the change process is not considered in the SEP, which is a root cause of this PoP. The greatest value in adopting the Cawsey et al. (2016) or Kotter (2014) models, therefore, is their emphasis on the final stage of the change process: institutionalize and embed new practices, respectively. Mastering the final stage of the change process is fundamental to both the success of this OIP and the success of other change efforts underway at NCSD through the SEP because the institutionalize stage includes the “[development of] a means of rectifying problems through feedback and adjustment” (Klein, 1996, p. 44). The means of feedback for adjustment is a comprehensive range of assessment measures in a monitoring and evaluation framework.
While there is clear congruence between the SEP and both the Eight Stage Model (Kotter, 2014) and the CPM (Cawsey et al., 2016), the CPM will be the central change theory used to understand and propel this OIP because its four steps align precisely with the SEP.

**The Change Path Model (CPM)**

The Change Path Model, or CPM, delineated by Cawsey et al. (2016) is the best model for informing the change process of this OIP because it is simple, closely matches the SEP, focuses on institutionalization, and stresses the importance of measurement.

*Simple, SEP alignment.* A four-step model is easier to understand than an eight-step model. Even though there are sub-steps in the four-step CPM that align with Kotter’s (2014) Eight-Stage Accelerate Model, the simplicity of the CPM makes it the best choice. Moreover, the CPM is aligned with NCSD’s SEP. This alignment is a critical understanding for the CLT because it will shed tremendous light on their understanding of the change process they are leading and the entire NCSD community is engaged in.

The first step of the CPM, awaken, is aligned with the SEP’s inspire. That first step answers the question ‘why change”? The need for change is determined and an inspiring vision for change is developed. The second step of the CPM model, mobilize, is aligned with the SEP’s investigate. That second step uses formal systems and structures to communicate the change vision and engage employees in investigating change ideas that will realize the change vision. The third step of the CPM, accelerate, builds employee capacity in the knowledge and skills required to innovate ways to realize the envisioned change. Finally, the fourth step of the CPM, institutionalize, uses multiple measures to assess progress toward the change goal and make modifications that support
the institutionalization of innovations. There is currently no stage in the SEP that aligns with the fourth stage of the CPM; therefore, I incorporate institutionalization into the SEP.

**Institutionalization.** The CPM alignment with the SEP underscores the lack of attention to institutionalization in the current NCSD change process. That gap in the SEP is important to recognize because institutionalization is an important part of the change process (Cawsey et al., 2016; Fullan, 2006b; Hargreaves, 2007; Kotter, 2014).

The purpose of the final stage of the CPM is institutionalization (Cawsey et al., 2016). With institutionalization comes stability in the transformed organization as new organizational structures and refined employee skills sustain the change. Kotter’s (2014) change process model also underscored the need for change process to culminate in institutionalization. In that final stage, titled institute change, change process leaders are implored to “[integrate changes] into the… processes, systems, procedures, and behavior” of the organization. Both Hargreaves (2007) and Fullan (2006b) emphasize the importance of tempering innovation with purposeful institutionalization. Fullan (2006b) argued that effective schools select innovations carefully and focus on the institutionalization of those innovations, while Hargreaves (2007) explained that change is sustained when organizations choose the best innovations and drop the rest.

**Measurement.** The CPM emphasis on measurement in the institutionalization stage of the change process is central to this OIP. For the change process to be complete, change process leaders must “[t]rack the change periodically and through multiple balanced measures to help assess what is needed, gauge progress toward the goal and to make modifications as needed” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 55). That idea is fundamental to
address the PoP I have identified: the lack of a comprehensive range of measures to guide NCSD’s continuous improvement. The development of a comprehensive range of measures will help “[rectify] problems through feedback and adjustment” (Klein, 1996, p. 44).

Conclusion

Change process theories guide the understanding, implementation, and evaluation of change (Evans et al., 2012). The Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is the best change process framework for this OIP because it is simple, aligned with the SEP, and emphasizes institutionalization and measurement.

Critical Organizational Analysis

In this section, the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) is used as a critical organizational analysis tool to establish what needs to be changed in the NSCD application of the SEP (MSA, n.d.b). It is determined that a comprehensive range of effectiveness measures is required to overcome a deficit in the institutionalize stage of the change process.

Change Path Model Diagnosis

The Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) was used to diagnose analyze NCSD’s application of the SEP as a change process protocol. The CPM model summary (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 55) was converted into an assessment rubric and used as a reflective tool to determine deficits in NCSD’s management of the change process (see Appendix B for the assessment rubric). While the CPM is depicted linearly by Cawsey at al. (2016), I view it as a cycle. Figure 5 shows how the final stage of the CPM,
institutionalize, leads back into the awaken stage because “the enactment of one set of changes sets the stage for the next ones” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 375).

Figure 5. The Change Path Model represented as a continuous-improvement cycle. Adapted from “Organizational change: An action-oriented toolkit” by T.F. Cawsey, G. Deszca, and C. Ingols, 2016, p. 55. The three steps of the NCSD Sustaining Excellence Protocol are aligned with the first three steps of the Change Path Model. Institutionalize is added as a fourth step in the Sustaining Excellence Protocol to continue the alignment and underscore the importance of measurement for the continuous improvement of NCSD through the Sustaining Excellence Protocol.

Much the same as Armenakis and Harris (2002), I believe “the whole [change] process is continuous as institutionalized changes themselves become the focus of future change efforts” (p. 169). When the CPM Criteria (Appendix B) is viewed in Figure 6 as a cyclical model and used to critically analyze the change process underway in NCSD
through the SEP, the lack of a range of measures in and surrounding the institutionalize stage of the change process is startlingly evident.

Figure 6. The CPM Criteria assessment of NCSD in cyclical form.

The CPM Criteria as a formative assessment measure illustrates the negative effect of limited measurement tools on the SEP underway in NCSD. Thorough reflection on each criterion in the CPM will inform decisions made and actions taken to achieve the goal of this OIP: the innovation of comprehensive measurement to inform strategic growth through the SEP. In the next section, I elaborate on the assessment of each CPM
criterion to describe the CLT’s use of the SEP as demonstrating either thorough (green), partial (amber) or initial (red) understanding and application of the change process. This assessment is completed from my perspective as a member of the DTLT, and given my collaboration with the CLT, STLT and DTLT, during the initiation of the SEP and the first year of its implementation. Ideally, if this OIP were initiated, the CLT would use the CPM assessment to refine their understanding of the status of the SEP as a change process and subsequently use that understanding to inform ongoing decisions regarding the SEP.

The awaken – inspire stage of change (i1). The awaken-inspire stage of change requires the collection of data to identify the need for change and articulate the gap between the present and the envisioned future state. The stage also requires the development and dissemination of a powerful vision for change.

1: Data collection to identify need for change – partial (amber). The envisioned future state is student achievement of maximum potential; the problem is that NCSD does not have a comprehensive range of measures to provide a comprehensive baseline or wholly assess movement toward that envisioned state. That lack of comprehensive measures also makes the gap between the current status of student potential and the desired state of student maximum potential difficult to articulate.

2: Articulate the gap in performance – partial (amber). In the past, the sole measures used to guide NCSD growth were external, standardized assessments such as the MAP and Cognitive Abilities Test, or CogAT (Lohman, 2011). Currently, some of the external standardized assessments have been dropped in favour of different external or internal standardized assessments, such as the Education Northwest (EdNW)
standardized writing assessment and the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) for reading. At the same time, National Company has imposed two measures that NCSD is required to administer: an employee engagement survey and a parent satisfaction survey.

It is important to note that the company monitors the data from those two surveys to make judgements about the effectiveness of NCSD as a division of National Company. In my mind, the company imposition of measures is a red flag; it suggests to me that NCSD should delineate and masterfully use a broader range of effectiveness measures to counter-balance company-imposed measures: “[e]valuating change success can provide crucial information for funding authorities who may be monitoring change efforts and the outcomes” (Dudar, Scott, & Scott, 2017, p. 53).

In the future, NCSD could gather data regarding different aspects of student achievement and the change process. Student achievement could be measured by student service-learning participation, the NCSD graduate profile, the inclusion of student voice, or many other student-centred measurement methods. In a similar way, NCSD change process could be assessed by using a Change Path Model rubric (see Appendix B) or by specifically measuring institutionalization. As well as guiding NCSD continuous improvement toward the vision of student maximum potential, incorporating a wider range of measures would also demonstrate NCSD effectiveness to the company; that range of measures may even counterbalance the two narrow measures the company is using to judge NCSD effectiveness: employee engagement and parent satisfaction. Nevertheless, despite a lack of measures to identify the need for change or articulate the gap in performance, the CLT has developed a powerful change vision through the SEP.
3: **Develop a powerful vision for change – thorough (green).** Vision is essential to transformational change (Cawsey et al., 2016; Johnson & Leavitt, 2001; Kotter, 2014), and the NCSD CLT are sophisticated transformational leaders (Leithwood et al., 2004; Moolenaar et al., 2010). The CLT has created and maintained a powerful vision, which resonates with Johnson and Leavitt’s (2001) claim that “[i]t is both the vision, and the process of developing this vision, that create the energy to drive change throughout the organization” (p. 129). The CLT has created that powerful vision by including employees from across the district schools and throughout the district’s hierarchy through the development of the DTLT and the STLT and purposeful activities with those teams. For example, those teams meet regularly to rekindle the vision, engage in planning, and learn design strategies that enhance innovation. Moolenaar et al. (2010) claimed that transformational leadership is an approach that effectively develops innovation in schools, and the CLT has done just that. One caution to note is that students have not been involved in the visioning process for the innovations underway at NCSD; including students in future visioning activities would “reengage the disengaged and disenfranchised in their schools which can lead to more close-knit and committed educational communities” (Dudar et al., 2017, p. 70). That idea is transformational and transformative.

4: **Disseminate the vision for change – thorough (green).** The CLT has used several powerful means to disseminate the SEP vision for change. One powerful symbol used to broadcast the vision for student maximum potential is the creation and use of a tree metaphor (see Appendix C). Storytelling is another powerful tool for vision communication (Riel & Martin, 2017). By capturing the SEP journey in a timeline, the
CLT is recording and disseminating the unfolding story of change underway in NCSD (see Appendix E). Further, the CLT has created a team of representatives from all schools in the district to spread the vision for change. Known as the DTLT, the members of that team are a conduit for the change vision that extends from the Superintendent’s office to every level of the NCSD hierarchy.

Overall, the CLT is on the line between partial and thorough understanding and application of an effective Awaken – Inspire stage of the change process. While the vision for change is powerful and disseminated purposefully, there is room for improvement in the gathering and use of measurement data to identify the need for change and articulate the gap in performance.

The mobilize – investigate stage of change (i2). The mobilize-investigate stage of change requires that organizational structures, power dynamics and change agents are leveraged to realize the change vision. Further, organization-wide communication regarding change is required to move change forward in this stage.

5: Organizational structures – thorough (green). Formal structures are used wisely in NCSD to reach the change vision. Two important idea structures are embedded in NCSD organizational practice to build change capacity and provide tools that support change and growth: adaptability structures (Garmston & Wellman, 2016; Dolcemascolo & McKanders, 2017) and design thinking structures (Brown, 2009; Brown & Martin, 2015; Riel & Martin, 2017). Each of the two Curriculum Coordinators is an expert in, and champion and capacity-builder of, one of those structures.

6: Power dynamics – partial (amber). Prudently revised power structures support the change process underway at NCSD. For example, teams have been restructured to
include more roles from across the district and throughout the organizational hierarchy. What was formerly the Senior Administrative Team, or SAT, is now known as the Senior Transformational Leadership Team, or STLT. The former Executive Council is now known as the District Transformational Leadership Team, or DTLT, and consists of teacher and administrative representatives from across the district. The members of those teams champion the SEP change process in schools and classrooms by supporting the work of NCSD employees who engage in action-research projects. As another caution, however, it is important to remember the power of the company and the lack of student power in the greater NCSD hierarchy. A robust measurement framework developed in-house by NCSD may preclude the National Company from mandating burdensome measurement methods and, at the same time, empower students by including their voices. Moreover, a broader understanding of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) political frame emphasizes the need for the CLT to take control of accountability, better address the tension between alignment and adaptability, and engage in more purposeful reflective practice. Hence my assessment of partial understanding and application.

