Special Issue
Educational Leadership Redesign in Alabama: Deans' Perspectives on Organizational Change

Frances K. Kochan
Auburn University

Principal preparation programs in colleges throughout the country are being initiated and redesigned using diverse models and approaches. Creating change in any organization requires the involvement and support of supervisory personnel in leadership positions (Lincoln, 1989; Welch & Welch, 2007). Thus, although supervisory roles in colleges and universities tend to be less direct than those in K–12 and private enterprise (Gornitzka, 1999), the college deans have a strategic role in program redesign within their colleges (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Kolodny (1998) suggests that the deanship is "the critical administrative point at which meaningful change might be effected" (p. 8). Although this statement may appear to be logically true, there is scant research on the role of the dean in fostering organizational change (Martin, Samels, et al., 1997; Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies, 2001).

I am a dean in a college in Alabama that has recently completed an educational leadership redesign process. This manuscript describes research I conducted to examine the process as perceived by the deans involved. It begins with an overview of the redesign process nationally, followed by a description of the Alabama initiative. The next section presents my perceptions of this effort at my institution. This is followed by a description of the research questions, the data collection and analysis process, and the findings. The manuscript concludes with a discussion of the findings and implications for the future.

The Context of Educational Leadership Redesign

During the last two decades, there has been an increased focus on student achievement in K–12 schools. This focus has led to research on why some schools are able to foster student success, regardless of the context of the school or the socio-economic status of the children it serves, while others are not successful in doing so. Although the classroom teacher is an important factor in student success, research indicates that leadership is also a major element in successful school-related student learning (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007; Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). The role of

leadership appears to be even more significant in schools that face the greatest challenges (Leithwood, et al., 2004).

The realization of the importance of leadership in fostering student success in schools has led to increased attention on how principals are recruited and prepared (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2007; Hess, 2003; McCarthy, 2002; Murphy, 2006; The Wallace Foundation, 2006). It has also led to criticisms about the processes and programs being employed in principal preparation programs (Hess & Kelley 2005; Levine, 2005). These criticisms have resulted in calls for the creation of alternative programs and methods to certify school principals (Adams & Copland, 2005; Hess & Kelley, 2005; Herrington & Willis, 2005; LeTendre & Roberts, 2005) and for the extensive redesign of college and university principal preparation programs (Bottoms & O'Neil, 2001; Murphy, 1992; Southern Regional Education Association [SREB], 2004, 2007).

States and universities throughout the country are engaging in redesigning their principal preparation programs to address these concerns and criticisms (Barbour, 2005; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2007; LeTende & Roberts, 2005). While many redesign efforts are being undertaken, there is still inconsistency in program quality across the states, and there is not much research about program development or implementation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Sanders & Simpson, 2005). Darling-Hammond and her associates (2007) studied programs in eight states (California, Connecticut, Delaware,

Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, New York, and North Carolina) and identified "seven policy levers" used to facilitate program redesign and improvement (p. 119). They were: providing a vision and standards for school leadership, providing accreditation or program review, implementing an assessment program, creating a continuum of training, developing strategies for recruitment and training, and building infrastructures for ongoing professional development.

The Southern Regional Education Board (2004) identified six indicators for assuring that states prepare, develop, and support principals who they describe as "learning-centered." These indicators are: recruit and select future school leaders, redesign principal preparation programs to emphasize curriculum and instruction and student learning, develop programs with school-based experiences that prepare participants to lead school improvement, base professional-level licensure on improved school and classroom practices, create alternative pathways to initial licensure, and provide training and support for leadership teams in low-performing schools. In a recent publication, the SREB reported, "only three states—Alabama, Louisiana, and Maryland—have made promising progress on several indicators, with Louisiana as the pacesetter" (SREB, 2007, p. iii). A seventh indicator, progress on learner-focused leadership standards has been added to their indicator list and will be assessed beginning next year.

SREB also conducted research on states in their region that have worked with them to initiate principal preparation program change. This report identifies five factors that hindered these efforts: (a) insufficient resources, (b) lack of administrative priority and support, (c) departmental resistance, (d) institutional hurdles, and (e) state and district policies that, in effect, turn principal preparation programs into a system for raising teachers' pay (SREB, 2004).

The Alabama Educational Leadership Redesign Initiative

Background and Context. Alabama, which is a part of the SREB region, initiated its educational leadership program redesign process in 2004 through the creation of the Governor's Congress on School Leadership (GCSL). The governor appointed over 200 individuals to serve on the GCSL. These individuals represented schools, colleges, universities, businesses, and the community at large. The governor's charge to the GCSL was to develop a plan to improve the quality of educational leadership in Alabama's public schools. The congress responded to this responsibility by developing recommendations that included a code of ethics, standards and requirements to implement a university preparation program redesign process, revised requirements and processes for the certification of instructional leaders, the creation of a professional development process to support instructional leaders, and the establishment of incentives to attract and retain quality principals in

every school. These recommendations were developed into a report that was submitted to the Office of the Governor of Alabama and the Alabama State Board of Education.

The governor accepted the recommendations and the school board of education approved them. An outcome of these actions was that all colleges and universities that had educational leadership programs were required to redesign them using the approved standards and requirements. The redesign initiative was placed under the supervision of the state department of education. The Southern Regional Education Board was hired as an outside agency to assist the state with this effort.

The state initiated the restructuring of educational leadership programs in two phases. Phase I involved issuing a RFP to colleges to create model programs that would guide others as they became engaged in this activity. Phase II involved having all colleges redesign their programs once the pilot projects completed their redesigns. Our college was one that applied for and received one of the four pilot grants issued. The grant was for $25,000 and required matching funds of $25,000, some of which could be in-kind.