7: Communication – thorough (green). Communication is vital for change success (Armenakis, & Harris, 2002; Bryk, 2015; Cawsey et al., 2016; Gilley et al., 2009; Heide, von Platen, Simonsson, & Falkheimer, 2018; Kang, 2015; Klein, 1996). NCSD’s STLT and DTLT structures ensure the need for change is communicated across the district. As the change moves forward, those team structures support change recipients and other stakeholders in understanding the status of the change process. Moving forward, however, the use of a communication-specific measurement tool such as the
Communication Tracker (see Appendix F) will ensure NCSD stays in the green with this important part of the change process.

8: Change agents – thorough (green). Change agency is realized from any role or level in a hierarchy (Cawsey et al., 2016). In NCSD, change agents from across the district use their skills as “initiators, implementers, facilitators, and/or task force team members” to benefit the change process (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 257). Teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators work together at school sites to innovate change in pursuit of the vision for student maximum potential. Members from those teams frequently meet to support each other as members of the DTLT, while Curriculum Coordinators and other members of the CLT visit schools routinely to support SEP change process. However, there is still room for improvement; leveraging external expertise can help to accelerate the change (Ball et al., 2011; Godkin, 2010; Scott & McNeish, 2013; Swaffield, 2004).

While there is room for improvement in the CLT’s understanding and management of power dynamics, the CLT has generally demonstrated a thorough understanding and application of the Mobilize – Investigate stage of the change process.

The accelerate – innovate stage of change (i3). The accelerate-innovate stage of the change process demands continual support of change participants, appropriate tools, and purposeful transition to institutionalization.

9: Continuous support – thorough (green). As noted above, continuous support of change participants is achieved through the prudent structuring of the STLT and DTLT and the purposeful training of NCSD employees in adaptive strategies (Garmston & Wellman, 2016) and design thinking principles (Brown, 2009; Brown & Martin, 2015;
Riel & Martin, 2017). Coordinated purposefully by the CLT, that continuous support achieves both capacity building and accountability through collaboration (Fullan, 2006; Harris, 2011; Mourshed et al., 2010).

10: Capacity building – thorough (green). Employee training in adaptive schools and design thinking methodologies builds the capacity required for effective investigation and innovation of changes in pursuit of the change vision. The CLT knows that without capacity building, innovations are unlikely to succeed (Harris, 2011). Moreover, internal accountability can be defined as “capacity building with a focus on results” (Fullan, 2006, p. 9). External accountability reform, such as through standardized assessments, has failed (Harris, 2011); real accountability is achieved internally through collaboration because collaborative practice is the main mechanism for improving practice and holding colleagues accountable to each other (Mourshed et al., 2010). Through the STLT, DTLT, and productive professional development, the CLT has wisely made collaboration a force for capacity building and internal accountability. There is a lack, however, in the number and kinds of measurement tools being used to inform capacity building efforts.

11: Appropriate tools – partial (amber). Through adaptive schools and design thinking strategies, many different tools are being used to increase capacity and accelerate the change process in NCSD. For example, the norms of collaboration explained in adaptive schools’ literature and used across NCSD supports the collaboration efforts of NCSD employees (Garmston & Wellman, 2016). On the other hand, a broad range of measures employed to consolidate progress and determine next steps is lacking. A simple measurement tool like the CPM being used in this section would help to close that gap.
12: Transition to institutionalization – partial (amber). While small wins along the change path are celebrated – the CLT knows how to throw a party - there is little management of the transition to institutionalization thus far. How might the kindergarten innovation be sustained when individuals in key roles move on? How might the kindergarten innovation be adopted in other schools? What other measurement tools might be used to fill this gap? Institutionalization is a crucial, yet often neglected, part of the change process in education (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Goldman & Smith, 1991).

The institutionalize – institutionalize stage of change (i4). The current SEP change model understood by the CLT is i3: inspire, investigate, innovate. The argument I present throughout this OIP is that a fourth stage of change in the SEP change model needs to be understood and applied by the CLT: institutionalize, or i4.

13: Comprehensive measures – initial (red). A comprehensive range of measures helps “[rectify] problems through feedback and adjustment” (Klein, 1996, p. 44). While NCSD continues to use measures to inform its efficacy and guide its growth, current measures do not cover the requisite range of inputs, processes, or outputs (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Cawsey et al., 2016; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016; NEA, 2013). For example, one critical measurement missing is the assessment of the change process (Cawsey et al., 2016; NEA, 2013). Another essential measurement missing in the NCSD SEP is the assessment of the institutionalization of innovations (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Cawsey et al., 2016; Goldman & Smith, 1991).

14: Deploy new structures to embed change – initial (red). The institutionalize-institutionalize stage of the change process requires the development of new knowledge, skills, and structures to embed change in an organization. One of the key structures
required is a system of multiple measures to assess progress toward the change goal and inform necessary adjustments (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Cawsey et al., 2016; Kotter, 2014; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). To this point, the CLT has neither innovated nor deployed a system of multiple measures to assess movement toward its envisioned state: student maximum potential.

**Conclusion**

When the CPM is used to critically analyze the change process underway in NCSD through the SEP, the lack of a comprehensive range of measures in an institutionalize stage is startlingly evident. The next section outlines four possible solutions to address that PoP.

**Possible Solutions to Address the Problem of Practice**

The objective of this OIP is to help the CLT employ a comprehensive range of effectiveness measures to inform and strategically accelerate NCSD’s growth toward its vision: the realization of student maximum potential. Four solutions to the PoP are explored in this section: 1) maintain the status quo; 2) adopt the National Company’s Operational Excellence (NCOE) measurement framework; 3) devise a measurement framework specific to the needs of NCSD; and, 4) devise a hybrid measurement framework, where NCSD measurement needs are prioritized and context-specific measurements are designed to dovetail into the NCOE framework. Each solution is considered with regard to resource needs. Subsequently, the similarities, differences, benefits and consequences of each solution are considered in comparison to other solutions. Solution 4, the hybrid solution, is determined to be the best solution for the PoP.
identified in this OIP. Table 8 summarizes the resource needs required for each solution considered to address the PoP.

Table 8  

*Resource Needs Required Across Possible Solutions to the Problem of Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1+ FT Position</td>
<td>0 - 1 FT Position</td>
<td>0 - 1 FT Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1+ FT Position</td>
<td>0 - 1 FT Position</td>
<td>0 - 1 FT Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>OE expertise</td>
<td>Measurement knowledge</td>
<td>OE knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Solution Proposal 1: Maintain the Status Quo**

This solution proposes that the CLT continue its excellent leadership work without making any changes to its current effectiveness measures.

**The solution.** NCSD is a healthy organization led by skilled leaders. As revealed in the CPM assessment (see Appendix B), the CLT thoroughly understands and applies many of the fundamental dimensions of the change process. While there are deficits noted through the assessment, the strength of the CLT’s work in most change process dimensions appears to be improving growth toward the vision.

**Resources needed.** Maintaining the status quo requires no additional resources, but the efficient use of resources can be questioned.
Solution Proposal 2: Adopt National Company Operational Excellence

National Company uses a measurement framework to guide continuous improvement across the company; that measurement framework is called National Company Operational Excellence, or NCOE (National Company, 2014). NCOE is a measurement framework comprised of thirteen elements housed within four overarching focus areas (see Appendix G). This solution proposes that NCSD adopt NCOE as a means to broaden its range of effectiveness measures.

The Solution. Operational excellence (OE) is “a sophisticated way to measure and compare” how what an organization is doing through its policy and processes results in achievement of its intended outcomes (LeMahieu et al., 2017b, p. 92). OE was born in a business context in the United States in the 1980s and has grown since then to become a common measurement framework in corporations; while the framework is based on business, OE concepts have been applied successfully in K-12 and higher education contexts (LeMahieu et al., 2017b; Rojas, 2008).

In schools, operational excellence is “driven by a close understanding of [student] needs, disciplined use of [data], and diligent attention to managing, improving, and reinventing processes” (Rojas, 2008). The overarching goal of OE as a measurement method in an education context is to “build a trail of data and evidence” to support the change process, from problem identification through solution proposal, implementation and institutionalization (LeMahieu, 2017b, p. 104). The concepts of OE are relevant to education organizations, but implementation of OE is resource heavy (LeMahieu et al., 2017b).
Resources needed. In the NCSD context, a significant commitment of resources would be required to implement and sustain the adoption of NCOE as a solution. As leaders of NCSD, the CLT and other members of the STLT would require training in the NCOE system, and training requires precious time. Moreover, significant time commitment would be required to manage the NCOE in NCSD; the creation of at least one, and realistically more, full-time positions would be required to manage such an extensive measurement framework.

It is also likely that an OE expert, or team of experts, would be required in the short term to establish the NCOE framework in the NCSD education context (LeMahieu et al., 2017b). To bridge the gap between business and education, one of the members of that expert team should include an education consultant that is an experienced educator with knowledge and experience in the application of measurement frameworks in education contexts. As a result of both training and increased-personnel requirements in the short- and long-term, this solution would require a significant fiscal commitment.

Solution Proposal 3: Create a NCSD-Specific Measurement Framework

This solution proposes that NCSD create its own framework of comprehensive measures to assess and inform NCSD strategic growth toward its vision: student maximum potential.

The Solution. The CLT is currently leading an effective macro-change process through the SEP. The vision for that change is student maximum potential. To achieve that vision, the SEP inspires NCSD employees to investigate and innovate improved practices. This solution proposes that the CLT engage in their own action-research project as one of those SEP-inspired changes. By engaging in their own action-research
project, the CLT will communicate their commitment to the SEP at the same time as improving the SEP. By innovating a comprehensive range of measurements for NCSD improvement, the institutionalize stage of the SEP will become an effective part of the change process.

**Resources needed.** There are resources required for Solution 3. As in Solution 2, an education consultant with knowledge and experience in the application of measurement frameworks in education contexts would be required at the onset of this change. Further, the CLT would be required to engage in the development of this process; while no specific outside training would be necessary, CLT members would need to work with the consultant to increase understanding and skill in the creation and use of organization-improvement measurements and measurement frameworks. Those requirements will demand time and money. Once the measurements are defined, the implementation and use of the measurement framework could be managed either by the CLT alone or in collaboration with a specific role assigned to manage the measurement framework. Starting small and gradually increasing measurement factors is advised in this solution. If a specific role were assigned to the management of the measurement framework, cost would increase.

**Solution Proposal 4: Create a NCSD/NCOE Compatible Measurement Framework**

This solution proposes that NCSD innovate its own measurement framework to assess and inform NCSD strategic growth, and that the framework innovated is designed with the NCOE framework in mind.

**The solution.** As a division of the Human Resources (HR) department of the National Company, NCSD has not yet been required to implement its own OE
measurement framework. Currently, NCSD feeds requisite data to the HR Department on
an as-requested basis for use in the HR Department’s OE measurement framework. For
example, fiscal and labour statistics from NCSD are used to inform the HR Department’s
Financial Resources element for OE (see Appendix G). However, it is not unreasonable
to believe that National Company executives will require NCSD to establish an NCOE
measurement framework in the future because in 2014 the National Company mandated
that NCSD adopt a similar measurement framework to manage its safety processes and
practices.

With those understandings in mind, creating a measurement framework specific to
the NCSD context but potentially compatible with the NCOE framework would be
prudent for three reasons: first, it would easily allow for the passing of measurement data
to the congruent OE process in the HR Department when requested; second, it would
demonstrate to National Company executives that NCSD has a robust measurement
framework in place specific to education and likely does not need to implement the
NCOE framework; and, third, if National Company executives did mandate NCSD to
implement the NCOE framework, the NCSD measurement framework already in place
could easily be modified to fit the language and semantics of the NCOE measurement
framework. For example, NCSD might consider using a tool like the Change Path Model
Criteria (Appendix B) as part of its measurement framework related to change. Doing so
would align directly with the Change Management element of the NCOE framework (see
Appendix G). Then, while the policy and practice created to develop a measurement
framework specific to NCSD would need to be modified to fit the NCOE framework, the
bulk of the work would already be done. Most importantly, right now and into the future,
NCSD would benefit from the accelerated improvement inevitably realized from measurement framework processes and tools created specifically for NCSD.

**Resources needed.** The resource needs for this solution are the same as those determined for solution three.

**Preferred Solution – Solution 4**

Solution 1, maintain the status quo, is the easiest; it requires no further action. Yet the consequence of that solution is organizational inertia (Godkin, 2010). One of the reasons for using a measurement system is to identify what is not getting the organization closer to its vision, stop doing those things, and reallocate those resources to innovations that will get the organization to its target (Adelman & Taylor, 2007).

Solution 2, adopt the NCOE framework, is a viable solution but it is resource heavy. While in theory a full OE measurement framework can be applied to an education setting (LeMahieu et al., 2017b; Rojas, 2008), it requires extensive human capital and associated fiscal resources. The benefit of Solution 2 would be alignment with the NCOE measurement framework, but that alignment could also be achieved in Solution 4.

Solution 3, create a NCSD-specific measurement framework, is viable from a resource perspective. In fact, there is potential for a net resource gain if the measurement framework created allows the CLT to stop investing human and fiscal resources in practices that are not moving NCSD toward its vision. While the expertise of a consultant would be required to guide the CLT through the creation of an NCSD-specific measurement framework, the clarity of the Markiewicz and Patrick (2016) text and its PDSA-like process makes the achievement of this solution realistic for relatively little resource commitment.
Conclusion

In conclusion, Solution 4 is the best solution. Given the viability and clarity of Solution 3, prudence demands the creation of a NCSD-specific measurement per Solution 3 with NCOE in mind. Solution 4 has the same potential resource surpluses and achievability of Solution 3 as well as the prudent flexibility to adjust to the conceivable mandating of the NCOE framework upon NCSD by National Company executives.

Leadership Ethics and Organizational Change

In education, ethics are touted as all-important (Bown, Bessette, & Cham, 2006), yet ethics are rarely covered in leadership training (Bown et al., 2006) or discussed in practice (Ehrich, Harris, Klenowski, Smeed, & Spina, 2015). The purpose of ethical theorizing in this section is to challenge assumptions about leadership and articulate ways ethical leadership can be practiced more fully (Liu, 2017; Stefkovich & Begley, 2007). Stefkovich and Begley (2007), for example, claimed that ethics understanding can help leaders build consensus toward shared objectives and make better decisions. Likewise, Liu (2017) argued that challenging assumptions about ethical leadership helps leaders practice their leadership with “emancipatory intent” (p. 351). For the success of this OIP, it is important to describe how ethical thinking like that might inform the organizational change and leadership approaches relevant to this OIP.

Ethics and The Leadership Approach of the CLT

Ethical thinking informs the leadership of the CLT by revealing an ethical paradox in transformational leadership, by stressing the need for education leaders to constantly reflect on ethics, and by describing how ethical practice is achieved in the action research of the SEP.
The ethical paradox of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is an effective approach for organizational change in education contexts and the CLT is composed of passionate and skilled transformational leaders (Leithwood et al., 2004; Moolenaar et al., 2010). There is a potential Achilles heel in a transformational leadership approach, however, when that approach is considered through an ethical lens (Liu, 2017; Mills & Gay, 2016; Zeni, 1998). Increased understanding of the threat will allow the CLT to mitigate the threat’s believably negative effects. In NCSD, the students who are championed through the vision of student maximum potential may paradoxically be oppressed by the change efforts underway on their behalf.

Traditional views of leadership can reinforce systems of oppression (Liu, 2017). Liu (2017) argued that leadership is traditionally viewed as a hierarchical construct, with leaders at the top and followers below; power is transferred down to lower levels of the hierarchy, reinforcing the power hierarchy. That paradox is overcome when ethically aware leaders empower others through relational and dialectic practices as they muddle together through the ambiguity and uncertainty of change (Liu, 2017). While the CLT has empowered employees across NCSD, student voice may not be included as often as it might. Constantly reflecting on the need to include all voices in change-process dialogue will help the CLT continue to lead ethically.

Constant reflection on ethics. Ethical considerations must take student voices into account, and that behaviour begins with educators who "engage in active inquiry and self-reflection" (Stefkovich & Begley, 2007, p. 220). That active inquiry and self-reflection will benefit all levels of a school system when education leaders engage in the practice themselves, raise awareness of the importance of ethical inquiry across their
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organizations, and overtly discuss ethics (Ehrich et al., 2015). Such overt ethics praxis can help education leaders build consensus toward shared objectives and make better decisions (Stefkovich & Begley, 2007). Constant reflection on ethics can also inform the action research process.

**Action research and ethics.** All members of NCSD engaged in action research projects through the SEP should also engage in ethical considerations because action-researchers participate in the research process (Zeni, 1998). In traditional research processes, the researcher was separate from those being researched and relied on contractual declarations of research intent and consent to mitigate risk of harm (Mills & Gay, 2016). Mitigation of harm in action research, on the other hand, is achieved through open dialogue regarding all aspects of the research, including participants’ worldview and ethical stance (Mills & Gay, 2016). Are students participants in SEP action research processes? Should they be?

Ethical thinking informs the leadership of the CLT by revealing an ethical paradox in transformational leadership, by stressing the need for education leaders to constantly reflect on ethics, and by describing how ethical practice is achieved in the action research of the SEP. Ethical thinking also informs my leadership approach for this OIP.

**Ethics and My Leadership Approach**

The change I am proposing is the innovation and implementation of a measurement framework to improve NCSD movement toward the vision of student maximum potential. Capper (2019) argued that, like many theories of organizational change, the change approaches I propose are grounded in a structural-functional way of
knowing and managing change in organizations. While Capper (2019) argued that social-justice-oriented transformative leadership approaches based in critical theory are “ultimately incommensurable” (p. 27) with structural-functional change processes, she also acknowledged that “critically oriented organizational theory can be a powerful lever for preparing equity leaders to lead for equity” (p. 50). My purpose through this OIP is to appreciate and leverage the powerful transformational leadership employed by the CLT for strategic growth toward the transformative goal of student maximum potential. With that transformative end in mind, my structural-functionalist approach to leadership and organizational change can, and must, be tempered by a relational ethic steeped in the emancipatory intent of critical theory (Capper, 2019; Liu, 2017). In that regard, ethical thinking is important to the creation of a measurement framework through modified situational leadership and appreciative inquiry.

The ethics of measurement. Ethical thinking is required when designing a measurement framework; a participatory approach determined by context, inclusive of all voices and “viewed from a social justice perspective” as “part of an empowerment approach” is realistic (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 53). The purpose of measurement can be individual and organizational learning for improvement toward the vision of student maximum potential instead of evaluation for upward accountability, where “accountability is essentially concerned with being answerable to those with power over a particular context” (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 44). The situational leadership and appreciative inquiry models are amenable to the ethical development of a measurement framework.
**Situational leadership.** As I awaken-inspire the CLT to mobilize-investigate measurement framework possibilities, student empowerment must be central to the endeavour. Through dialogue and interdependent collaboration, learning together how to use measurement to realize student maximum potential is central to the modified situational leadership approach I outlined and reflects a relational ethic underpinned by emancipatory, or empowering, intent. To be clear, guiding the CLT through learning conversations about transformative leadership (Capper, 2019) and Bolman and Deal’s frames (2017) with the intent to release the CLT into interdependent collaboration for the purpose of innovating and institutionalizing a measurement framework is a form of empowerment. Likewise, the learning intent of appreciative inquiry is based in a relational ethic.

**Appreciative inquiry.** Appreciative inquiry is a strengths-based approach in a cyclical change-process model that moves from appreciating through envisioning impact to co-constructing and sustaining (Evans et al., 2012). The learning approach central to appreciative inquiry is encouraged as a means to develop a measurement framework (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). The CLT will co-construct a sustainable measurement framework in the accelerate-innovate and institutionalize-institutionalize stages of the change process; the goal is the development of a measurement framework to guide NCSD continuous improvement toward student maximum potential. As in the situational leadership approach, the relational ethic is achieved through the “ongoing process of negotiated meaning-making” (Liu, p. 346) inherent in the collaborative nature of appreciative inquiry.
The development of a measurement framework through appreciative inquiry is amenable to the collective meaning-making of a relational ethic in other ways, too. For instance, critical concepts underpinning the development of a measurement framework include a participatory approach, the development of collectively determined measurement criteria, and measurement-framework capacity building (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). Moreover, because a “a more overt approach to discussing values and ethical conduct may be beneficial at all levels of the school system” (Ehrich et al., 2015), the development of a measurement framework will provide a way to keep ethics conversations central to the action-research change process underway in NCSD through the SEP. Those ethics conversations will ensure that structural-functional objectives and organizational improvement efforts do not overpower the student-centred core objective of the SEP: student maximum potential.

**Chapter 2 Conclusion**

In summary, ethical considerations in education are important (Bown et al., 2006) and must be continually discussed by education leaders in their practice (Ehrich et al., 2015). Ethical thinking informs the leadership of the CLT by revealing an ethical paradox in transformational leadership (Liu, 2017), by stressing the need for education leaders to constantly reflect on ethics (Stefkovich & Bailey, 2007), and by describing how ethical practice is achieved in the action research of the SEP (Mills & Gay, 2016; Zeni, 1998). Importantly, the traditional perspective of the structural-functional frame (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Capper, 2019) applied to this OIP is tempered by my leadership approach for this OIP. Similar to a release-of-responsibility coaching model, a modified situational-leadership approach channelled through appreciative inquiry establishes a relational ethic...
with emancipatory intent (Liu, 2017). Further, while a structural-functionalist change approach, the improvement of NCSD’s strategic growth process through the innovation and institutionalization of a comprehensive range of measures increases the likelihood that students and their maximum potential remain central to measurement-informed reflection and decision-making. The organizational improvement goals of transformational leadership can be a powerful lever for the social justice goals of transformative leadership (Apple, 2005; Apple, 2019; Capper, 2019; Peters, 2005); it is that synergistic view of leadership that underpins the pragmatic approach to the innovation of a comprehensive range of measures described in Chapter Three.
Chapter 3: Implementation, Evaluation, and Communication

The PoP addressed in this OIP is the lack of a comprehensive range of measures to guide NCSD’s continuous improvement. The change proposed in Chapter Two is that NCSD innovate its own measurements to assess and inform NCSD strategic growth, and that the measurements innovated are designed with the NCOE measurement framework in mind. To begin this chapter, therefore, a plan to implement the proposed change is delineated. Then, to inform and enhance decision-making during the change, a method for monitoring and evaluating the change plan is outlined. It is important to understand that the measurements outlined in the monitoring and evaluation framework for this OIP are intended to communicate and model potential measures that could be adopted for NCSD-specific measurements. After the monitoring and evaluation details, additional strategies to communicate both the need for this change and the process of this change are provided. Finally, to express the limitations of the ideas presented across this OIP, a next steps and future considerations section concludes this document.

Change Implementation Plan

In this section, the goals and priorities of the planned change are summarized. An overview of the change strategy is then provided, with each phase of the change strategy subsequently described.

Summary of Goals and Priorities of the Planned Change

NCSD leadership has employed the SEP as its strategic plan. The visionary goal of the SEP is to help each student reach their maximum potential. The change plan presented in this chapter intends to bolster the NCSD strategic plan by strengthening the institutionalization phase of the SEP. The objective of this OIP is to awaken the CLT to
the critical need for a comprehensive range of effectiveness measures to inform and accelerate NCSD’s growth toward its vision: student maximum potential. Once the CLT is *inspired* to develop a range of measures, this OIP specifically proposes that the CLT *investigate, innovate, and institutionalize* its own monitoring and evaluation framework to continually measure and inform NCSD strategic growth. Further, this OIP proposes that the NCSD-specific measurement framework innovated is designed with the NCOE framework in mind. The two primary resources required for this change process are time and expertise; I will provide the expertise in my role as agent of learning, and the CLT will prioritize the time.