My View of the Auburn Initiative. When our college embarked on its educational redesign effort, I was serving as the dean. I had been in this position for five years, three as interim dean and two as dean. Prior to entering the academy as an associate professor and being promoted to full professor, I had experience as a school system administrator. I currently hold my

professorship in educational leadership, and I served for five years before becoming a full–time administrator in the college. Therefore, I had a working relationship with the educational leadership faculty and with the department head.

When the RFP was issued from the state, I met with the faculty and department head to discuss it. Our faculty members were active in the University Council for Educational Administration and knew the literature in the field, so they had internalized the need to change. Thus, they were very supportive of developing a pilot program. The faculty met on a regular basis to develop the proposal, and one faculty member took the responsibility for writing the first draft. I stayed involved in the writing process and helped to finalize the proposal.

Prior to our completing the proposal, the faculty and department head asked if I would be the principal investigator on the project. They believed it would help create a closer working relationship among them if none of them were in charge. The department head was not from the educational leadership area and was not really comfortable providing leadership to the group in this particular area. Although I was hesitant to do this, I accepted this role for two reasons. First, it sent a clear message to everyone involved that this pilot program was a top priority for the college and that faculty and the department head had my full support. Secondly, it sent the same message to the state department of education and to those reviewing the proposal, which I believed would give

us an edge in being funded. In speaking with the state department of education, the fact that a dean was taking a personal interest in the project was a strong consideration in our receiving the grant.

The state model mandated that the program be redesigned and delivered in partnership with schools. Our model involved working with seven school districts, most of whom are small and rural. Such partnership arrangements are consistent with our college's commitment to assuring that our graduates are prepared to engage in the community building process (Kochan & Reed, 2006). I had worked with many of these districts over time, and one of the members of our team was actively engaged in partnership efforts with all seven of them. In addition, many of the leaders in these districts are graduates or are students in our doctoral program. Thus, there was a great deal of trust and goodwill between us. This helped us put our partnership structure together.

The research indicates that if school/university partnerships are to succeed, it is vital that leaders from both environments be engaged in the process (Kochan, 1999). In order to assure this engagement, we formed an advisory committee composed of representatives from each of our school district partners, our faculty, the department head, me, a representative from the state department of education, and a business partner. The advisory committee created four subcommittees: Admissions, Curriculum, Evaluation, and Partnership. I chaired the partnership committee. These committees were, like

the teams suggested by Tierney (1999), focused on attaining specific outcomes and results. The role of the partnership committee was to create memoranda of agreement and to develop structural arrangements that would allow us to design a program that was jointly owned, evaluated, and implemented.

Early in the process, we decided the entire curriculum, including course structures, materials, and evaluation processes would be completely new and developed jointly. This was a very time-intensive process. Faculty had to be available to work with school personnel when they were available. They often met after hours and on week-ends. Due to the rigorous nature of the redesign process, I gave approval to the department to discontinue all master's and doctoral program admissions until the redesign process was completed. Although this was an unusual step, I saw it as necessary to our success.

The full committee and sub-committees met on a regular basis over an eighteen month period. At the beginning, they met almost monthly. I sometimes chaired the meetings of the whole. We also hired an outside consultant to work with us as we thought this would broaden our perspective and create a stronger sense of equality among and between the partners and members. From my perspective, it achieved those ends.

We worked together to develop the mission and vision and a set of principles upon which the program would be developed. As each sub-committee completed its tasks, its recommendations were brought to the full committee for approval. Some

committees were able to complete their work more quickly than others because of the nature of the work to be accomplished.

The state department of education held numerous meetings throughout the process. Some were conducted to assist us by providing models that others had created. Others were conducted to supply information or support. We often shared our progress and the problems that we were encountering as well as how we were addressing them. As we progressed in the process, the Phase I colleges met with and shared what they were doing with colleges that were not yet involved in program redesign. In addition to holding scheduled meetings, personnel from the state department of education were also readily available throughout the process to provide information, guidance, and support.

The primary responsibility for academic programs at our university falls under the provost. At the onset of this endeavor, I shared our grant proposal with the provost and told him why I saw this effort as important to our college and university. I also shared the potential financial impact of the program. Since we are a land- grant university, he was pleased with the idea of our partnerships. I found that having these partnerships lent credibility to the initiative and also gave it some political clout. Our president was also kept informed of the process and why it was being initiated. When the redesign effort was entering its final stages, I was able to gain two additional faculty positions from the provost. I believe that part of the reason for this was that he

understood the nature and context of our work.

We submitted our completed plan to the state department of education. They gave us some feedback and then sent a team to conduct an on-site pre-review. This pre-review was conducted by members of the state department of education, personnel from the SREB, and external reviewers from schools and other universities. Upon completion of the pre-review, we made some revisions, submitted a final plan, and engaged in a final on-site review process. The redesigned program was approved, and we have since implemented it.

A new president was appointed after the redesign process had been completed. I made him aware of our work and he is supportive of it. Recently he came to one of our classes and shared his perspectives on leadership in difficult economic times. We also recently hired a new provost. I have also kept her informed about this program. She is supportive of school/university partnerships, and we will be inviting her to events throughout the year. I believe gaining upper-level administrative support is a vital part of the redesign process if it is to be sustained over time.

Reflections and Considerations. Brooks (2006) suggests that in school reform, it may be the interactions that occur between and among the faculty and the school leader, rather than what the leader does, that is the most important factor in success. Perhaps this is true at the college level as well. As dean, it is difficult for me to evaluate these interactions objectively and to

determine if our interactions were as important as what we did. I do know, however, that the interactions that occurred throughout the process were of extreme importance.