**Change Strategy**

As described in Chapter Two, the CPM (Cawsey et al., 2016) is the best change model for this OIP because it closely matches the NCSD change model expressed through the SEP, focuses on institutionalization, and stresses the importance of measurement. Further, through the CPM, the CLT can model the action-research process of the SEP for their employees; this could be the CLT’s own SEP-based action-research project to support fulfilment of the NCSD mission. As illustrated in Figure 7, this OIP proposes a micro-change within, and supportive of, the strategic macro-change underway through the SEP, just like the kindergarten start-up innovation and all other SEP-inspired action-research initiatives underway across NCSD.
Figure 7. Micro changes support the macro change purpose of the SEP: student maximum potential.

The CPM has four phases: 1) awaken; 2) mobilize; 3) accelerate; and, 4) institutionalize. The first step of the CPM, awaken, is aligned with the SEP’s inspire (i1). That first step answers the question ‘why change’? The need for change is defined by the CLT and an inspiring vision for change is developed. The second step of the CPM, mobilize, is aligned with the SEP’s investigate (i2). That second step uses formal systems and structures to communicate the change vision and engage CLT members in investigating change ideas that will realize the change vision. The third step of the CPM, accelerate, is aligned with the SEP’s innovate (i3). The third step builds CLT capacity in the knowledge and skills required to innovate ways to realize the envisioned change. Finally, the fourth step of the CPM, institutionalize, uses multiple measures to assess progress toward the change goal and, with that assessment data to guide decisions, make ongoing modifications that support the institutionalization of innovations. There is currently no stage in the SEP that aligns with the fourth stage of the CPM; the purpose of this change is to innovate a measurement framework for the SEP that will become a significant part of the institutionalization stage (i4).
Ball et al. (2011) emphasized that change process is iterative and additive, and I agree. While the CPM-SEP change process is expressed linearly here, there is fluidity between change stages dependent upon the unfolding context of the change process (Ball et al., 2011; Cawsey et al., 2016; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). By fluidity, I mean that different stages of the change process will be revisited as the overall change process unfolds. For example, while the Accelerate-Innovate stage of change is underway, it will be important to regularly refer to the gap between current and preferred states (Awaken-Inspire), consistently communicate the change vision (Mobilize-Investigate), and use multiple measures to assess progress toward the change goal (Institutionalize – Institutionalize). With that fluidity in mind, the CPM-SEP change process proposed to address the PoP is delineated in the following sub-sections.

**The awaken – inspire [i1] stage of change.** The first step of the CPM, awaken, is aligned with the SEP’s inspire (i1). That first step answers the question ‘why change’? In this step, the need for change is identified, a gap is articulated, and an inspiring vision is developed and communicated (Cawsey et al., 2016).

The CLT are the main stakeholders for this change and the ones to be awakened to the idea of a comprehensive range of measures to guide NCSD strategic growth. While my leadership at all stages of this change is expressed through appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Kovach, 2009; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008) – the CLT and I will collaborate throughout this process – this first step requires situational leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Hersey & Blanchard, 1981; Hersey & Blanchard, 1996; Northouse, 2019). That is, to address knowledge inertia as an agent of learning (Godkin, 2010), I will guide the CLT through the understandings I have gained by
studying this problem for the past two years and release them into interdependent collaboration as they build measurement system capacity (Collet, 2015). In this step specifically, the CLT and I will review the ideas I presented in Chapter One of this OIP.

First, the CLT and I will review the gap analysis, problem of practice, and guiding questions delineated in Chapter One. Through dialogue, we will build a collective understanding of the problem. At this time, it will be important to study and understand Bolman and Deal’s (2017) framework for analyzing organizations because that is how the problem of practice is framed in Chapter One. For example, the CLT could engage in a jigsaw book study of Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames, summary the frames for each other, and use that understanding to complete their own assessment of the SEP’s status according to that framework. As consultant, I could lead the book study and enhance the conversation with insights from my perspective.

Second, the CLT and I will review the vision for change delineated through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) structural and political frames. It will be important to appraise the literature used to present that vision because it provides the fodder upon which the CLT will deepen collective knowledge. For example, the structural frame references many pieces of literature that detail themes in contemporary research that offer direction for the purposeful measurement of schools and school systems. One particularly important document for the CLT to review and dialogue at that time is Markiewicz’s (2014) summary of monitoring and evaluation frameworks so that the general concept is understood. Likewise, academic literature such as Judge and Douglas’ (2009) exposition on organizational ambidexterity, the ability to balance alignment and adaptability, will increase the CLT’s knowledge and understanding of ideas pertinent to the NCSD political
context with regard to this change. Through dialogue and appraisal of the literature, I will seek to understand CLT reactions and concerns and, together, determine ways to work through the concerns. Collaboration and inquiry in that way are essential to change success, even to the degree that “schools... become centers of inquiry, rather than targets of change” (Houchens & Keedy, 2009, p. 53). That inquiry approach is congruent with the appreciative inquiry leadership stance applied to this change and maintains a relational ethic.

Third, it will be important to review my leadership position and lens statement and engage the CLT in worldview conversations because tacitly held assumptions are drivers of insight inertia (Godkin, 2010; Houchens & Keedy, 2009; Riel & Martin, 2017). That kind of reflection is necessary for change: “[o]rganizations are able to change more effectively when individuals and change leaders within the organization shift their mental maps and frameworks, and this requires openness and reflection” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 267). One fundamental reflection tool that will be introduced in this first step is the Concerns Based Adoption Model, or CBAM (Dudar et al., 2017; Hall & Hord, 2019; Roach, Kratochwill, & Frank, 2009). The CBAM provides a structure to assess both the level of understanding and the stages of concern stakeholders have regarding a proposed change. As consultant, I could complete the Stages of Concern and Levels of Understanding portions of the CBAM assessment by interviewing members of the CLT and sharing the resultant information with the whole team. Not only would that help us understand where each individual on the CLT is with regard to this proposed change, it would also become an important tool to assess and inform our progress through the change process. In this stage, the CBAM will be used to gather a baseline, inform initial
decisions, and guide planned actions moving into the second stage of change, mobilization-investigation.

**The mobilize – investigate [i2] stage of change.** The second step of the CPM model, mobilize, is aligned with the SEP’s investigate (i2). That second step uses formal systems and structures to communicate the change vision and engage employees in investigating change ideas that will realize the change vision (Cawsey et al., 2016). One important task in this step is to make sense of this change using NCSD systems and structures (Cawsey et al., 2016). By making the connection between the SEP change process and the CPM change process, the CLT will have a robust organizational change theory and process to inform and enhance their work through the SEP. Ideally, using the CPM as a parallel structure to the SEP will underscore the institutionalization gap in the SEP and the important role measurement plays in closing that gap.

Cawsey et al. (2016) stated that measures supportive of the implementation and institutionalization of innovations focus on key factors, lead to challenging but achievable goals, are perceived as fair and accurate, ensure accurate data and are matched to the context. The last criterion is significant because it suggests that NCSD choose more approximate measures due to the high complexity, ambiguity, and long timeframe of the SEP change context (Botha, 2010; Cawsey et al., 2016). Several models of measurement approaches designed for effective approximation in the complexity of schools are discussed in detail by Botha (2010), while Leeward Mountain School [LMS] (2019) is an example of a very simple yet effective measurement tool for the high complexity found in schools (see Appendix H). Those models can be studied during this stage, and the CLT
and I could replicate the Leeward Mountain School measurement tool for NCSD as one measure to innovate and employ in the NCSD context.

Another essential step in the mobilize-investigate change stage is the assessment of power and culture dynamics that will affect this change process. Two important idea structures are embedded in NCSD organizational practice to build change capacity through such assessments: adaptability structures (Garmston & Wellman, 2016; Dolcemascolo & McKanders, 2017) and design thinking structures (Brown, 2009). Each of the two Curriculum Coordinators is an expert in, and champion and capacity-builder of, one of those structures. To engage in the change process regarding this PoP, diagnostic tools from those two structures could be used. For example, a Paired Weighting process (Dolcemascolo & McKanders, 2017, pp. 75-76) could be used to determine which NCSD power dynamic might have the greatest influence on this proposed change. At the same time, to augment the use of adaptability tools such as the Paired Weighting process, tools from Riel and Martin (2017) could also be considered. Riel and Martin (2017) would be a good fit because their approach is closely connected to design thinking paradigms, and is built on reflective-practice paradigms established in the seminal thinking of Chris Argyris and Donald Schön (Argyris, 1976; Riel & Martin, 2017; Senge et al., 1999; Sheppard et al., 2009). For example, the Pro/Pro Chart (Riel & Martin, 2017, pp. 94-105) could be used to investigate measurement strategies by comparing the different measurement models presented by Botha (2010) because “[u]ltimately, integrative thinking is about leveraging the tension between models to create something new” (Riel & Martin, 2017, p. 101). Further, while contemplating the vision for the political framework (Bolman & Deal, 2017), assessing positional, network,
knowledge, and personality power using the “Types of Individual Power” framework (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 187) will allow the CLT to make more effective decisions because their “mental maps and frameworks” (Cawsey et al., 2016, p.267) will have shifted through such reflection.

Organization-wide communication of the need for change is another vital part of the mobilization-investigate phase of the change process. There is an excellent opportunity here for the CLT to model the way (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) to institutionalization of the SEP-inspired innovations emerging across NCSD. Being explicit with the entire NCSD organization with this change process as the CLT’s own action-research project within the SEP has the potential to increase the success of other action-research innovations because the success of changes increases attitudes and openness to change (Devos et al., 2007). The consistent use of a visual like the one provided in Figure 7 will help communicate how the SEP has inspired this OIP alongside other action-research innovations budding across NCSD. Certainly, design-thinking tools and strategies will be essential in the third step of this change process, accelerate – innovate.

The accelerate – innovate [i3] stage of change. The third step of the CPM model, accelerate, aligns with the SEP’s innovate stage. In this step, members of the CLT are engaged and empowered to apply appropriate innovation tools and techniques to accelerate progress toward a measurement framework specific to the NCSD context. Along the way, small wins are celebrated.

There is broad and deep growth in innovation capacity already underway at NCSD through design-thinking learning and application; the CLT knows the importance
of capacity building for change success (Harris, 2011). In this specific change process, the key to the development of an effective, context-specific measurement system is “iterative interaction with the decision-maker” (Brown & Martin, 2015); in other words, it is the CLT itself that must design their own measurement system through application of their innovation and design skills, strategies and processes. Riel and Martin (2017) suggested three mutually inclusive approaches that are particularly helpful in the process of designing a concrete idea like a measurement system from abstract ideas; those three approaches are storytelling, visualizing and physical modeling. For example, the Superintendent brilliantly used storytelling in the visioning stage of the SEP by asking all members of the STLT and DTLT to write a story that would be written in a future NCSD publication celebrating the success of their imagined innovation. In the same way, storytelling in this stage could be used to “craft a short narrative that would explain the core of [a measurement idea] and the way it works to create value for users” (Riel & Martin, 2017, p. 180). As consultant, I could lead the CLT through this process and support their synthesis of the measurement ideas generated from the exercise.

My role at this step of the change process will be to inject knowledge regarding the measurement of schools and school systems, including knowledge of processes that support the development of measurement systems (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016) and examples of measurement strategies (BCS, 2019; National Company, 2012; National Company, 2014). As the CLT accelerates-innovates their NCSD-specific measurement system, I can inform their work as a critical friend whose knowledge of measurement frameworks and “external perspective [provides] a valuable contribution to the processes of planning, data collection, analysis, feedback and subsequent action planning”
(Swaffield, 2004, p. 276) that is essential in this stage. That critical friend work could look like individual or team conferences with me either in person or online. The external support that I provide can extend into the institutionalize-institutionalize stage of this change process.

**The institutionalize – institutionalize [i4] stage of change.** Finally, the fourth step of the CPM, institutionalize, uses multiple measures to assess progress toward the change goal and, with those assessments to inform decisions, make modifications that support the institutionalization of innovations (Cawsey et al., 2016). There is currently no stage in the SEP that aligns with the fourth stage of the CPM; the purpose of this change is to develop a comprehensive system of measures that will become a significant part of an institutionalization stage in the SEP: i4.

The work of Markiewicz and Patrick (2016) will be an important guide for this change and will be used extensively to institutionalize the measurements that are innovated through this process. For example, Appendices F and G provide templates to create a timeline, or work plan, for the implementation and institutionalization of any change. While the “timelines are illustrative only and will be dependent on the size and scale of the program” (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016, p. 241), those templates can guide the purposeful work of the CLT in the final stage of this change process.

It will be important in this phase to again leverage the formidable knowledge, skills, and abilities of the CLT. One measurement method that has been used to tremendous success for institutionalization of change across NCSD is the Planning and Post-Action Critique method. Synonymous with a Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle, the Planning and Post-Action Critique method was used to institutionalize and continuously improve
NCSD’s Emergency Response Program. A modified version of the Planning and Post-Action Critique method that could be used by the CLT to formatively and summatively assess the institutionalization of the change proposed in this OIP is shown in Appendix I and explained below. First, however, to reinforce the value of the Planning and Post-Action Critique method, it is important to understand the PDSA process summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

A Synthesis of PDSA Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Statement</th>
<th>Stage Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan for the change</td>
<td>Analyze current data and develop a change strategy that delineates specific actions to achieve well-defined objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the change</td>
<td>Perform the planned actions in a small, controlled setting, and gather data as the action unfolds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Study the effect of the change</td>
<td>Analyze results using a variety of data sources to compare actual outcomes with intended outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Act on the change data</td>
<td>Standardize and scale-up new practices and refine the change to re-enter the PDSA cycle or abandon the change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The PDSA process of continuous improvement follows four distinct stages. According to LeMahieu et al. (2017c), the PDSA cycle is “a rigorous, scientific process
designed to enhance learning at all levels of an organization” (p. 77). Originally created in a business context in 1939, the model was refined and championed by W. Edwards Deming as the PDSA, and it has been applied to much success in wider business contexts through the second half of the twentieth century to the present (Evans et al., 2012; LeMahieu et al., 2017c). In recent years, the PDSA model has also been successfully applied in healthcare and education settings (Buccino, 2011; Donnelly & Kirk, 2015; Evans et al., 2012; LeMahieu et al., 2017c). For example, the PDSA process is used by teams in healthcare systems to “[make] healthcare safer, more efficient, patient-centred, timely, effective and equitable” (Donnelly & Kirk, 2015).

While Evans et al. (2012) stated generally that educational leaders successfully applied the PDSA process “for the benefit of students” (p. 161), LeMahieu et al. (2017c) described specifically how the Austin Independent School District in Texas successfully applied an iterative PDSA cycle to continuously improve a process for building teachers’ instructional capacity. In another education-specific instance, Buccino (2011) found that the PDSA process, as part of a larger Operational Excellence organizational-improvement approach, led to positive outcomes in K-12 education for over ten years (and counting) in a New York State school district. The PDSA model has been used to excellent effect in NCSD through the Planning and Post-Action Critique (see Appendix I) method to support the institutionalization of a robust Emergency Response Program, and it most certainly could be used to support the institutionalization of a robust monitoring and evaluation framework.
Conclusion

To conclude, the use of a CPM-SEP change process that includes a fourth stage, institutionalize, will effectively address the current lack of a comprehensive range of measures used to guide NCSD’s continuous improvement. The i3 model currently used by NCSD would become the i4 model: *Inspire, Investigate, Innovate, Institutionalize*. As well as accelerating strategic growth, a comprehensive range of measures in an institutionalize stage will ensure organizational improvement goals championed by traditional measures like the MAP do not eclipse the broad needs of all students striving for their diverse maximum potentials (Khalifa et al., 2016). Further, monitoring and evaluating the change process proposed above will increase the likelihood that it is a successful change process.

Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation

In this section, change process monitoring and evaluation is defined as it pertains to this OIP. The monitoring and evaluation plan for this OIP’s change process is then described. Finally, this section explains the idea of cascading, the systemic connection between this monitoring and evaluation plan, the innovated measurement framework proposed as the solution for this OIP’s PoP, and the NCOE measurement framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation Defined

With an appreciative leadership approach, it is important to connect the idea of monitoring and evaluation to the strengths of educators in general and of the CLT in particular. The concept of monitoring and evaluation is easy for educators like the CLT to understand given their assessment expertise, where assessment is the use of qualitative and quantitative data to inform and refine decisions. The language used by educators for
monitoring and evaluation is formative and summative assessment (Bennet, 2014; Calkins & Ehrenworth, 2016; Davies, Herbst, & Reynolds, 2012; Dixson & Worrell, 2016; Frey, Fisher & Hattie, 2018), and those are the terms that will be used for this OIP. By monitoring, I mean formative assessment; by evaluation, I mean summative assessment.

**Formative assessment is monitoring.** Formative assessment is assessment *for* learning (Bennet, 2014; Calkins & Ehrenworth, 2016; Davies et al., 2012; Dixson & Worrell, 2016). Formative assessments are completed before and during instruction with the purpose of improvement (Davies et al., 2012; Dixson & Worrell, 2016). In the classroom, formative assessments are ongoing; teachers use a range of data on a daily basis to provide feedback and inform instructional decisions (Calkins & Ehrenworth, 2016; Davies et al., 2012). For example, English teachers in NCSD use a continuum to provide progressive descriptors of different writing criteria (Calkins, 2014). Student writing is then compared to the continuum, and specific feedback and targeted instruction is given to students to help them progress along the continuum (Calkins, 2014; Calkins & Ehrenworth, 2016). Thus, targeting instruction based on objectives described in the writing continuum and informed by formative assessment becomes a recurrent instructional cycle for continuous student learning equivalent to the PDSA model outlined above.

In an identical way to formative assessment for student learning, the main purpose of monitoring in change management is organizational learning (Markiewicz, 2014; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). Learning is generated by using assessment data to inform decisions on program direction, to improve design of an innovation during
implementation, and to disseminate best-practice knowledge across an organization (Markiewicz, 2014; Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016; Senge et al., 1999). As with student-learning formative assessment, tools like the Stages of Concern Continuum outlined below can be used to inform organizational learning through the change process (Dudar et al., 2017; Roach et al., 2009). With specific descriptors of a change described through continuums, tables or checklists, change managers can then use a wide range of measures to gather data, reflect on the status of the change initiative, and make informed decisions to move the change along (Botha, 2010; Cawsey et al., 2016; Dudar et al., 2017).

**Summative assessment is evaluation.** Summative assessment, on the other hand, is assessment of learning (Bennet, 2014; Davies et al., 2012; Dixson & Worrell, 2016). Summative assessments are cumulative and take place after instruction with the purpose of evaluation and reporting (Bennet, 2014; Davies et al., 2012; Dixson & Worrell, 2016). Moreover, the quality of student learning is often compared to a known standard (Dixson & Worrell, 2016). For example, the student-writing continuums used by English teachers in NCSD include standard, or grade-level indicators, along the continuum (Calkins, 2014; Calkins & Ehrenworth, 2016). Continuum descriptors are used formatively over a period of instruction to inform decisions and next steps in the learning process. Then, at the end of an instructional cycle, data gathered is used summatively to determine the standard or level achieved at that point in time for evaluation and reporting of student progress.

In an identical way, the main purpose of summative assessment in change management is evaluation, where assessment data is used to make judgements about the value and effectiveness of an innovation, to report the implementation progress of an innovation, and to account for the results of a change to key stakeholders (Markiewicz,
The same continuum used to monitor, or formatively assess, a change can be used to evaluate, or summatively assess, a change (Calkins, 2014); such a concept is known as integrative complementarity (Markiewicz and Patrick, 2016).

Formative and summative assessment are foundation concepts for NCSD educators. The use of continuums as formative and summative assessments are also established effective practices by NCSD educators. By celebrating and the strengths of those assessment understandings and connecting them to monitoring and evaluation theory through an appreciative leadership approach, the use of monitoring and evaluating frameworks will easily be understood by members of the CLT.

**Monitoring and Evaluation of this Change**

There is “no shortage of possible measurement indicators” to monitor and evaluate change (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 344). At the same time, it is important to “harvest just enough information in the least obtrusive means possible” (Bryk, 2015, p. 475), keep measures as simple as possible (Cawsey et al., 2016), and use more general measures as the complexity of the measurement increases (Cawsey et al., 2016). This section will describe several measures that could be used to monitor and evaluate the proposed change.

**Stages of concern continuum.** A stages-of-concern continuum (see Appendix J) describes the progression of an individual’s perceptions and feelings as they move through a change process (Dudar et al., 2017); the purpose is to “[facilitate] the identification and design of specific consultation and support strategies to address the needs of implementers at different stages of concern” (Roach et al, 2009, p. 305). As
Kang (2015) noted, human factors must be addressed in the change process. To inform the work we do together, an initial step in this change initiative is to establish a baseline of the CLT’s stages of concern regarding monitoring and evaluation frameworks (Dudar et al., 2017; Hall & Hord, 2019; Roach et al., 2009). Once the baseline is determined, specific decisions can be made regarding how to proceed with monitoring-and-evaluation-framework knowledge-building with the CLT.

To explicitly describe the stages of concern the CLT would need to move through to achieve the intended outcome of this OIP, the stages-of-concern continuum in Appendix J is detailed specifically for the change proposed. The use of that tool would help me in my role as consultant and the CLT understand each member of the CLT’s development of understanding and application of a monitoring and evaluation framework. That knowledge would in turn support decisions and actions required to bolster that understanding and application.

**Levels of use continuum.** A levels-of-use continuum (see Appendix K) focuses on the behaviours and actions of individuals as they implement a change (Roach et al., 2009). The purpose of this continuum is “to inform leaders and facilitators of the supports, resources, information, and assistance that are needed for individuals to move them to the next level of use” (Dudar et al., 2017, p. 57). The value of this continuum is that it provides a means to describe the whole range of a change process, rather than a simple, binary frame that compares use-of-innovation to non-use-of-innovation. In essence, a levels of use continuum describes how much a given innovation is being used and provides important distinctions between levels. That distinction provides greater clarity for decision-makers responsible for change management (Roach et al. 2009).
To explicitly describe the levels of use the CLT needs to move through to achieve the intended outcome of this OIP, the levels-of-use continuum in Appendix K is detailed specifically for the change proposed. The CLT can use this continuum to track its growing understanding and use of a monitoring and evaluation framework and inform decisions required to propel itself to the next level of use. Like the Stages of Concern continuum, the use of that tool would support the identification and acquisition of resources and assistance required by the CLT to move forward at each stage in their investigation, innovation and institutionalization of different measurement tools designed to inform NCSD strategic growth.

**Change path model criteria.** Just as it was used as a gap analysis tool in Chapter One, the CPM (Cawsey et al., 2016) itself can be used as an important change process measure to monitor and evaluate this change (see Appendix B). By monitoring their achievement of those descriptors for this change, the CLT can gauge its progress through the change process and take action to bolster any criterion that is identified as needing more attention.

**General and specific action plans.** An action plan is a charted timeline, or schedule, that shows who will do what during the implementation of a change (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). While flexibility is required to adjust the timeline to accommodate unforeseen obstacles or delays, a schedule provides concrete change targets as milestones that can be measured. An action plan can be as general or specific as the CLT decides. Both a general and more specific work plan template based on the ideas of Markiewicz and Patrick (2016) and aligned with the CPM (Cawsey et al., 2016) are provided in Appendix L and Appendix M, respectively. Either or both could be used by
the CLT to monitor and evaluate their progress through this change. Moreover, the complexity of the work plan can be increased or decreased according to the complexity of the context and the desires of the users. To demonstrate a possible action plan for the change proposed in this OIP, Appendix N is a completed version of the General Action Plan template that delineates which change drivers might take which actions across the change process.