When engaging in programmatic change in the college, the dean finds him or herself seeking to find the right balance between involvement and control. Trying to find the balance in this situation was sometimes problematic. For example, it is hard for me to determine the extent to which faculty may have felt pressured to accept an idea that I presented rather than to challenge me. However, I believe that this was mitigated to some degree because decisions had to be accepted by the entire group, which included all of our partners. Having the involvement of so many stakeholders and an outside consultant, who sometimes led the meetings and provided his perceptions and ideas, helped to assure that all voices were heard. On the other side of that issue, since I was engaged in the process, I could often make a quick decision or answer a question about policy or budgets that helped facilitate the process and eliminated bureaucratic slow down.

Another factor I struggled with was the perceptions of faculty in other programs who may have seen my involvement in this effort as displaying favoritism, especially since this is the program that I am affiliated with. It is possible that this is the perception of some. I have tried to deal with this to some extent by my active participation in the Professional Development School Partnership initiatives in our college and

by participating in other college outreach and redesign efforts. However, this is something that I had to consider and that others in similar positions would also have to deal with.

The redesign effort was expensive and I found that I had to invest not only my time, but college resources beyond the grant and our matching funds to assure its success. I would be hesitant to engage in a process of this magnitude without knowing that I had some financial capacity to do so. Due to present economic realities, we are beginning discussions about how to ensure the sustainability of some of the program components including some joint sharing of financial responsibilities with our school partners, partnerships with local businesses and corporations, and support from private donors.

There were personnel changes in the college and in the school systems we partnered with during the redesign process as well. Our department head and two superintendents left, as did one faculty member. Another faculty member passed away. It is important to consider this possibility as one enters into such an endeavor. We dealt with this by having very clear goals and objectives as well as by stating our mission clearly. We also assured that all of our faculty members and two or three individuals from each school system were involved in the process. That way, when a faculty member or a superintendent or other administrator left, we still had enough support and involvement from our college or the school system to keep things going.

A Statewide Perspective of the Dean and Organizational Change

In an effort to gain a deeper understanding of the redesign process in our state beyond my own experience, I initiated an exploratory study of deans' perceptions of the process. Since little is known about the role of the dean in program change, I thought this would be a good starting point to understand the program change process at the grassroots level. The study addressed the deans' perceptions of their role in the redesign process and factors that facilitated and hindered their success.

The deans of these institutions belong to a statewide association that meets at least three times a year. We have open interactions with one another and I am secretary of this group. I thought that having a professional working relationship with most of these deans would allow me to get open and honest feedback from them.

Data Collection and Analysis. There are 27 private and public colleges and schools of education in Alabama. Thirteen of them have educational leadership programs. These colleges are diverse in nature. Some are research institutions, others are doctoral granting, and some are regional institutions with undergraduate, master's, and specialists programs.

At the time this research was conducted, twelve program redesigns had been approved. The thirteenth program has since received approval. Six of the deans, including me, were in place throughout the redesign process. Seven deans took over after the process had started. One of them moved from

one college to another. Three of them took over as dean or interim dean in colleges where they had been faculty members. Two of the other three deans came from Alabama and one came from out of state. The dean from out of state had been an associate dean in another institution that had already gone through a redesign process.

The research involved conducting interviews with the twelve other deans whose programs had been involved in redesign. Interviews were conducted by phone or in person. Each interview lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. The questions asked were:

- What was your role in the educational leadership redesign process?
- What do you think helped you to be successful?
- Can you identify any factors that served as barriers to your success?
- Do you have any other comments about this process that you think are important for me to know?

Following each interview, I conducted a review of the transcripts first by placing all responses to each question in a grouping under that question. I then culled each transcript to determine if any statements made within each question, given in response to another question or shared in general conversation during the interview, might fit into one of the responses to the questions asked. I used the constant comparative method (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) to organize responses into themes that addressed each question.

The Deans' Perceived Role in Educational Change. All deans agreed that part of their role in the redesign process was becoming knowledgeable about the program so they could understand what resources and support faculty needed and so they could deal with issues that required administrative action. Some acquired this knowledge because they had served on the Commission. For example, one dean said, "I was on the Commission so I knew what had to be done." Stated another, "I heard about it [the redesign] because I was sitting in at the Commission meetings and so I was fully aware of it from the very beginning and the process was very obvious to me."

Most of the deans indicated they had gained helpful information by attending state department of education meetings that described the requirements and the process. One dean, who took over after the redesign process had started, said he had read about the program design including the Commission report. He stated, "Once I knew what was expected I could help guide the process." Another dean said he attended the meetings, but also read the guidelines very carefully so that he could understand the needs of his faculty and the expectations of the state. Another dean shared that when he realized his faculty members were having difficulty redesigning their program, since he was not from the educational leadership area, he put an associate dean with this background in charge of leading. He said he did that

because he believed that it was essential that someone with such knowledge be available to help.

In addition to agreeing about the importance of being knowledgeable about the program requirements, all deans expressed the belief that it was essential for them to demonstrate their support and to be involved in this effort in some manner. As one dean stated, "The dean had to be there. Having the dean there gave it credibility and demonstrated its importance to the members and to the review team." However, although they agreed on the importance of their engagement in this effort, their level of involvement differed.

Some deans had an associate dean, a department head, or a faculty member take the lead. For example, in one instance, a graduate dean, who had previously been a faculty member in the department, provided leadership alongside the department head. One dean, who depended on others to provide the day-to-day leadership, expressed his involvement as being a "guided mentor." He remarked, "I tried to stay out of it. I thought they needed me to organize things in-house and to support them." This dean stated that although he did not lead the effort, he attended the meetings because since the partners were present, he thought it was important for him to be there. Another dean, who indicated that his faculty led the change, but who also attended many of the college redesign meetings said,

I think it was important [to attend the meetings] because with our partners that

participated in the development, they generally sent some pretty high-level people including the superintendent or assistant superintendent. The fact that the dean was involved and came to a good many of the meetings demonstrated to them that it was important. I think the other thing that it did was help us demonstrate to the review team when they came that we were taking it seriously.