**Planning and post-action critique.** As noted above, NCSD has successfully institutionalized a major change to their Emergency Response Program through the purposeful use of a PDSA-like process known as the Planning and Post-Action Critique (see Appendix I). The application of that method as a formative assessment tool within the monitoring and evaluation framework for this proposed change can enhance the organizational learning required to successfully institutionalize this change.

**Communications tracker.** Effective communication is imperative for successful change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Bryk, 2015; Cawsey et al., 2016; Gilley et al., 2009; Heide et al., 2018; Kang, 2015; Klein, 1996). In fact, Gilley et al. (2009) determined that communication is the primary skill of leadership for change. A measurement tool like the Communications Tracker, therefore, is essential for change process monitoring and evaluation because the tool can be used formatively to reflect on communications applied and make purposeful decisions regarding the further application of communication principles required to best propel the change forward.

To enhance formative assessment, or monitoring of the change, Klein’s (1996) seven “empirically founded communications principles” (p. 34) have been mapped onto the Communications Tracker (see Appendix F). Strategically applying the seven
principles summarized in Table 10 across the change process will improve the outcome of this OIP.

Table 10

*A Summary of Klein’s (1996) Seven Principles for Strategic Communication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of Message</td>
<td>- Repeat the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repeat the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repeat the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy of Medium</td>
<td>- Repeat the message using a variety of mediums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repeat the message using a variety of means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Speak, listen, and do the message.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>- Most effective means to communicate the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourages involvement in the process (do the message).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity to capitalize on different perspectives, clarify and explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Authority</td>
<td>- Hierarchical authority gives credibility to the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gives message practical and symbolic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not interfere with positive effect of involvement in the process.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Supervision</td>
<td>- Hierarchical authority is linked through supervisory levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supervisors expected to be well-informed and accurate message transmitters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased face-to-face communication with direct supervisors increases message effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Leaders</td>
<td>- Individuals believed to be knowledgeable in the change topic significantly influence the attitudes and opinions of their colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Opinion leader messages are a highly effective means of communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally Relevant</td>
<td>- Messages that directly affect a person’s role or job are heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Messages regarding others (the organization, other roles) are easily forgotten.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*a*Communication as a process.

**Cascading: Connecting this Proposed Change to the SEP and NCOE**

Cascading is when system-level monitoring and evaluation frameworks share related measures with sub-level monitoring and evaluation frameworks; in such instances, the relationship between monitoring and evaluation frameworks is both vertical and horizontal in an organization (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). In the NCSD context,
the proposed solution to the PoP identified in this OIP is that NCSD innovate its own measurement framework to assess and inform NCSD strategic growth through the SEP, and that the framework innovated is designed with the NCOE framework in mind. The idea of cascading is fundamental to that proposed solution because the same monitoring and evaluation framework innovated as a solution to this OIP can be applied to all action-research innovations blossoming across NCSD at the same time as it connects to monitoring and evaluation processes within National Company’s Operational Excellence framework. Figure 8 illustrates the horizontal and vertical connections between the monitoring and evaluation framework proposed for the NCSD SEP through this OIP, other SEP-inspired innovations and the NCOE framework.

Figure 8. Cascading monitoring and evaluation frameworks in the NCSD context.

While dialogue between the different levels is essential to ensure the measures used and data gathered remains relevant and useful in each context at each level (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016), the measurements innovated for the SEP through this OIP
can be applied to other SEP-inspired action-research innovations evolving across NCSD. At the same time, those innovated measures can be aligned with the National Company’s Operational Excellence measurement framework.

Connections to National Company OE Framework

This OIP proposes that NCSD innovate a broader range of measurements to assess and inform SEP-inspired strategic growth and that the measures innovated are designed with the NCOE in mind. There are many potential connections between the creation of a NCSD-specific measurement system and the NCOE framework. To provide examples of the potential connections, the following sub-sections summarize the objective of specific NCOE elements, the specific measures required for each element, and how proposed measurement strategies described for this OIPs measurement and evaluation framework could be used to inform specific NCOE element objectives and measurement requirements.

NCOE element 1 - leadership and accountability. The objective of this NCOE element is leaders who drive and sustain organizational improvement and hold themselves and their organization accountable for constant growth. Processes and measures required in this element focus on clarity of vision and mission, the development of strategies to realize vision, continuous review and improvement, effective communication, and resource management for strategic growth (National Company, 2014).

Measurement tools described above such as the CPM Criteria, Communication Tracker, Stages of Concern Continuum, and Levels of Use Continuum could be used to inform this element when requested by any National Company department.
**NCOE element 3 - human resources.** The objective of this NCOE element is the regular assessment, development and improvement of employee capacities to meet their full potential and the vision of the organization. Processes and measures required in this element focus on employee selection, development, engagement and performance (National Company, 2014).

Currently, the NCSD’s Employee Engagement and Parent Satisfaction survey inform this element for the National Company’s HR department. Measurement tools described above such as the Stages of Concern Continuum and Levels of Use Continuum could be also be used to inform this element when requested by any National Company department.

**NCOE element 8 - policies and strategies.** The objective of this NCOE element is the alignment of policies and strategies with the organization’s vision, mission and strategic goals. Processes and measures required for this element focus on continuous review, revision and communication of strategic growth plans (National Company, 2014).

Measurement tools described above such as Planning and Post-Action Critique Form, the CPM Criteria and Communication Tracker could all be used to inform this element when requested by any National Company department.

**NCOE element 12 - innovation, learning, & continuous improvement.** The objective of this NCOE element is the promotion of innovation, learning and continuous improvement to stay competitive in a constantly changing environment. Process and measures required for this element focus on the generation, development and
implementation of innovative ideas, benchmarking to identify and close gaps, and performance monitoring (National Company, 2014).

Measurement tools described above such as the CPM Criteria, Stages of Concern Continuum, Levels of Use Continuum and the monitoring and evaluation framework itself could be used to inform this element when requested by any National Company department.

Those four examples demonstrate how the solution proposed for this PoP, a NCSD-specific measurement and evaluation framework innovated with NCOE in mind, could support any potential request for applicable data from any National Company department. Further, if the National Company were to impose NCOE on NCSD, the measures in the NCSD monitoring and evaluation framework would simply become the measures used within the NCOE monitoring and evaluation framework. Further, while not stated in the summaries above, it is important to note that communication of some form is a required process and measure for all thirteen NCOE elements (see Appendix G) which reinforces the importance of communication in change management.

Conclusion

To conclude, it is critical to understand that guiding the CLT through this change with the use of the monitoring and evaluation tools just described is experiential learning that will inform the creation of the monitoring and evaluation framework that is the change-goal for this OIP. That is, this monitoring and evaluation plan is meant to increase the knowledge of the CLT at the same time as it guides the innovation of a monitoring and evaluation plan by the CLT for the SEP. When system-level monitoring and evaluation frameworks share measurement strategies in that way, it is known as
cascading (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016), an idea that clarifies the connections between: 1) the monitoring and evaluation framework for this OIP; 2) the monitoring and evaluation framework for the SEP that the CLT will innovate through this OIP; and, 3) Operational Excellence, the monitoring and evaluation framework of the National Company.

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

Any plan to communicate the need for change and the change process must be based in academic literature regarding change communication. In this section, after a thematic review of communication in change-management literature, purposeful plans to communicate both the need for change and the change process are delineated.

**Communication in Change Management**

There are several themes across change management literature regarding communication that guide my thinking regarding a communication plan for this OIP. Communication is important, complex, and required across the change process. Most importantly, communication must be ethical.

**Effective communication is ethical.** Empathy is a vital part of effective communication (Kang, 2015); good communication, therefore, is a priority for leaders who care about the people in their organization. Effective communication decreases harm to individuals as it increases organizational outcomes (Bryk, 2015) because effective communication decreases anxiety and the resistance to change associated with it (Cawsey et al., 2016; Klein, 1996). Gilley et al. (2018) espoused the idea of information justice, where the truth is always communicated, even when well-intentioned plans go wrong. They also argued that individuals must be treated with dignity through a fair change
process that includes realistic conversations about the negative aspects of a change initiative. These ideas merge with the ideas of ethical leadership expressed in Chapter 2, where, for example, open dialogue as a form of communication is recognized as essential to the mitigation of harm in instances of action research such as is underway across NCSD through the SEP (Mills & Gay, 2016). Communication is important for other reasons as well.

Communication is important. In a behavioural study that examined leadership from a skills-based perspective, it was found that motivation and communication, respectively, resulted in “the greatest positive correlation with change effectiveness” (Gilley et al., 2009, p. 85). It was further recognized that communication is the foundation of motivation, thereby making communication the primary skill for leadership-for-change effectiveness (Gilley et al., 2009). The importance of communication during change is supported by other change leadership thinkers (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Bryk, 2015; Cawsey et al., 2016; Heide et al., 2018; Kang, 2015; Klein, 1996). For example, Cawsey et al. (2016) stated that change is an essential skill for change leaders because it mobilizes support, sustains enthusiasm and commitment, and minimizes rumours and their negative impact. Further, communication is important because it positively influences all stages of the change process as it coordinates the change process (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Cawsey et al., 2016; Heide et al., 2018; Klein, 1996).

Communication is required across the change process. Strategic communication “contributes to the fulfillment of overall mission and goals” (Heide et al., 2018); it creates change readiness and motivates individuals to adopt and institutionalize
innovations (Armenakis & Harris, 2002). Communication is essential across all change stages (Cawsey et al., 2016), and there are different communication priorities in the different stages (Cawsey et al., 2016; Klein, 1996). The communication tracker concisely captures some of those important ideas. While there are varied complexities in communication across the change process, the Speak-Listen-Do Communication Triangle presented in Figure 9 is a simple way to understand the complexities of change-related communication.

![The Speak-Listen-Do Communication Triangle](image)

*Figure 9. The Speak-Do-Listen Communication Triangle.*

**The speak-listen-do communication triangle.** Change communication is tremendously complex (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Bryk, 2015; Cawsey et al., 2016; Gilley et al., 2009; Heide et al., 2018; Kang, 2015; Klein, 1996), yet there are simplicities that can be determined. The Speak-Listen-Do Communication Triangle is a simple synthesis of the complexities of change communication.

A superficial reading of change management literature may give the impression that change communication is a one-way prospect, something that is done by the leader to individuals in the organization for change realization. For example, Armenakis and
Harris (2002) outlined five domains and three strategies for leaders to communicate change, while Klein (1996) presented a model of seven key principles for organizational communication. The tone of both articles suggested communication is something leaders push out to others to increase change effectiveness, yet a deeper reading of both articles underscored the importance of communication as an input as well. Klein (1996), for instance, emphasized that communication includes seeking feedback from stakeholders to rectify change problems and adjust change actions. In a similar way, Armenakis and Harris (2002) stressed the active participation of stakeholders in the change process who, through their input, developed understanding of the need for the change, shaped the change, and recognized the benefits of the change for themselves.

Other change management thinkers explicitly acknowledged the need for two-way communication (Cawsey et al. 2016; Gilley et al., 2018). Gilley et al. (2018), for example, claimed that two key purposes of communication are to deliver appropriate messages and to solicit feedback by addressing employee concerns and questions. Similarly, Cawsey et al. (2016) stated that two-way communication is essential during the change process, and that listening should occur more than speaking:

- There can never be too much top-level communication and support, but unfortunately, there is often far too little listening. A rule of thumb for [leaders] is to talk up a change initiative at least three times more than you think is needed and listen at least four times as much as you think you should. (p. 102)

While change literature regarding communication identified the importance of output and input, or *speaking* and *listening*, communication as *doing* is also emphasized (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Cawsey et al., 2016).
The familiar adage ‘actions speak more than words’ is apropos to communication considerations in change management. Armenakis and Harris (2002) stated that leader support for change through resource commitment is one of the five crucial domains of a change message. For example, time is a critical resource for this OIP; the CLT action of committing time to this change initiative will signal its importance across the organization. Likewise, Cawsey et al. (2016), emphasized that what a leader does through systems and processes communicate just as much as what a leader says. A commitment to the creation of a monitoring and evaluation system to support the institutionalization of change underway through the SEP protocol will communicate the CLT's commitment to the longevity, or institutionalization, of the action-research-based innovations being developed across NCSD.