A third dean, whose department head took the major leadership role said, "I was there at the beginning. I became familiar with the process. Deans need to be involved, informed, and supportive. Dr.____ kept me informed."

Some deans became the leaders of the change. This happened for a variety of reasons. In some instances, the dean had to take a leadership role because he or she believed that the faculty members were not able to provide appropriate leadership. One dean explained the situation this way,

I may have been a bit more active than most. We have a very good department head, but he is not very proactive. I found that as long as I was involved, he was productive. I attended all meetings, negotiated the Memoranda of Agreement, and worked with the school districts.

Another dean believed the faculty needed someone to help them formulate a vision. He stated, "You have to let faculty know what is possible. You

cannot expect people to redesign themselves." Said another,

As a faculty, they were thinking from the perspective of the program that they already had, and they were not thinking out of their own experience. They had no model in their head…. I took a major role in shaping what that would look like.

Others got involved because of faculty resistance to the change. One dean described this in this way, "The faculty believed that they had a good program. Our data showed that, so they did not believe that they needed to make this change." She indicated she had to take a lead in order to help them come to terms with the need to change. Said another,

This is what I often refer to as the paranoia of other initiated change…. Rather than seeing an opportunity or at least recognizing that there were some efforts to address a long-standing problem in the state, they resisted it.

In a few instances, there were very few faculty members in the program or there was significant turnover so the dean had to step in, lead the redesign, and hire new faculty to help complete the process. Being able to hire faculty who understood and agreed with the change was helpful in some situations. As one dean, who hired a number of new people, stated, "You have to get the right people in place. It helped that I was able to hire people

who understood and supported the new design model." Said another, "Faculty were not supportive. One of them left and that made it easier."

Some deans began the process by having a faculty member or head take the lead, but as the process continued, they intervened because the redesign was not going well. This happened prior to or after the first review. Said one dean,

[At first,] I periodically attended the meetings, but I became more involved just before the onsite visit. I found that having faculty lead themselves is problematic. They thought they understood what was expected, but they did not. They had trouble making decisions.

Once the dean realized what was occurring, he got more involved. He began getting weekly updates and became an active participant in the process. Said another dean, "For eight months, I had been told that everything was on target, but I found out that it wasn't and had to get more involved." Another respondent indicated that the faculty were not able to come to consensus and could not deal with what was happening. This was late in the process and he stated that he had to, "exert a lot of pressure." He stated that if he had it to do over again, he would have been more involved from the beginning.

The level of involvement of the dean in each program did not seem to be related to the size or type of institution involved. In all settings,

someone served as the lead person. In some instances, it was the dean, but in others, it was a faculty member or someone else from the administrative team. However, no matter what the level of involvement, there appeared to be general agreement that it was essential to the success of the endeavor that the dean demonstrate support for the redesign process in some meaningful and visible manner.

Factors that Facilitated the Program Design Process. Findings about the role of the dean suggest that the deans viewed their ability to access and gain knowledge about the redesign effort, to visibly support the process, and to assure that they or someone who was knowledgeable was helping to direct the change were important elements in the success of this endeavor.

There were four additional facilitative elements that were mentioned by most deans as they discussed the process: (a) having the state mandate the program change, (b) receiving support from the state department of education, (c) having good relationships with school personnel and systems, and (d) having faculty who were willing to change.

Mandated change. An important factor in aiding colleges to successfully develop their redesigned programs was the fact that the state had mandated the change. Although this created some resentment and resistance (see Hindrances), every program knew that it either complied with the mandate or lost its program. Although some faculty and deans may not have liked or agreed with some of the standards or program requirements, this mandate gave the

dean authority to assure that the recommendations were followed. It also aided them when they dealt with upper level administrators.

Describing the situation, one respondent said, "There was a mandate and there was oversight. It had to be done." Stated another dean, whose faculty members were not supportive of the change, "We had discussions and I asked the faculty if they wanted to keep their jobs. Spending a lot of time and effort got faculty to understand that this was required." Another dean said, "We either had to get on board or lose the program." One dean, who supported the change stated, "This would not have happened without a mandate. Our faculty are nice people, but they are not progressive. They would say, 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it.' They saw no need for change."

External support and assistance. As indicated previously, there were many opportunities for faculty and deans to become knowledgeable about the redesign process. The state department of education held meetings to share information and to provide work time. Deans said that the meetings and workshops were helpful. In addition, they stated that state department personnel were always available and willing to assist. One dean reported, "Any time we had a question, we called _____. We called frequently, and we got the help we needed." Stated another, "We called _____ often to be sure we were on the right track. We had a very successful review." Commented a third, "We called the state department a lot and they responded to our questions readily." A dean, who took

over after the redesign had already been started and was not going well, said, "The state department people did everything to be responsive." Another dean indicated that their group followed the advice given to them by the state department and visited a lead program. The dean stated that this advice and visit were very helpful.

The pre-review process was an important part of the assistance provided. A number of deans indicated that this activity helped them to make the changes needed to complete the final review successfully. Said one of them, "The pre-review process was a way to get a second look. It was a helpful piece. It was a kind of affirmation. It was done very professionally and was very helpful." Another shared, "I appreciate the state department…. We could not have accomplished it [redesign] without their help. I think the pre-review process was a good experience. It gave us good feedback." It appears that although the requirements were frustrating at times (see Hindrances), having the opportunity to present the program in its draft form during pre-review allowed the colleges to prepare for the final review in a more comprehensive manner. This finding is consistent with those of Darling-Hammond and her associates (2007) who identified providing a vision and standards and program review as an important "policy lever" in the success of program redesign.

Partnerships and relationships. As I shared, when discussing our success in developing our program, these deans believed that having strong relationships with school systems prior to initiating the redesign effort enabled them to be successful in creating a redesigned program. Speaking about this, one dean said, "Ours are true partnerships. All of these superintendents support our programs so when we approached them to participate, they were willing to do so." In one instance, a school and university had developed a mentoring program for new principals and already had a handbook developed for it. This particular dean noted that having that partnership in place, along with written guidelines for mentoring, helped to cement their redesign partnership and made it easier for them to proceed. Another dean noted, "We have direct partnerships with two school systems, but we have worked with a lot of school systems around the state and that is what really helped us, not the formal partnerships." Similarly another dean remarked, "We had substantive involvement of the public schools. We had already had a good, longstanding relationship with them." One dean emphasized the importance of their school/university relationships by saying, "Our partnerships are very strong. Our professional partners rolled up their sleeves. They met with us regularly. We could not have done it without them. We had regular contact and interaction."

A closely aligned factor in having strong partnerships is the trust individuals in these systems have in one another. A dean, whose college is working with a large school system, said his strong relationship with the superintendent, allowed them to tie the redesign effort to the needs of the school

system. Talking about this, another dean said, "We had personal relationships with our partner schools that helped us to get them involved." Another stated, "Most of these people are our graduates. Some trust was built up that way."

Faculty engagement. A final factor in creating a redesigned educational leadership program was the willingness of faculty members to get involved and to provide leadership. In many instances, such as ours, the faculty viewed the program change in a positive way from the beginning. Stated one dean, "Our faculty saw the need for change. They were willing to work and get the job done." Said another, "They were involved in the process in a very public way. When I saw their involvement, I was sure that they were moving in the right direction." Finally, one of the deans expressed his faculty's attitude in this manner, "Our faculty viewed it as a way to improve our program. They embraced this."

Even in colleges where faculty members may have been initially defensive, in most situations, although not all, the faculty realized what had to be done and did it. As one dean expressed it, even though some faculty were hurt and resented the change because they really believed in the value of their program, "once they got over themselves having their feelings hurt … they committed themselves to the change." He indicated that he believed that they had designed a very good program.

Factors that Hindered Change. All deans indicated that there were elements that hindered the redesign process. There were four issues that

seemed to be the most problematic: (a) resistance to change, (b) lack of administrative support, (c) program design and requirements, and (d) lack of clarity of expectations.

Resistance to change. As noted in the section on the dean's role, some faculty did not accept the need for redesign easily, which hindered the redesign effort. This is consistent with the SREB findings that faculty resistance can serve as a barrier to success (2004). At one institution the dean noted, "Our faculty believed that they had already been working on redesign and had a strong program." Another dean had a similar situation. She said,

> It took a lot of cajoling and gentle prodding. There was some inertia on the part of the faculty. We had good enrollments, our students get hired, and they are satisfied with our program. So they saw no need for change.

Talking about this, another dean said, "We had data that showed that our program was good. The (Alabama) Report Card showed that people were consistently very satisfied with our graduates…. It was hard to believe that we needed to change." Said another respondent, "I think the biggest problem was overcoming faculty negativity." One dean said that his faculty did not believe in the need to change and displayed "passive/aggressive resistance." This dean went on to say, "Folks in our area are products of the program and they have excelled. There is a certain bitterness [about] saying the program

they graduated from needs to be changed." The dean added that for some faculty this was "a painful and difficult experience."

In a number of instances, the dean found him or herself caught in the middle between advocating for change and advocating for their faculty. One dean said "we have to be careful to acknowledge those things that work and figure out some redeeming qualities [of the old program]." Another dean said that when he told the faculty that they needed to make significant changes, they asked, "Well, who is directing us to do it that way?" When he responded that the state board of education had mandated the changes and the state department of education was directing them to implement them, their response was that it was their program, not the state department's program.

There was a strong recommendation from the state department support team and from some deans that because the redesign was such an extensive change, it was essential for deans and faculties to have conversations about whether the college and university wanted to keep the program. Following this advice, one dean shared, "We had to decide as a college whether we were going to continue our program or not. I had conversations with faculty and department heads and we had to come to a consensus." Another dean, whose faculty had struggled with the process, said that if had to do it over again, he would have gotten the faculty together at the beginning and said,

It's not a modification of the program. It is a complete redesign. Now how does that make you feel?..... Who in the room is for it and who in the room is against it? And where can we get to a place that we all buy into this?

He indicated that such an approach may have helped to overcome the faculty resistance he had faced. Some resistance occurred because, despite the fact that the GCSL was comprised of individuals from a broad sector of groups and some of those involved in the redesign were on it, some faculty and deans did not think that the decisions and the design were legitimately made by the GCSL. They believed that there was a preconceived notion of what the redesign was going to be. They did not believe that they had had real input into the decisions that were made and they did not agree with them. Among their comments were that this change was "mandated by others" and that they "had not participated in it." One dean said that she viewed this process as a change in direction at the state level. Describing this she remarked, "This was like turning the clock back. This was more like 20 years ago. We had to cross the T's and dot the I's. [The state department] are forcing this on us." Stated another dean, "It was hard for me to convince my faculty that this is something that came from the grassroots." This dean continued,

At every one of these meetings, I or one of the other folks from my faculty brought up the fact that

this redesign almost forced colleges of education to partner with those school systems right around them and consequently it was almost like it was de facto dividing up the state for the institution. Consequently, our faculty felt that this was a ploy to essentially carve up the state into regions.