The Speak-Listen-Do Communication Triangle is a simple way to illustrate the complex aspects of change communication. That simple framework can be used to establish purposeful plans to communicate both the need for change and the change process.

**Communication Plan to Build Awareness of the Need for this OIP**

A change message can build awareness of the need for change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002), and the use of a diverse set of communication techniques increases the effectiveness of a change message (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Gilley et al., 2009; Klein, 1996). Within the Speak-Listen-Do structure, several strategies can be applied to build awareness of the need for this OIP.

**Speak.** This OIP is the primary means of speaking the need for change to the CLT. Given my knowledge and experience with measurement for organizational
improvement, this OIP represents my voice as an opinion leader and therefore an “effective [changer] of attitudes and opinions” (Klein, 1996, p. 34). In addition to speaking through this written document, conversations with the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction regarding the need for this change is important because face-to-face conversations are the most effective means of building awareness of the need for change (Klein, 1996). As well as speaking his own thinking to build awareness of the need for this change in his change-driver role as change initiator, the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction is a communication conduit of my consultant voice to the CLT generally and the Superintendent specifically.

**Listen.** At the same time that my voice is speaking out to build awareness of this change, my ears are wide open to input from the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction and other members of the CLT. As we engage in dialogue regarding this change, the Associate Superintendent and I are building a shared vision of the potential change. Anticipated inquiries that this document predicts, and I am ready to expound upon when asked, include why and how questions: “Why is measurement important?”; “How might this change help us move closer to our vision?”; “How might we innovate a measurement system?”; and, “How can we leverage systems and processes already in place to support this change?”.

As I listen to CLT members’ inputs in the form of questions and engage their ideas and concerns through dialogue, my previous actions as a NCSD change leader communicate my credibility.

**Do.** My actions in my former NCSD roles as Teacher, Instructional Coach, and Safety and Facilities Coordinator communicate my capacity as a change leader and
measurement framework specialist and give credibility to the need for change. My latest role, in which I spent three years as Safety and Facilities Coordinator innovating and implementing a monitoring and evaluation system for safety and facilities across NCSD, legitimizes my expertise as a measurement-for-organizational-improvement consultant. Now applying those measurement understandings and practices to education outcomes, my previous actions reinforce the speak and listen strategies to emphasize the need for change.

The Speak-Listen-Do Communication Triangle is a simple way to illustrate the complex aspects of change communication required to build awareness of the need for the change outlined in this OIP. That simple structure can also be used to establish a purposeful communication plan to manage the change process for this OIP.

**Communication Plan to Manage the Change Process for this OIP**

The CLT is the primary audience for communication regarding this OIP because that team will be responsible for the management of this change process. Since this change process is potentially one of many action-research projects under the SEP umbrella, the secondary audience for communication of this change process are the members of the STLT and the DTLT because of their direct involvement in the SEP. The broader audience for the communication of this change process includes NCSD employees, parents and students and the National Company. It is important to remember that a primary purpose of measurement is accountability to those broader stakeholders; as described in Chapter One, by taking control of accountability through a self-innovated measurement framework, the CLT will have a wide range of measurement tools to
confidently communicate strategic growth toward the vision of student maximum potential to all audiences through speaking, listening and doing.

With those audiences in mind, the path of change, including milestones along that path, will be communicated through the measurement tools described in the monitoring and evaluation framework for this change. The Speak-Listen-Do structure is used to explain which tools will be used for which audience.

**Speak.** The CPM Criteria can be used explicitly to speak the envisioned process for the proposed change and the current place on that path to all audiences for the duration of the change process. The *Inspire, Investigate, Innovate, Institutionalize* (i4) language of the revised SEP is made concrete by the fourteen descriptors stated in the CPM Criteria. Such a tangible description of the change process communicates clearly to all audiences. As well as a reflection tool to inform decision-making and guide action-taking, the CPM Criteria can be used as a milestone marker to tell all audiences the status of the change and the reason to celebrate achievements. Importantly, the CPM Criteria as a measurement tool meets the objectives of NCOE Element 1 and Element 12. For example, the measures required for Element 12 focus on the generation, development and implementation of innovative ideas, benchmarking to identify and close those gaps, and performance monitoring (National Company, 2014). The alignment between those measurement requirements and the CPM Criteria are obvious; the CPM Criteria could be used to tell any National Company department NCSD’s status regarding NCOE Element 12.

Like the CPM Criteria, the General Action Plan Template and Specific Action Plan Template can communicate out to all audiences. Both measures will be used by
members of the CLT and STLT to communicate out the expectations for who will do what during each stage of the change. It is important for those in positions of hierarchical authority to speak with such communication tools because “communiques from those in authority carry both practical and symbolic weight” (Klein, 1996, p. 35). Further, because the CLT, STLT and DTLT includes a relatively small number of people, face-to-face communication of the work plans is possible and will be most effective (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Klein, 1996).

**Listen.** While important speaking tools, the General and Specific Action Plans and Planning and Post-Action Critiques are also listening tools. Specific roles may have ultimate responsibility for completing the documents, but the development of the plans is a collective affair where two-way communication espoused for strategic communication is required (Cawsey et al., 2016; Gilley et al., 2018). For NCSD employees, capacity in the listening skills necessary for effective two-way communication is developed through adaptive schools training. For example, three of the seven norms for collaborative work are related to listening: pausing, paraphrasing, and posing question (Dolcemascolo & McKanders, 2017).

Listening occurs in ways other than through face-to-face communication. For instance, Roach et al. (2009) outlined several ways to gather input information for the Stages of Concern Continuum. As well as listening by engaging in face-to-face conversations, recipients of the change can be asked to write “open-ended statements of concern” or complete a comprehensive survey (Roach et al., 2009, p. 306). The Parent Satisfaction Survey and Employee Engagement Survey already in use by NCSD are
examples of such listening. Further, those different ways of listening demonstrate the message redundancy that increases communication effectiveness (Klein, 1996).

Various types of listening and speaking are important communication strategies for the proposed change, but communication as a process will have the greatest effect.

**Do.** CLT collaborative investigation, innovation, and institutionalization of comprehensive measures will be the most effective form of communication for the proposed change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Heide et al., 2018). For instance, Heide et al. (2018) claimed that “an organization is a product of continuous sense making and communication processes” (p. 456) while Armenakis and Harris (2009) stated that “persuasive communication may not be as effective as active participation… because the self-discovery aspect of active participation is such a profound event” (p. 135). To be clear, engaging the CLT in a collaborative journey to innovate a comprehensive system of measures for strategic growth is the most effective form of communication in support of the change proposed in this OIP.

**Chapter 3 Conclusion**

The PoP addressed in this OIP is the lack of a comprehensive range of measures to guide NCSD’s continuous improvement. The change solution proposed is that the CLT innovate its own measurements to assess and inform NCSD strategic growth, and that the measurements innovated are designed with the NCOE measurement framework in mind. Following a revised SEP that includes the addition of a fourth ‘i’ (institutionalize) will enhance the likelihood that the proposed change improves NCSD as an organization. Speaking, listening and collectively doing all four stages of the i4 process will leverage the power of communication along the change path.
NCSD’s CLT are passionate and skilled transformational leaders. Through the SEP, they inspired a vision for student maximum potential and empowered NCSD employees to investigate and innovate changes to achieve that vision. The kindergarten start-up innovation is just one example of the innovations blossoming across NCSD that benefit students. An analysis of the SEP through Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames indicated the CLT’s transformational leadership attends to the symbolic and human resources needs for organizational improvement but does not fully meet the structural and political needs for that strategic growth. Further analysis with other change models reinforced that conclusion; the CPM (Cawsey et al., 2016), the Eight-Stage Accelerate Model (Kotter, 2014) and Appreciative Inquiry models (Cooperrider, 1986; Evans et al., 2012; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008) all underscored the general structural need for a fourth ‘i’ in the SEP model: institutionalize. Further reflection specifically suggested a comprehensive range of measures is required to better inform the SEP and move the innovations blossoming across the district into the full bloom of institutionalization. A revised version of the SEP, i4, is therefore proposed to delineate a change process that addresses the PoP. The change proposed is the innovation of measures specific to the NCSD context and compatible with the overarching NCOE measurement framework.

The most important next step for this OIP is to follow through on the ideas elucidated, either in whole or in part, either within NCSD or beyond it in other contexts. The researcher’s learning through this research process was significant; there is potential for positive pragmatic change represented within the ideas expressed throughout this document. Yet, while potentially effective, the plan to improve NCSD presents a
structural-functionalist approach to change that has limitations (Capper, 2019; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). There are three particular limitations to this study to consider.

First, while Capper (2019) and others (Apple, 2005; Apple, 2015; Peters, 2005) acknowledged the transformational leadership and structural-functionalist approaches of this OIP can benefit students, they also questioned whether student maximum potential can ever be achieved through such a paradigm:

I no longer believe that structural functional and interpretivist epistemologies can be joined with critically oriented epistemologies to view or analyze organizations or to guide leadership practice. These epistemologies are ultimately incommensurable because… these epistemologies all have fundamentally different histories, worldviews, and goals. (Capper, 2019, p. 26)

Where and when do educators make the shift to a more critical form of transformative leadership where structural-functionalism and the organization-first reality it serves is eschewed, and in its place the emancipation of students drives all decisions? Although it is argued that achieving social-justice equity through critical theory in a neo-liberal educational context is a naïve undertaking (Ya’akov, 2006), Capper (2019) argued that, while “nearly all organizational theories reside within the structural functional epistemology” (p. 23), the number and maturity of critically oriented epistemologies such as Disability Studies or Queer Theory is growing, and that social justice goals “could greatly benefit from studies that are grounded in these epistemologies” (p. 51). Moreover, as indicated earlier, collaborative forms of measurement emphasize social constructivism (Dunlap, 2008) and a social-justice approach to the measurement of organizations is possible (Markiewicz & Patrick, 2016). This study can be considered one step further in
such an evolution, and an invitation to others to take a further step toward the application of a more critically oriented approach.

Second, as in all organizations, there are microscopic changes always underway in NCSD that practitioners need to be aware of and nurture by simply keeping students at the centre of all decision-making:

If we focus our attention only on what becomes institutionalized, an approach largely assumed by synoptic accounts of organizational change, we risk missing all the subterranean, microscopic changes that always go on in the bowels of the organization, changes that may never acquire the status of formal organizational systems and routines but are no less important. (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002, p. 580)

Another limitation of this study’s structural-functionalist focus on formal organizational systems and routines, therefore, is the lack of attention to important microscopic changes constantly underway in NCSD and the potential those small changes have for significant change. Such thinking is compatible with chaos and complexity theories as presented by thinkers like Margaret Wheatley (1999) and applied by education practitioners for doctoral research (Middleton, 2011). Approaching the PoP presented in this study through those theoretical lenses would undoubtedly yield further insight to augment the understandings gained through the lens of critical theory.