Lack of administrative support. Another problem some deans faced was a lack of university support. Although all deans were able to garner the support of their upper level administrators, in some cases it did not come easily. Although the plan was presented at statewide meetings of the presidents and others in upper level administration, there were still some problems in garnering support for the change at some institutions. The extent to which this hindered the process varied.

In some instances, the educational leadership program was one that had high enrollments and brought in significant funding to the university. The redesign process, with its partnerships and extensive field-based curriculum, necessitates lowered enrollments and, in some cases, increased faculty and other resource support. Additionally, these colleges had to close out master's level admissions while they were working on the redesign process. When asked about the provost's response to the change one dean said, "[The provost] was not happy about it. The provost does not feel that the state department should have that kind of control over us." At

one institution, a member of the upper-level administration made a statement at a public meeting that the reason that they "lost so many enrollments at _____ in the college of education is because [the dean] has shut down the educational leadership program."

In some cases, as in one regional college with a large educational preparation program, one dean shared,

It did not go well with the provost when it was first presented." Another said, "We had a very large program and I had just gotten permission to hire extra faculty to support it and now I was asking to cut program enrollment.

One dean was particularly concerned because he had been adding staff to the program, and now that he had them in place, his enrollment was going to go down. In his words,

I've put all of this money into [the program] and all of a sudden a program where we used to graduate in the neighborhood of 75–100 a year, we are going to do well to do half of that.

Program nature and design. A third hindrance to success was the nature of the program change, which in some instances was related to faculty resistance. In a few programs, there were conflicts between faculty members because of disagreements over the extent of the change, making it difficult to get them to agree on what to do. Some faculty believed that the process

was just a technical one, requiring cosmetic change, and they tried to follow that approach. One dean described the situation he encountered this way, "They had difficulty coming to consensus on some critical areas." In these instances, it appears that the dean had to intercede, reminding faculty that significant change must occur.

The element of the program design that appeared to cause the most difficulty was a requirement that in addition to other field-based experiences, students were required to engage in a residential internship over a ten day block of time. Some of the faculty and partners believed that this compressed time was inferior to the way they were already conducting their internships. Speaking about this issue, one dean said that the faculty thought that the 10-day residency internship "was a sloppy requirement." One dean, who is concerned about the internship design, expressed his thoughts by saying that "[The residency] looks good on paper, but raises a red flag."

Some school systems did not like the10-day residency requirement. Some saw it as detrimental to student learning. As one dean said, "Our school systems do not like the idea of their teachers being out of the classroom for 10 days." Other school systems viewed the internship as unfeasible economically. One dean said that his superintendent told him, "Our schools cannot pay for the substitutes to do this." Another dean remarked, "We can't provide funds to keep it up. Neither can the school systems." He continued that he was "worried about the economics of it." Another dean

described the situation in this manner: "School districts were surprised and did not realize that they were going to have to do [the 10-day residency] and realized that it had financial implications." This college solved the problem by letting the districts determine how to handle the 10-day residency. The system decided to give their teachers ten days of professional leave—which is leave without pay. The dean is concerned that this may limit student enrollment. Another dean expressed his concerns about the residency this way, "We are still worried about the residency requirement. We are planning on having it in the summer, but we do not know if there will be funding for summer school now." One program, which was working with a large school system, was able to develop a semester-long residency. Unfortunately, because of the economic downturn, he fears that this may now be in jeopardy.

In some settings, those involved had problems not only with the 10-day structure, but with the content of the internship. They thought it left out some things they believed were essential. One dean stated, "We think we may have weakened the practical experience." Some faculty and partners believed that the required content was neglecting important elements. One dean expressed it this way, "We have a lot of adjuncts who teach in our program and they think we are not doing enough about management issues like finance."

Expectations and interpretations. A final problematic area was what some deans perceived of as a lack of clarity about what was expected in order to

meet program requirements and standards. Some thought that the process was not defined well enough. One dean stated his frustration this way,

I think those individuals at the state department who had responsibility and involvement for overseeing this process had an agenda that either (a) wasn't articulated in such a way that the faculty and universities understood it, or (b) no matter what universities and faculty were going to do, these agendas were going to be forced through anyway. And it wasn't articulated.

Another expressed her feelings by saying, "There was a lack of clarity of expectations. We found out things as we went along. It was frustrating." One dean who has been an administrator for a long time said,

This was the hardest review I have ever had. There were a number of things that were not spelled out anywhere that we were expected to do. For example, the cohort model is nowhere in the standards. I was very shocked at the number of things that were required. This process was not as straightforward as others.

Some deans believed the written standards and requirements differed from those that were actually required. For example, one of them said, "The state had minimum standards, but they

are not really minimum. They expected more to approve the program." Another dean said that there were gray areas and she felt as if the requirements were changing while the program was being designed and reviewed. Another dean gave an example of this lack of clarity when he said that "collaboration," which seemed to be required for program approval, was "ill-defined," and he found it difficult to assure that they were meeting this standard because he believed "the reviewers had a model in their head that he and his faculty did not understand."

Discussion and Implications
        The Deans' Roles. The deans held different perspectives about the redesign process and their role in it, but their stories sent a very clear message that the dean had to be knowledgeable, perceptive, sensitive, and active when this mandated change was placed upon their organization. Their sharings point out that the dean had to be a listener as well as a contributor in order to assure the success of the process.

        Wolverton and Gmelch (2002) discovered that the dean engages in four "very broadly defined activities" (p. 6): planning, organizing, controlling, and leading. It appears that the deans engaged in all of these behaviors during the program redesign process. Though they participated in varying degrees, all seemed to help in the planning by becoming knowledgeable about the process and the requirements, in organizing by helping to form the partnerships, finding resources, identifying who would provide the primary leadership; in controlling by

guaranteeing that there would be adequate resources and people, assuring that the review was successful, and monitoring any needed changes; and in leading by dealing with upper level administration, being visible, helping to assure that barriers were overcome, helping to create a learning environment, and making the decision to keep the program at their institutions.

Considerations in Implementing Organizational Change. The factors that helped support the redesign process and those that hindered them seem to indicate a number of strategies these deans adopted to foster the success of the redesign effort. They were being (a) knowledgeable, (b) visible, (c) involved, (d) flexible, (e) directive when needed, and (f) sensitive to concerns and needs.

It seemed vital that the deans assured that all of those involved understood and accepted the changes that were to be made. Although the role of the dean differed, all of them demonstrated their support in some visible manner. Other important roles of the dean appeared to be a bridge builder, visionary, advocate, and in some settings, referee.

Three of the four barriers to change identified by the deans were also identified as problems in the SREB study: insufficient resources, departmental resistance, and a lack of administrative priority (2004). The issue of insufficient funding impacted these programs negatively in a number of ways. One of most problematic was the 10-day residency. In just one situation a school system had sufficient funding for a semester internship and there are some questions as to whether that

model will be able to be sustained. Most of the other school systems struggled with finding the resources to provide this internship. Darling- Hammond and her colleagues (2007) and Orr and Barber (2006) stress that well-funded, sustained, and well-developed field-based experiences are essential elements in assuring high quality principal training. Thus, this issue of funding and time for field-based experiences may prove to be critical in the success or failure of these programs during the implementation phase.

Finances were also an issue in situations where it was anticipated that enrollments would decline or faculty would increase. The financial impact of this was problematic in a number of institutions. Darling-Hammond and her co-authors (2007) stress the need to "budget comprehensively" (p. 117) when developing a redesigned program. They stress the need to fund internships, mentoring, tuition, and compensation for participants as well as provide all the necessary resources for program implementation. Although colleges received some funding during the planning stages, no additional funds have been made available for the implementation phase. The present economic situation may cause some institutions to pressure their deans to make changes and increase student enrollment. Once implementation begins, the financial hurdle could prove to be the most difficult one these colleges will face. This requires investigation in the year ahead.

In the SREB (2004) study, the primary resistance to change came from the faculty. In Alabama, some of the

resistance also came from school partners, many of whom were program graduates and thus resented the implication that their program was inadequate and was being changed. The findings suggest that it is important to deal with people's feelings when engaging in the change process and give them the opportunity to vent when necessary. There is a danger that some of these partners may feel disenfranchised. It appears, therefore, that it will be important to keep them involved in the process so that the strong relationships already formed continue to grow.

The deans supported the redesign process, even when they may not have agreed with it themselves. However, like the members of the pacesetter schools in the SREB (2004) study, some of them did not receive adequate support from the upper- level administration. If the program had not been mandated by the state, in some situations, it would have been extremely difficult for these colleges to change their programs.

The Question of Mandates. The deans indicated that one of the reasons that the redesign effort was successful was that it was mandated by the state. Darling-Hammond and her co-authors (2007) write that most of the programs they studied, which were exemplary, were in states that had created a vision and standards for educational leadership programs. The program in Alabama had these attributes, but it was also mandated. The Southern Regional Education Board agrees with the importance of mandated change and oversight. The authors write, "States

and districts cannot depend on universities to change principal preparation programs on their own because the barriers to change within these organizations are too deeply entrenched" (SREB, 2004, p. 4)

However, there is a philosophical issue here that should be addressed. Dealing with change, Fullan (1993) recognizes the role of the state in establishing standards and monitoring performance through mandates. Yet, he stresses that "you can't mandate what matters" (p. 22). Wolverton and Gmelch (2002) stress that those who lead change must "understand the benefits that accrue to an organization from involving people from multiple constituencies (especially those who will later be charged with implementation) in the planning phases of the change process" (p. 8). Fullan (1993) encourages educators to become agents, rather than victims, of change. Dealing with change at the school level, he writes that since we live in a world that offers no "silver bullets" to draw upon, the challenge for managing change lies at the institutional and individual level. Thus, he believes that meaningful change can only be effected from within and that this requires developing teachers' generative capacities and transforming schools into learning organizations.

Those responsible for implementing this program change had the opportunity to be involved in redesigning the program. In most cases, it appears that those involved saw the need and accepted the underlying theoretical foundations for the change, but even some of them did not accept the strategies and structures that they

were required to implement. In other colleges, although they engaged in the process and developed an acceptable program, there was reluctance to make the necessary changes, and one wonders about the degree to which this may cause problems in the future. As one dean said, "They did the program redesign, but I don't really know if they own it."

Assuring that faculty and the school partners view the program as their own is paramount to its success (Fullan, 2001). The ultimate outcome one would want of a redesign effort would be that it transforms not only the curriculum and the way in which principals are prepared, but that it transforms relationships between the university and schools builds a learning community (Wolverton, Gmelch, & Sorenson, 1998), and empowers others (Bennis, 1999). When writing about change in school settings, Fullan (2007) suggests that one of the most important outcomes in the change process is expanding the capacity of individuals and organizations to understand and deal with change. It would seem that this would be true in institutions of higher education as well. The degree to which those involved in this mandated change develop this capacity is yet to be determined.

The issue of implementing a mandate will always bring the degree of real involvement and the ability to empower others when they are implementing something they MUST do into question. There does appear to be resentment on the part of some people and programs regarding this change, while others seem open and excited

about it. The extent to which there is buy-in will not be known until there is an assessment of the extent to which program implementation matches the program design and the degree to which the principals educated in these programs become school leaders who foster student success.