Finally, a third limitation of this study is the researcher’s position as an agent of change external to NCSD. While external expertise has the potential to contribute to change in organizations (Ball et al., 2011; Swaffield, 2004), one critical risk “concerning the use of consultants.... [is that] managers may feel the hired consultants have little worthwhile to provide [or] they may simply deny the problems under scrutiny even exist”
(Godkin, 2010, p. 199). This OIP relies on NCSD’s formal leaders to acknowledge the PoP presented and apply the change ideas proposed.
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## Appendix A

### Bolman and Deal’s Four Frames Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** A simple assessment tool designed to illustrate gaps in the CLT’s application of the SEP for NCSD strategic growth: 1 = not attended to; 2 = partially attended to; and, 3 = fully attended to. Adapted from the overview of the framework outlined in “Artistry, Choice and Leadership: Reframing Organizations” by L. Bolman and T. Deal, 2017, p. 20.
### Appendix B

Change Path Model Criteria Applied to A Critical Analysis of the NCSD SEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Path Model Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awaken – Inspire (i1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify need for change; confirm problems or opportunities that incite the need for change through collection of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Articulate the gap in performance between the present and the envisioned future state; spread awareness of data and gap throughout the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop a powerful vision for change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disseminate the vision for the change and why it’s needed through multiple communication channels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobilize – Investigate (i2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make sense of the desired change through formal systems and structures and leverage those systems and structures to reach the change vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess power and cultural dynamics at play and put those dynamics to work to build coalitions and support to realize the change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communicate the need for change organization-wide and manage change recipients and stakeholders as they react to and move the change forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leverage change agent personality, knowledge, skills, abilities, related assets (e.g. reputation, relationships) to benefit change vision and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accelerate – Innovate (i3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Continue to systematically reach out to engage and empower others in support, planning and implementation of the change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Help others develop needed new knowledge, skills, abilities, and ways of thinking that will support the change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Use appropriate tools and techniques to build momentum, accelerate and consolidate the progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Celebrate small wins and the achievement of milestones along the difficult path of change; manage the transition to institutionalization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionalize – Institutionalize (i4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Track change periodically through multiple measures to assess what is needed; gauge progress toward goal and make modifications as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Develop and deploy new structures, systems, processes, knowledge, skills and abilities to embed the change and stabilize the transformed organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1 = initial understanding and application; 2 = partial understanding and application; 3 = thorough understanding and application.
Appendix C

A visual representation of NCSD’s Sustaining Excellence Protocol
Organizational Change Capacity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Change Capacity Dimensions and Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. TRUSTWORTHY LEADERSHIP</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do business unit leader(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the core values while encouraging change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently articulate an inspiring vision of the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show courage in their support of change initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate humility while fiercely pursuing the vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. TRUSTING FOLLOWERS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do middle managers in this organizational unit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively link top executives with frontline employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show commitment to the organization’s well-being?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance change initiatives while getting work done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice dissent constructively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. CAPABLE CHAMPIONS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do we have change champion(s) who:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command the respect of the rest of the business unit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess good interpersonal skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are willing and able to challenge the status quo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the will and creativity to bring about change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. INVOLVED MID-MANAGEMENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do we have an organizational culture that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values innovation and change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracts and retains creative people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides resources to experiment with new ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows people to take risks and occasionally fail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **INNOVATIVE CULTURE**
Do frontline employees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open themselves to consider change proposals?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have opportunities to voice their concerns about change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally know how change will help the business unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally view top management as trustworthy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **ACCOUNTABLE CULTURE**
Do change champions recognize the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent systems implications of change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of institutionalizing change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to realign incentives with desired changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of addressing causes rather than symptoms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION**
Do employees throughout the organizational unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience consequences for outcomes of their actions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet deadlines and honor resource commitments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept responsibility for getting work done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have clear roles for who has to do what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **SYSTEMS THINKING**
Does information flow effectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From executives to workers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a timely fashion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across organizational units?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From customers to the organizational unit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

A Timeline of the Sustaining Excellence Protocol Journey
## Appendix F

### Communications Tracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Date</th>
<th>Communication Description</th>
<th>Speak</th>
<th>Listen</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Face to Face</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Op tips</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 2018</td>
<td>Superintendent led creation of the Team MetaPhor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec, 2015</td>
<td>Newsletter update on SEF next steps (email)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan, 2016</td>
<td>Adoption Schools Training for N. U.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 2016</td>
<td>SEF meeting to plan support of SEF activities in schools</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 2017</td>
<td>Newsletter update on SEF next steps (email)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 2019</td>
<td>Parent Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2020</td>
<td>Thesis formally shared with CLT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan, 2021</td>
<td>CN/Chia to introduce and dialogue</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G

#### National Company Operational Excellence Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Focus Areas</th>
<th>Health, Safety and Environment</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Cost and Profitability</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Process Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>External Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policies and Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Information and Document Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Innovation, Learning and Continuous Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Corporate and Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Priority:

We must be a leading-edge place of learning.

### Champion:

Charlise Montoya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY INITIATIVES</th>
<th>KEY ACTIONS</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
<th>EXPECTED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the new BC Curriculum</td>
<td>● Student self-reporting through advisor system for core competencies.</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater student self-awareness and metacognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Career-Life Education/Career-Life Connections</td>
<td>DN (KC)</td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>Create program of delivery for two Career-Life courses, including Grade 12 capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Run Student Learning Institute to focus on classroom observation for improved student learning</td>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>Build on culture of collaboration and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISABC linked action research opportunity involving involving 3-5 BC teachers gathering data on the benefits of experiential education</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Jun 2019</td>
<td>Increase number of peer classroom visits to provide feedback on implementation of ideas. Greater understanding of the value of experiential education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trip Policy and Handbook</td>
<td>Create guidelines for teachers to embed and array out field trips within their courses with appropriate risk management and planning/procedures.</td>
<td>EO/EP</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>Increase awareness and data on the amount of experiential education. Ability to prioritize and streamline opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add more course offerings</td>
<td>Additional courses for 2018-19 include: Advanced Math Topics 12</td>
<td>DN/CQ</td>
<td>Sept 2018</td>
<td>Improve the breadth and depth of our course offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP Research 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Coding 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Business 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP US History 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy, Politics and Economics 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP Microeconomics 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create an integrated learning course for all grade 9 students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

Planning and Post Action Critique

**NCSD PLANNING and POST-ACTION CRITIQUE FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Date: March 28, 2020</th>
<th>Version: 01</th>
<th>NCSD Monitoring and Evaluation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Action Leader:**

**Action Summary:**

**Action Objectives [2 or 3 SMART Goals]:**

1. 

2. 

3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANNED ACTIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Times:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Actions by Who:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ACTION OBSERVATIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Times:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Actions by Who:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POST-ACTION CRITIQUE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSD Employees in Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in Attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned – Done Well:

•

Lessons Learned – Neutral:

•

Lessons Learned – To Improve:

•

# | Actions to Take in Next Steps
--- | ---


MINUTES PREPARED BY: ________________

PRINCIPAL: ________________________
Appendix J

Stages of Concern Continuum Mapped to the CPM/SEP Change Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPM/SEP Change Stage</th>
<th>Awaken - Inspire</th>
<th>Mobilize - Investigate</th>
<th>Accelerate - Innovate</th>
<th>Institutionalize – Institutionalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Category of Concern</td>
<td>Personal Concern re MEF</td>
<td>Task Concern re MEF</td>
<td>Impact Concern re MEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Stage of Concern</td>
<td>0 Awareness</td>
<td>1 Informational</td>
<td>2 Personal</td>
<td>3 Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Concern</td>
<td>Little to no concern about MEFs for the SEP.</td>
<td>A general awareness and interest in learning more about MEFs for the SEP.</td>
<td>Uncertainty about demands of MEFs, individual capacity to meet those demands, and potential conflicts with existing structures and other work-related commitments.</td>
<td>Attention is focused on processes and tasks of creating and using a MEF to inform the SEP; issues of efficiency, organization, management and time demands are primary concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action-research groups within the SEP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix K

Levels of Use Continuum Mapped to the CPM/SEP Change Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPM/SEP Change Stage</th>
<th>Awaken - Inspire</th>
<th>Mobilize - Investigate</th>
<th>Accelerate - Innovate</th>
<th>Institutionalize – Institutionalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Level of Use</strong></td>
<td>Non-use of a MEF</td>
<td>Use of a MEF</td>
<td>Non-use / Unaware</td>
<td>4a Routine Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Level of Use</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-use / Unaware</td>
<td>Non-use / Orientation</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>Mechanical Use</td>
<td>Routine Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CLT has little to no knowledge of MEFs, no involvement with MEFs, and is doing nothing about MEFs.</td>
<td>The CLT has recently acquired or is acquiring knowledge of MEFs.</td>
<td>Most effort is focused on day-to-day use with little time for reflection. CLT primarily engaged in stepwise attempts to manage the MEF, which results in disjointed, superficial use.</td>
<td>CLT use of MEF is stabilized. Few if any changes are made to MEF. Little preparatory or thought is given to improving MEF or its consequences.</td>
<td>CLT modifies MEF to increase its impact and effectiveness. Modifications are based on knowledge of short- and long-term consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in use are made more for CLT needs than system needs.

regardin MEFs, explores new goals for self and system.

| Decision Point | A: CLT takes action to learn more information about MEFs. | B: CLT makes decision to use MEF by establishing a time to implement the MEF. | C: use of and any changes to MEF are dominated by CLT needs. | D1: CLT establishes a routine pattern of use of MEF. | D2: CLT modifies use of MEF to increase effectiveness. | E: CLT modifies use of MEF based on input and collaboration with others. | F: CLT explores alternatives or major modification to MEF in use. |
## Appendix L

General Action Plan Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPM/SEP Change Stage</th>
<th>Awaken - Inspire</th>
<th>Mobilize - Investigate</th>
<th>Accelerate - Innovate</th>
<th>Institutionalize – Institutionalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Winter/Spring 2021</td>
<td>2022-23 School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June - August</td>
<td>Sept-Dec</td>
<td>Jan – June</td>
<td>July - June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021 – 2022 School Year</td>
<td>2023-2024+ School Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July - June</td>
<td>July-June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
- **What (Who)**
## Appendix M

Specific Action Plan Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPM/SEP Change Stage</th>
<th>Awaken - Inspire</th>
<th>Mobilize - Investigate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Appendix N

General Action Plan for the Change Described in this OIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPM/SEP Change Stage</th>
<th>Awaken - Inspire</th>
<th>Mobilize - Investigate</th>
<th>Accelerate - Innovate</th>
<th>Institutionalize – Institutionalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>Winter/Spring 2021</td>
<td>2022-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June - August</td>
<td>Sept-Dec</td>
<td>Jan – June</td>
<td>School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July - June</td>
<td>July - June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021 – 2022 School Year</td>
<td>2023-2024+ School Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July - June</td>
<td>July-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What Actions to Take and Who is Responsible</strong></td>
<td>Hire the consultant to facilitate this OIP (Superintendent)</td>
<td>Prioritize and schedule the time for the CLT to learn about monitoring and evaluation frameworks (Superintendent)</td>
<td>Identify/Innovate potential measurement tools (CLT)</td>
<td>Implement the use of the one measurement tool identified/innovated (CLT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate monitoring and evaluation framework knowledge and</td>
<td>Choose one Measurement Tool to Implement in 2021-2022 (CLT)</td>
<td>Continue to Identify/Innovate further potential</td>
<td>Refine the Implementation of the one measurement tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refine the Implementation of the measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Understanding (Consultant) | Co-plan with the consultant the facilitation of the monitoring and evaluation framework knowledge and understanding (Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | Use the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Continuums to reflect on and facilitate CLT process knowledge and understanding (Consultant/Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | measurement tools (CLT) implemented last year (CLT) | Implement the use of one or more new measurement tools (CLT) | Revise the monitoring and evaluation framework that schedules the use of each different measurement tool (CLT) | Continue to use the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Continuums to facilitate CLT process knowledge and understanding (Consultant/Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | tool(s) implemented last year (CLT) |

Facilitate monitoring and evaluation framework knowledge and understanding (Consultant/Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | Use the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Continuums to reflect on and facilitate CLT process knowledge and understanding (Consultant/Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | measurement tools (CLT) implemented last year (CLT) | Implement the use of one or more new measurement tools (CLT) | Revise the monitoring and evaluation framework that schedules the use of each different measurement tool (CLT) | Continue to use the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Continuums to facilitate CLT process knowledge and understanding (Consultant/Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction) | tool(s) implemented last year (CLT) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>understanding (Consultant)</th>
<th>reflect on and facilitate CLT process (Consultant/CLT)</th>
<th>Continuums to reflect on and facilitate CLT process (CLT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>