Concluding Thoughts

Since the perceptions included in this paper are those of only the deans involved in the Alabama redesign initiative, the findings do not present a comprehensive view of the entire process. However, the findings do provide an understanding of some of the complexities of the deanship relative to organizational change, which might be applicable to other situations.

In order to get a more complete picture of the process as it occurred in Alabama, additional studies should be conducted with all constituent groups including the faculty, state department personnel, the program review committee, individuals from the K–12 environment, and any other partner groups, such as business and community members who participated in the process. It would be of value to determine how these participants perceived the role of the dean and their own role and what they viewed as the factors that facilitated or hindered the effort. Once this is done, it may also be beneficial to conduct surveys regarding how each of these groups ranks the importance of the elements that hindered and facilitated the process.

It is also essential that longitudinal studies be conducted to determine the degree to which the

outcomes of the programs designed match their purpose to prepare leaders who create successful schools. Additionally, studies should be implemented to identify whether there is a relationship between the outcomes achieved and the manner in which the dean engages in the process over time. Such studies will be of great value in giving direction to college deans as they seek to provide effective leadership in an ever-changing environment.

The needs of the society demand that colleges and universities create new ways of operating and new visions for the future just as the colleges in this study had to do (Duderstadt, 2003; Tierney, 1999). Such changes will be difficult, and those responsible for leading them will need to be involved in working with others within and outside of the organization (Guskin, 1996; Layzell, Lovell & Gill, 1996; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). This study, though limited in scope, provides those at the college, university, and state levels some thoughts for reflection that may be useful as they seek to transform programs, people and relationships through curricular and structural redesign. Hopefully, it will also stimulate others to conduct similar research which can add to the richness of the conversation and make the journey easier.

References

Adams, J. E., & Copland, M. A. (2005). *When learning counts: Rethinking licenses for school leaders.* A report prepared under a grant from the Wallace Foundation to the Center on Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Barbour, J. D. (2005, November). *Non-university based principal preparation programs: Analysis and discussion of findings.* Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

Bennis, W. (1999). *Old dogs, new tricks.* Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: an introduction to theory and method.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Bottoms, G., & O'Neil, K. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Brooks, J. S. (2006). *The dark side of school reform: Teaching in the space between reality and utopia.* Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford,

CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2003). *A university for the 21st Century.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Change forces: The sequel.* Bridgeport, NJ: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2007). *New meaning of educational change.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Gornitzka, A. (1999). Governmental policies and the organizational change in higher education. *Higher Education*, *38*(1), 5–31.

Guskin, A. E. (1996, July/August). Facing the future: The change process in restructuring universities. *Change*, 26–27.

Herrington, C. D., & Willis, B. K. (2005). Decertifying the principalship: The politics of administrator preparation in Florida. *Educational Policy*, *19*(1), 155–180.

Hess, F. M. (2003, January). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools.* Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

Hess, F. M., & Kelley, A. P. (2005). The accidental principal: What doesn't get taught at ed schools: *Education Next, 5*(3), 33–40.

Kochan, F. K. (1999). Professional development schools: A comprehensive view. In D. M. Bryd and D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on professional development schools: Teacher evaluation yearbook VII* (pp. 173–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kochan, F. K., & Reed, C. J. (2006). Collaborative leadership, community building, and democracy in public education. In F. W. English (Ed), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Kolodny, A. (1998). *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century.* London: Duke University Press.

Layzell, D., Lovell, C., & Gill, J. (1996, March). Developing faculty as an asset in a period of change and uncertainty. In *Integrating research on faculty: Seeking new ways to communication about the academic life of faculty.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, L. K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning* [Electronic

version]. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

LeTendre, B. G., & Roberts, B. (2005, November). *A national view of the certification of school principals: Current and future trends.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders* [Electronic version]. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Critical requisites for transformational leadership: Needed research and discourse. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 176–181.

Martin, J., Samels, J. E., & Associates. (1997). *First among equals: The role of the chief academic officer.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

McCarthy, M. (2002). Educational leadership preparation programs: A glance at the past with an eye towards the future. *Leadership Policy in School, 1*(3), 201–221.

Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing school leaders: defining a research and action agenda.* Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Education.

Orr, M. T., & Barber, M. E. (2006). *Collaborative leadership preparation: A comparative study of innovative programs and practices.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Sanders, N. M., & Simpson, J. (2005). State policy framework to develop highly qualified administrators. Washington, DC: CCSSO.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). *Schools need good leaders now: State progress in creating a learning-centered school leadership system.* Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2004). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs.* Atlanta, GA: Author.

Tierney, W. G. (1999). *Building the responsive campus: Creating high performance colleges and universities.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wallace Foundation. (2006). *Leadership for learning: Making the connection among state, district, and school policies and practices.* New York, NY.

Welch, J., & Welch, S. (2007). How to really shake things up. *Business Week, Issue 4061.*

Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans leading from within.*

Westport, CT: American Council on Education Oryx Press.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Montez, J., & Nies, C. T. (2001). The changing nature of the academic deanship. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28*(1).

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W., & Sorenson, D. (1998). The department as double agent: The call for departmental change and renewal. *Innovative Higher Education, 22*(3), 203–215.

Frances K. Kochan, is Dean of the College of Education and Professor of Educational Leadership in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University, Alabama. She is past president the University Council on Educational Administration. Dr. Kochan's research focuses upon collaboration and organizational change. She has studied this area by examining organizational environments, partnerships between organizations, and mentoring programs and relationships. She has published in the *Journal of School Leadership*, the *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, and *Studies in Philosophy and Education.* Dr. Kochan is editor of a series on mentoring for Information Age Publishing.